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Māori Land: A strategy for overcoming constraints on development

by J. D. Reid

This thesis is constructed on long-term action research with seven case-study groups of Māori
landowners with strong development aspirations for either unutilised land, or underutilised
land, but are constrained in their ability to unlock its potential. The research found that each
case study shared similar development goals. Each viewed their land as a spring-board for
business development, cultural revitalisation, environmental restoration, and community
development encapsulated by the vision of contemporary Papakāinga. However, common
constraints were experienced in achieving development aspirations that included: Limited
financing options; inappropriate methods employed by education institutions to build
technical knowledge and skills within communities of landowners; high levels of distrust and
suspicion within communities; leadership which is unable to maintain collective support;
inappropriately designed development support from government development agencies; and
the presence of colonial narratives within communities that create despondency and inertia.
To address these constraints it is determined that a well-resourced multi-disciplinary team
from a single agency is required that can provide specialists and capacity in a manner that is
directly accountable to landowners. First, the institution should possess the capacity to
provide social lending and venture capital. Second, a team of highly experienced
professionals and technical specialists is required to support landowners in decision-making
and engagement with external government and corporate institutions in commercial,
sustainable land management, and community development areas. Third, specialists either
external or internal to a land-owning community are required that possess the cultural
competency to develop endogenous and contextualised critical learning and planning programmes that encompass the following areas: Endogenous leadership philosophies and cosmology; identity reconstruction through immersion in narratives and practices that encourage a positive and contemporary Māori self-image; and agriculture, horticulture, business administration, governance, and the discourse of government agencies.
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### Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arohatanga</td>
<td>Care, love, respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahikā</td>
<td>Burning fires of occupation – title to land through occupation by a group, generally over a long period of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahikā roa</td>
<td>Rights of occupation and use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atua</td>
<td>God/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Āwhinatanga</td>
<td>Give assistance to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awhi</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hae hae</td>
<td>Jealousy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hapū</td>
<td>Subtribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hua parekore</td>
<td>Uncontaminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hue</td>
<td>Gourd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hui</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwitanga</td>
<td>Uniqueness of tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawa</td>
<td>Rules or protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kāwanatanga</td>
<td>Government, dominion, rule, authority, governorship, province</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiora</td>
<td>Healthy food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaihautū</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaitiakitanga</td>
<td>Guardianship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karakia</td>
<td>To recite ritual chants, say grace, pray, recite a prayer, chant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaupapa Māori</td>
<td>Māori ideology – a philosophical doctrine, incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of māori society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kamo kamo</td>
<td>Māori squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingitanga</td>
<td>King Movement – a movement which developed in the 1850s, culminating in the anointing of Pōtatau Te Wherowhero as King. Strongest support comes from the Tainui tribes. Current leader is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 The definitions provided in this glossary are either direct quotes or abbreviations from *Te Whanake*, the online Māori dictionary found at: [http://www.Māoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm](http://www.Māoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm).
Tūheitia Paki.

Kōrero  Yarn, story, gossip, joke, fiction, storytelling
Kūmara  Māori sweet potato
Kōhā  Acts of giving
Komiti  Committee
Kōrero  Speak
Kaumātua  Māori elders
Kuia  Māori woman elder
Mahinga kai  Wild hunted, angled, and gathered food as well as cultivated food
Manaaki  Unqualified acts of giving
Mana  Prestige, authority, control, power, influence, status, spiritual power, charisma – mana is a supernatural force in a person, place or object. Mana goes hand in hand with tapu, one affecting the other. The more prestigious the event, person or object, the more it is surrounded by tapu and mana. Mana is the enduring, indestructible power of the atua and is inherited at birth, the more senior the descent, the greater the mana. The authority of mana and tapu is inherited and delegated through the senior line from the atua as their human agent to act on revealed will. Since authority is a spiritual gift delegated by the atua, man remains the agent, never the source of mana. This divine choice is confirmed by the elders, initiated by the tohunga under traditional consecratory rites (tohi). Mana gives a person the authority to lead, organise and regulate communal expeditions and activities, to make decisions regarding social and political matters. A person or tribe's mana can increase from successful ventures or decrease through the lack of success. The tribe give mana to their chief and empower him/her and in turn the mana of an ariki or rangatira spreads to his/her people and their land. Almost every activity has a link with the maintenance and enhancement of mana and tapu. Animate and inanimate objects can also have mana as they also derive from the atua and because of their own association with people imbued with mana or because they are used in significant
events.

**Manawhenua**
Territorial rights, power from the land – power associated with possession and occupation of tribal land. The tribe's history and legends are based in the lands they have occupied over generations and the land provides the sustenance for the people and to provide hospitality for guests.

**Manuhiri**
Guest

**Marae**
Courtyard – the open area in front of the *wharenui*, where formal greetings and discussions take place. Often also used to include the complex of buildings around the marae.

**Mātauranga Māori**
Education, knowledge, wisdom, understanding, skill

**Mauri**
Life principle, special nature, a material symbol of a life principle, source of emotions

**Mihi**
To greet, pay tribute, acknowledge, thank.

**Moemoeā**
Dream

**Motu**
Island

**Ngahere**
Forest

**Ngā taonga tuku iho**
Passed on treasures

**Nohoanga kāinga**
Home/village and food gathering area

**Pākehā**
European New Zealander/s

**Papatūānuku**
Earth mother and wife of Rangi-nui. All living things originate from them.

**Papatipu rūnanga**
Elected council of a subtribe

**Pono**
Be true, valid, honest

**Pou**
Post, upright, support, pole, pillar, goalpost, sustenance

**Pōwhiria**
Formal welcome onto a marae

**Pūrākau**
Myth, ancient legend, story

**Rangatira**
Chief (male or female), chieftain, chieftainess, master, mistress, boss, supervisor, employer, landlord, owner, proprietor – qualities of a leader is a concern for the integrity and prosperity of the people, the land, the language and other cultural treasures (e.g. Oratory and song poetry), and an aggressive and sustained response to outside forces that may threaten these
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ranginui</td>
<td>Atua of the sky and husband of Papa-tū-ā-nuku, from which union originate all living things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūnanga/rūnaka</td>
<td>Tribal authority and traditional tribal council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rūwai</td>
<td>Māori potato</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rohe</td>
<td>Tribal area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rongoā</td>
<td>Māori medicine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takiwā</td>
<td>District, area, territory, vicinity, region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tāne</td>
<td>Husband, male, man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangata whenua</td>
<td>Local people, hosts, indigenous people of the land – people born of the whenua, i.e. Of the placenta and of the land where the people's ancestors have lived and where their placenta are buried.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taniwha</td>
<td>Water spirit, monster, chief, something or someone awesome – taniwha take many forms from logs to reptiles and whales and often live in lakes, rivers or the sea. They are often regarded as guardians by the people who live in their territory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
<td>Property, goods, possessions, effects, treasure, something prized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga raranga</td>
<td>Weaving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taramea</td>
<td>An alpine plant used for perfume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taumata</td>
<td>Summit, top of a hill, resting place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tautoko</td>
<td>To support, prop up, verify, advocate, accept (an invitation), agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tau ututu</td>
<td>Reciprocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te reo</td>
<td>Language, dialect, tongue, speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiaki</td>
<td>To guard, or look after</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga</td>
<td>Correct procedure, custom, habit, lore, method, manner, rule, way, code, meaning, plan, practice, convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti kouka</td>
<td>Cabbage tree (Cordyline Australis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tino rangatiratanga</td>
<td>Self-determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te ika a Māui</td>
<td>The North Island of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tēina</td>
<td>Younger brothers (of a male), younger sisters (of a female), cousins (of the same gender) of a junior line, junior relatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</td>
<td>The Treaty of Waitangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te waipounamu</td>
<td>The South Island of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Tuakana                     | Elder brother (of a male), elder sister (of a female), cousin (of the
same gender from a more senior branch of the family

Tuna Eels
Tūrangawaewae Domicile, place where one has rights of residence and belonging through kinship and *whakapapa*
Urupā Burial ground, cemetery, graveyard
Wairua Spirit
Wairuatanga The spiritual dimension
Waka Canoe, vehicle, conveyance, spirit medium, medium (of an *atua*), long narrow receptacle, box
Wehi Reverence
Whakama Be ashamed, shy, bashful, embarrassed
Whakatauaki Proverb, saying, aphorism – particularly those urging a type of behaviour
Whakapapa Faith and structured genealogical lineage to all things
Whakapono Trust
Whānui Be broad, wide, extensive
Whare House
Wharekai Dining hall
Wharenui Meeting house, large house – main building of a marae where guests are accommodated, Traditionally the wharenui belonged to a *hapū* or whānau but modern meeting houses have been built for non-tribal groups, including schools and tertiary institutions. Many are decorated with carvings, rafter paintings and tukutuku panels.
Wharerau Name of a small igloo shaped house used in New Zealand southern latitudes
Whānau Extended family, family group, a familiar term of address to a number of people – in the modern context the term is sometimes used to include friends who may not have any kinship ties to other members
Whenua Land
Whakakotahitanga Respect for individuals – desire for consensus
Whanaungatanga Bonds of kinship – togetherness
Introduction

The purpose of this thesis is to identify solutions that overcome the constraints on development experienced by the owners of unutilised or underutilised Māori land. The thesis has developed over nearly a decade and long-term involvement with seven case-study groups of Māori landowners seeking to develop their land. The experiences that have shaped this thesis make it clear that the constraints on developing Māori land are complex and multifaceted and fall within multiple spheres including the political, legal, social, psychological, economic, and environmental. Similarly the solutions to each constraint identified are multifaceted, although interlinked. However, fundamentally the constraints on the development of Māori land have their roots in New Zealand’s history of colonialism, and the ongoing challenges that this history brings with it in many different spheres of life for Māori landowners. Meanwhile finding solutions for overcoming challenges requires new development approaches that challenge much of the postcolonial orthodoxy within government and tribal institutions.

It would have been simple exercise to have tackled this complex and multifaceted research subject from one particular disciplinary perspective or viewpoint, perhaps focussing on a particular problem area such as tenure, leadership, or capabilities. Although this would have reduced the complexity of the undertaking, it would not have provided a sorely needed ‘birds eye’ perspective, or have delivered a holistic approach to solving the multiple challenges encountered while working alongside case-study groups. Instead I decided to take the difficult approach of undertaking a multidisciplinary study.

The reason that multidisciplinary study is so challenging is because it must deal with problem of boundaries, and in particular making decisions regarding which theoretical perspectives, from multiple disciplines, should be included, or excluded, from consideration. Different
theoretical perspectives can each shed light on a problem situation in a different way; however, it would be impossible to take into account every possible theoretical perspective within a single thesis. Consequently, limits need to be established.

The approach taken to manage complexity in this thesis was to privilege experience. This approach requires explanation. Undertaking a multidisciplinary thesis involves extensive reading of different theoretical perspectives across many fields and disciplines. The choice regarding what material to consider or not consider was made in the following manner. First, I had a supervisory team made-up of individuals from different disciplinary backgrounds including; engineering, ecology, Māori studies, human ecology, psychology, feminism and development. Second I had an Academic Oversight Komiti established by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu to guide my research within the Ngāi Tahu takiwā. This komiti consisted of Ngāi Tahu rangatira and Māori researchers. Within each oversight body there was a number of individuals with significant experience in both the context within which my field research was to be undertaken, and also the diverse disciplines that I was working across. Following the guidance of these individuals I explored a number of key theoretical approaches that could shed light on my research subject from different viewpoints.

Privileging the knowledge and experience of my supervisors and advisors, was only part of the selection process. I determined that the most appropriate methodology to undertake my research would be action-learning based on a case-study approach, which would involve me working alongside Māori landowners in pursuit of their development goals. This approach is outlined in detail within Chapters Six and Seven and emphasises the role of experience in identifying constraints and solutions to Māori land development. Through these experiences theoretical perspectives that were directly relevant to identifying constraints and solutions to Māori land development were incorporated within this thesis. In this manner praxis was a mechanism for creating boundaries between relevant and irrelevant theoretical perspectives.

The structure of this thesis does not reflect the underpinning interchange between theory and practice. Initial drafts of the thesis did follow a theory-practice interchange. However, my oversight teams felt that the thesis was becoming too long, and the critical engagement, coherency and linkages between different theoretical positions was becoming lost. Consequently it was determined that it would be best to critically explore the different
theoretical positions together within a literature review and work to synthesise them under different themes. Through this process a ‘meta’ theory could be developed, which would provide multiple juxtaposing theoretical perspectives that could assist in this process of identifying constraints and solutions to Māori land development.

In response to this decision the first five chapters of this thesis communicate and synthesise a number of different theories to establish a development meta-theory. Chapter One primarily focuses on the history of Māori land to provide background and context to the research subject under investigation. In particular this chapter identifies a number of historical themes regarding New Zealand’s colonisation and the effects this process has had on Māori land ownership and development. Chapter Two explores Fourth World Development theory, which offers mechanisms for overcoming constraints on indigenous development explored in contexts similar to Māori in New Zealand. The chapter then moves into Māori development theory, providing a brief exploration of both the history of Māori development and current Māori development theory. Chapter Three then ‘drills down’ into literature concerning Māori land development, and in particular the constraints, previously identified in the literature, on development and the governance platforms and structures used to overcome constraints. Specifically, this chapter clarifies the shortcomings in the research to date concerning Māori land development, and outlines the need for in-depth research guided by three research questions:

1. What are the development goals of case-study groups?
2. What are the constraints on their development?
3. What are the solutions for overcoming constraints?

Chapter Four explores international perspectives and theory that relate to postcolonial states and the relationship between indigenous peoples and settler nations. In particular, postcolonial and postdevelopment theory offer a number of insights into the constraints on indigenous development generated by the persistence of colonial narratives within settler nation states and within indigenous communities. Colonial narratives cause settler nations to generate paternalistic and culturally mismatched development policy for indigenous peoples, and when internalised within indigenous communities create social pathologies. The chapter then investigates international development theory that provides tools for thinking about how the
needs of indigenous peoples denied by the policy of settler nations can be met, and in particular how entitlements to resources can be expanded to support indigenous development.

Chapter Five focuses on intercultural planning, or the bringing together of settler-nation agents and Māori communities to critical plan. It is argued that Māori communities are reliant upon the settler society and nation-state to provide supporting policy, resources, and in particular human assets, that can provide technical and specialist input when charting a development course. Consequently, appropriate intercultural planning is crucial to designing effective support for Māori land development. Finally, this chapter integrates all theoretical perspectives explored from Chapters One through Five to create a meta-theory which thematically presents the multiple constraints to development, and possible solutions for overcoming constraints, represented within the literature concerning Māori, indigenous, and marginalised peoples generally.

Chapter Six is the methodology chapter, and argues for an approach based on endogenous action learning, ethnographic narrative, and kaupapa Māori methodology. Chapter Seven is the methods chapter and outlines the rationale behind taking a case study approach to this research, and articulates the process used to select case studies, gather data, and interpret data.

Chapters Eight to Eleven are the results chapters, which present and interpret the data gathered through the research in a manner that sequentially answers each of the research questions outlined above. Chapter Eight begins by providing a narrative of my experiences working with seven case-study groups of Māori landowners to articulate their development goals. Chapter Nine outlines in detail the key goals, strategies and development themes that emerged from the development planning undertaken with each case-study group. Conversely, Chapter Ten articulates the constraints on development experiences by case-study groups relating to human, financial, and physical resources, and the attempts made by case-study groups to overcome these constraints.

Chapter Eleven primarily investigates the lack of development support from New Zealand government agencies to Māori land development. Further it highlights the presence of social trauma within landowner communities resulting from colonisation, and the methods employed by case-study groups to overcome this trauma. The final chapter, Chapter Twelve, provides...
the discussion and conclusions, which involve a critical interplay between the multidisciplinary theory outlined and in Chapters One through Five with the research results articulated within Chapters Eight through Eleven. Through this critical deliberation multiple insights and conclusions are generated concerning the development goals of case-study groups, the development barriers experienced by these groups, and proposed methods for overcoming constraints.
CHAPTER ONE: The Historical Context of Māori Land Ownership

Introduction

A thesis exploring mechanisms for unlocking the development potential of Māori land cannot be adequately undertaken without an initial exploration of the historical context underpinning contemporary Māori land ownership. This chapter begins by exploring the pre-European property right structure of Māori as a means of demonstrating traditional concepts of ownership. This is used as a foundation for the second section of this chapter, which provides an outline of the pre-contact economic and political forms of organisation emerging from this property right structure. The third section investigates the early contact period between Māori and Europeans, with a particular emphasis on how the traditional forms of political and economic organisation generated rapid tribal economic expansion, and novel models of development, based on the use of European technologies within a Māori cultural framework.

The fourth section of this chapter uncovers how the settler government systematically worked to disenfranchise Māori from their economic base through the transfer of land into Crown ownership. Sections five, six and seven outline the methods used to dismantle the Māori land asset base through duplicitous purchase techniques, legal mechanisms, and confiscations. The chapter concludes that the process of making Māori virtually landless undermined Māori autonomy and freedom to self-govern according to their own forms of political organisation. Also undermined was their mana which was experienced as deep humiliation as well as personal, psychological, and spiritual denigration.
Traditional property rights

Traditional property rights in the Māori cultural context were defined by the resources procured from the land or sea rather than the land or sea itself. Rights to resources were attributed according to length of occupation and use – referred to as ahikā roa (Firth 1972; Kawharu 1977; Evison 1997). Three generations of occupying land, and utilising resources on that land, gave an individual, whānau or hapū a property right to the resource. These user rights were inherited by subsequent generations of occupiers – a process referred to as tāke tupuna (Firth 1972). It was nonetheless common for individuals and whānau to move away from occupied areas and travel to new locations. For their descendants to maintain their access rights to resources they needed to travel back and periodically occupy the areas previously inhabited by their ancestors in order to remain ahikā/occupiers (Kawharu 1977; Evison 1997).

However, inheritance was not the only method by which resource rights could be transferred or allocated. There were also at least three other methods including tāke tuku, rau patu, and marriage (Firth 1972; Kawharu 1977; Evison 1997). Tāke tuku involved the payment of an acceptable fee for the temporary access to a resource, or resources. Raupatu concerned the conquering of new territory and in turn gaining access to the resources of that territory. However, permanent ‘title’ to resources from conquered territory was not ‘conferred’ until three generations of occupation had passed. Finally, marriage was another method by which rights to resources could be conferred, with children inheriting the rights of both parents.

Further, the role of social status in relation to property rights is important. It was well recognised that chiefs and heads of whānau had mana over resources and possessed the ability to re-assign access to different resources, and could revoke the rights of particular individuals or parties, but it was also recognised that the expression of this power was politically difficult and contestable (Firth 1972). The conference of rights through inheritance, or whakapapa, ensured that occupation and access rights to resources could be held by multiple rangatira and heads of whānau. Consequently, rangatira could not easily reassign access rights without agreement from all those sharing ownership. Even rangatira who conveyed significant mana were likely to generate resentment if ownership was reassigned unjustly or without good reason (Firth 1972). This is particularly the case in the Māori tribal society as autonomy was
defended at different social scales including whānau (family), hapū (subtribe) and iwi (tribe) (Firth 1972; Kawharu 1977).

In this manner land itself was not ‘owned’ as such, but the different resource areas on the land, or mahinga kai, were owned by individuals, whānau and hapū through a complex array of rights dependent upon genealogical linkages, status, and occupation. This is not to say that there were not land ‘boundaries’ indicating where the user rights of one tribe ended and another began. Such boundaries did exist and were defended by iwi, hapū and whānau from the threat of resource expropriation (Kawharu 1977). These boundaries were not rigid. For many hapū, boundaries overlapped and rights to gather or hunt in an area might change according to changes that went along with seasons, or according to rights associated with lines of descent.

Resources were also owned at different social scales including individual, whānau, hapū or iwi. At an individual level, tools, weapons, garments, cooking vessels and fibres were owned privately. Game and fish that were acquired by a person acting alone would be considered to belong to them, although it would be usual to incorporate this food into the communal family food supply (Firth 1972, p. 341-342). This followed a general principle that the ownership of resources by ‘single persons was accompanied, or qualified by an over-right of the mass of the community to use such goods to service the wider need’ (Firth 1972, p. 356).

Ownership of tools and objects also tended to follow economic groupings associated with the scale of the activity. The koko method of catching fish, for example, only required two people. By this technique, one person would hold the net across the channel, while another would walk up the stream guiding the fish into the net (Firth 1972, p. 222). The ownership of such small nets was likely to reside at the individual, or whānau level. Conversely fishing with seine nets might require several hundred members of a hapū. For example 30 might be required to paddle large canoes carrying nets; six might be required to pay out the net, while several hundred might be required to drag the net (Firth 1972, p. 227). Ownership of such large waka and nets was likely to reside with the entire hapū.
Māori traditional economic organisation

Despite the ownership of resources being quite defined according to a complex array of rights associated with genealogy, occupation and social scale, the actual wealth accumulated through the management of these resources was continually redistributed throughout, and between, hapū (Firth 1972). Within Māori traditional society significant emphasis was placed upon giving, and in particular reciprocal obligations (Firth 1972; Kawharu 1977). As outlined previously, although an individual might have ‘owned’ fish or game they personally caught, there were strong social obligations to incorporate the food within the communal food supply within a social unit (e.g. whānau, or hapū). Furthermore, there were strong obligations on the leaders, or rangatira, of social units to gift their goods to the leaders of other social units (e.g. whānau, hapū, or iwi) (Firth 1972; Kawharu 1977). This might be in reciprocation for goods previously received, or for the gifting of specialist skills and labour. It was then concomitant upon the receiver of goods to distribute the goods fairly and liberally, given that the mana of the receiver was dependent upon their ability to do so.

This system of gifting might seem free and spontaneous but, in reality, a strict system of obligations was in force, ‘involving not only compulsion to give when the situation arose and a compulsion to accept, but also a corresponding imperative to repay the gift by another of at least the equivalent value’ (Firth 1972, p. 423). Failure to deliver in this respect was associated with a loss of reputation (Firth 1972, p. 423). Furthermore, goods gifted, were required to be, if possible, in excess of what the ‘principle of equivalence’ expected, so that the transactions tended to evolve into a situation where each party attempted to out-do the other (Firth 1972, p. 423). In addition, social sanctions were at stake if gifting failed to be reciprocated. There are stories of individuals who continually received gifts without reciprocating being killed, or being subject to cursing, whereas hapū failing to reciprocate might have war declared upon them.

Through the system of reciprocity, capital tended to circulate rather than reside with particular individuals or social units. The wealth held by rangatira, for example, was not much in excess of that of other tribal members. The primary difference lay in the amount of wealth that passed through their hands (Toft 1984, p. 39). It might be assumed that the continual circulation of wealth would create a disincentive for its accumulation, given that individuals or social units generating surpluses through hard work would not enjoy personal gain.
However, this was not the case. Instead, the moral force, which attributed prestige to ever-increasing benevolence rather than personal gain, encouraged the accumulation and circulation of wealth (Toft 1984).

The role of rangatira in this system would have no doubt been difficult given that meeting their duties required access to increasingly large quantities of goods, which in turn required increasing productivity (Toft 1984, p. 39). In the absence of any strong hierarchical divisions of labour within Māori tribal society, leaders required methods for encouraging production that did not rely heavily upon coercive forms of power (Firth 1972, p. 204-216). Social sanctions and moral force played a part by compelling members of whānau and hapū to contribute to the collective. However, the role of the leader was important to encourage and drive production through establishing an industrious example. This is illustrated by Toft (1984, p. 39) who cites numerous stories and proverbs which demonstrate the level of value attributed to rangatira who led by example. Two such proverbs include: ‘short fingernails show the rank of the man in power’, or ‘when commoner and chief work together the task is done.’ Eldson Best (1925) also identified the need for rangatira to be persuasive, to maintain common direction, and for inventiveness to find ways to improve productivity continually.

**The effectiveness of traditional Māori economic organisation following European contact**

The effectiveness of Māori economic organisation in generating surpluses was apparent from the early years of European contact into the early years of the colony (Toft 1984; Anderson 1998; Petrie 2002). In direct contradiction to the European economic liberal theory at the time, the economic organisation of Māori tribes and society generated rapid economic expansion. This stage of Māori history is not widely known, with economists such as Maugham and Kingi (1997) asserting that Māori traditional property rights, and associated economic organisation, have been a constraint on Māori economic development. These economists essentially hold contemporary versions of economic liberal theory that dominated at the time of New Zealand’s early colonisation.

From 1820 the economic prosperity of Māori increased rapidly (Toft 1984; Anderson 1998; Kingi 2002; Petrie 2002). Māori quickly became accustomed to European styles of agriculture
producing large quantities of wheat, potatoes and vegetables primarily for the settlements of Dunedin, Auckland and Sydney (Toft 1984; Atholl 1998; Kingi 2002; Petrie 2002). Māori owned and operated dozens of coastal trading vessels and international trading vessels (Toft 1984; Petrie 2002). Dozens of flour mills were also constructed through the Waikato, Bay of Plenty, Taranaki, Whanganui, and the Kapiti Coast (Toft 1984; Petrie 2002).

According to Toft (1984) this economic prosperity was a result of Māori economic organisation, and its ability to circulate capital and accumulate surpluses to meet reciprocal obligations through organised industry. In some cases hapū maintained bank accounts in Wellington containing in excess of £150,000 (Toft 1984). Other contributing factors included the high-levels of entrepreneurship and rapid adoption of European farming technology and trading methods, which was aided by high levels of Māori literacy (Toft 1984; Petrie 2002). The adoption of European technologies and literacy is largely attributable to the extension work of humanitarian Christian missionaries, who were welcomed by many hapū that sought opportunities to learn new skills (Ballantyne 2005). Unlike many historical narratives that portray the arrival of Pākehā (European New Zealanders) to New Zealand as unequivocally bad, the impact humanitarian missionaries could in some cases positive (Stenhouse 1998).

However, the economic prosperity of Māori failed to last beyond 1860. This has been attributed to a number of causes including the following (Toft 1984; Petrie 2002):

- Volatility in the international wheat market following the expansion and development of agriculture in New South Wales, Australia;
- Declines in the quality and quantities of crops produced by Māori due to technology gaps in selecting seed stock and maintaining soil fertility;
- Increasing Māori nationalism leading to the rejection of European technologies as the settler threat to Māori culture and identity grew; and,
- Increasing Māori expenditure of surpluses on arms that previously would have been spent on implements and mills.

However, the forces outlined above that counteracted the early economic success of Māori were not the predominant reason for the economic decline. Toft (1984) argues that the single dominant cause was the lack of control that Māori were able to exercise over their economic organisation. Between 1850 and 1860 the settler population grew rapidly to outnumber the indigenous Māori population. Europeans were less reliant on Māori economic and political
support, and began to produce the commodities required by the colony, seeing Māori as competitors (Toft 1984, p. 94). By the end of the 1850s ‘the European required the Māoris’ land more than their produce, and the Māori needed self determination more than the Europeans.’ (Toft 1984, p. 95).

The settler government became dominated and led by political elements that championed realpolitik and a Machiavellian approach to Māori diplomacy (Stenhouse 1998). It was considered that settlers had a right to develop land in the possession of Māori in the interests of building a new civilised nation which Māori, as racial inferiors, did not have the capability to construct or defend (Stenhouse 1998). The political opposition that advocated for the rights and welfare of Māori within the settler government, the humanitarian Anglicans, became increasingly marginalised. As the land-hungry settler government grew in its dominance over tribes, it systematically worked to disenfranchise hapū from their economic base through the transfer of land into Crown ownership (Petrie 2002). As the Māori economic base was undermined so too were the traditional forms of leadership and economic organisation underpinning Māori economic expansion. The coexistence of dual political and economic systems was mostly rejected in the new colony, due to intolerance of cultural difference and a desire for homogeny within the emerging nation-state (Toft 1984, p. 116).

Despite the rapid economic contraction, in tribal areas where Māori forms of political leadership and economic organisation\(^2\) were maintained, and natural resources were still accessible, economic activity remained significant and high standards of living were achieved (Toft 1984). However, successful ventures ultimately ceased following the hostile attitudes of the government toward these alternative examples of development. Ultimately, Māori came under the coercive power of Pākehā authority and economic organisation, losing their ability to self-determine. This had a deep psychological impact upon Māori, as their autonomy and freedom to self-govern according to their own forms of political organisation were

\(^2\) It needs to be noted here that Māori forms of political and economic organisation were changing due to European influences and in response to other environmental changes. Consequently the economic and political structures at this time were likely to have been cross-cultural hybrids. However, I would suggest that the success of these structures was most likely attributable to the ability of these communities to choose their own form of political and economic organisation, rather than having particular structures imposed.
undermined. Also undermined was their mana\textsuperscript{3} – a state of being characterised by a community’s experience of its own independent authority, control, influence, status, charisma and spiritual power. The process of undermining mana involved deep humiliation as well as personal, psychological, and spiritual denigration (Toft 1984).

**Undermining mana Māori through the colonisation process**

The first stage in undermining independent Māori political authority and economic organisation involved the British Crown annexing Māori tribal territory and establishing British sovereignty. This occurred principally through the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi between tribal leaders and the Crown in 1840. There were a number of political motivations on the part of both the British and Māori tribes in establishing a formal relationship through a Treaty.

In terms of British politics, corporate interests were calling for New Zealand’s annexation (Evison 1997). It was clear that the possibility existed for profits for British land speculators from purchasing ‘unutilised’ land from natives and then selling this land to settlers for significant profits. It was argued by corporate interests, led by the New Zealand Company, that capital raised from on-selling cheap land to settlers could be used to build the physical and institutional infrastructure of civil government in the new colony (Evison 1997). Such colonial schemes were hoped to generate profits and benefit the indigenous population, who would profit from the civilising effect of British institutions and culture.

At the same time there were calls from humanitarian political interests for increasing British government involvement in New Zealand to stem and control the activities of British citizens who were socially destabilising Māori tribal society through the introduction of disease, arms trading and land speculation (Evison 1997). This political position may appear at first glance to oppose those of the corporate interests, given that the humanitarians were seeking to limit the effects of European contact on Māori, while corporate interest were seeking to annex Māori tribal territory for profit. However, both wished to see British government intervention and the establishment of authority and control. There was nonetheless political resistance from Britain to the annexation of New Zealand due to concerns of the cost of such an

\textsuperscript{3} This definition of mana is taken from *Te Whanake*, the online Māori dictionary found at: http://www.Māoridictionary.co.nz/index.cfm.
endeavor (Olssen 1997). In the end the British government’s hand was forced when the New Zealand Company sent out shiploads of British settlers to New Zealand (Olssen 1997).

In 1840, Māori tribal territory could not simply be annexed militarily, given that Māori still significantly outnumbered Europeans (Evison 1997). Further, Māori had obtained muskets through trade, which were being used in inter-tribal conflict. Consequently, Māori not only outnumbered Europeans but were also experienced in musket warfare. As a result, the support and cooperation of the indigenous population was required in the annexation of their territory. From the Māori perspective there were a number of advantages seen in securing a governance arrangement with the British Crown. Māori were keen adopters of European technologies and were eager to have European settlements under their authority to facilitate and expand trade. Additionally, there was some interest in establishing over-arching order and control in the manner and rate of contact and settlement. Māori were suffering from the impact of introduced diseases, while coping with inter-tribal conflicts that had grown in scale and impact due to muskets. Land speculators were also sowing divisions and conflict within and between hapū, through the haphazard negotiation of land sales with individual tribal members who lacked authority.

Despite some reservations concerning the real intentions of the British, a treaty was prepared at Waitangi in 1840 and signed by a number of rangatira from throughout New Zealand. This treaty is known as Te Tiriti o Waitangi, or the Treaty of Waitangi, which sets the constitutional framework for the relationship between the Crown and Māori iwi who were signatories (Ministry for Culture and Heritage 2009). The Treaty consists of three articles written in both English and Māori. The Māori and English versions are slightly different, which has led to much debate. In the English version of Article I Māori tribal chiefs were understood to cede ‘to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of Sovereignty’ over their territories. However, in the Māori version of Article I, rangatira only ceded 'te kawanatanga katoa' or ‘governance’ over their territories. As a consequence of these differences between the versions, many iwi deny having ceded sovereignty to the British Crown.

In response to iwi granting ‘sovereignty’ or ‘governance’ to the Crown, the Crown in the English version of Article II guaranteed to the ‘Chiefs and Tribes of New Zealand full
exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates Forests Fisheries and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess so long as it is their wish and desire to retain the same in their possession’. However, there is once again a difference between the English and Māori version of Article II. In the Māori version they are guaranteed ‘te tino rangatiratanga’ or the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages, and all their property and treasures, rather than simple possession.

Article II also established the right of preemption, which gave the Crown exclusive right to purchase lands in preference to any other person. Finally Article III of the Treaty granted Māori ‘royal protection’ and ‘the Rights and Privileges of British Subjects’.

The Treaty paves the way to the eradication of Māori self-governance

The practical effect of the Treaty on Māori was to essentially affirm mana Māori, and the unqualified authority of chiefs in the lands that they retained ownership of. However, it also opened the door to the eradication of those rights (Ward 1999). From the British perspective the Treaty of Waitangi (according to the English version of Article I) established the Crown as absolute Sovereign over New Zealand in much the same vein as William the Conqueror established sole sovereign right over English territory in 1066 (Evison 2007). When William conquered England and became absolute Sovereign he assumed the power to remove existing proprietary laws (laws which gave title to property) without compensation to the existing owners. William chose largely to retain the existing proprietary laws – although the right to extinguish these entitlements at any time remained with his successors. The pre-Norman title to property was referred to as aboriginal title, which from its Latin root means ‘there at the beginning’ (Evison 2007).

However, unlike the conquered Anglo Saxons who could have their aboriginal title removed at any time by the Sovereign, Māori could presume that they were secure in their aboriginal title as they had been guaranteed by the Crown under Article II of the English version of the Treaty ‘full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates Forests Fisheries and other properties’. Furthermore in the Māori version of Article II chiefs were guaranteed their tino rangatiratanga, or the right to exercise their undisturbed chieftainship over their lands, villages, and all their property and treasures. In this manner tribes, under chiefly authority, could rightly conclude that their autonomy and freedom to self-govern according to
their own forms of political and economic organisation had been guaranteed, as long as the lands that supported their economic autonomy, and fell under their authority, remained in aboriginal title.

The recognition of Māori aboriginal title under the Treaty of Waitangi, and the Crown’s absolute right of preemption, was placed into law following the passing of the Land Claims Ordinance Act in 1841 within Governor Hobson’s legislative council (Ward 1999; Evison 2007). This legal recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi was made even stronger following a decision by a New Zealand Supreme Court decision in 1847 (Ward 1999; Evison 2007). However, ultimately under British law, title to property can be overridden by new acts of parliament. This is because, under a parliamentary system, the legislative body possesses absolute sovereignty, meaning that it is supreme to all other government institutions including, for example, judicial bodies.\(^4\) This power of the Crown was made explicit in relation to Māori aboriginal title by the 1847 Supreme Court decision, where the recognition of Māori aboriginal title was qualified with the assertion that the Crown maintained the exclusive right to extinguish this aboriginal title (Evison 2007).

Consequently, although Māori had a treaty guaranteeing undisturbed possession of their aboriginal title, their aboriginal title was not secure. As a result the Crown could potentially make laws breaching the Treaty of Waitangi and Māori would have no legal recourse. It would, of course, be duplicitous, dishonourable, and immoral for the Crown to act in this way.

In addition, Māori did not have any political recourse should the Crown decide to abrogate their rights, as they had no representation within the early New Zealand Legislative council. Although by 1853 Māori men were permitted to vote for members of the New Zealand Parliament, the right to vote was determined by levels of private property an individual owned. Given that land under aboriginal title did not fall under Crown title or jurisdiction it could not constitute private property. This meant that very few Māori could vote. In 1867 Māori seats were established in the parliament but these parliamentary members existed as a small minority. It was not until 1879 that all men in New Zealand could vote, and not until 1893 that all women could also vote. By this time Māori represented a small minority within

---

\(^4\) The function of judicial bodies is to only interpret the law as enacted by Parliament and royally assented by the Crown.
the population of New Zealand due to significant British immigration and steep Māori population decline from disease, war, and poverty. Consequently, they became a political minority within settler culture with little ability to defend their treaty rights and hold the Crown accountable.

Crown pre-emption – Negotiating sales through divisiveness, threats and false promises

In the initial stages following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi the Crown primarily worked to purchase land under its right of preemption, which would see land purchased converted from aboriginal title into title derived from the Crown. This offered a level of moral and legal legitimacy to the process of land transfer. Many Māori were willing to sell land at this early stage to encourage British settlement for the purpose of obtaining technology and trade. Further, the Crown was very keen to obtain land to meet the needs of arriving settlers and the demands of land speculators. The challenge for the Crown was in securing legitimate sales given the complexity of Māori proprietary customs. Based on the previous discussion regarding Māori customary property rights it can be deduced that a number of key criteria would need to be met before sales could be considered legitimate from a Māori perspective:

- Sales would need to be negotiated with all rangatira mandated to represent those who possessed user and occupation rights pertaining to an area of land.
- Consensus regarding land boundaries pertaining to user and occupation rights between these rangatira from different whānau, hapū, and even iwi would be required.
- A consensus agreement among all parties to sell all their rights of land occupation and resource use would be required before full conversion to Crown title could be justified. Or alternatively agreeable compensation provided to any who did not wish to part with their rights.
- All parties would need to be completely aware of what the sale of their rights entailed in regards to the land entering into Crown title.

However, Crown land negotiators did not appear to be overly concerned with the legitimacy of the process and of the tactics they used to obtain land, which seriously brought into question the morality and legality of the transactions they engaged in. It is not possible to go
...into detail regarding all of the early purchases but it is useful to provide two examples of large purchases in the mid-1840s conducted under the oversight of Governor George Grey. These examples, taken from the work of Harry Evison (1997; 2007) illustrate the types of negotiating process and tactics used to extract land from Māori.

The Wairau Purchase
In 1845 George Grey was appointed governor of New Zealand. Grey’s attitude to indigenous populations is outlined in his ‘aborigines report’ of 1840 – a report generated when Grey was Governor of South Australia. In the report he states that ‘the best method of civilising aborigines was to get them off the land and into wage labour’ (Evison 2007, p. 62). Further, Grey outlines his opinion that aborigines should be forced into European employment, which would render ‘a before useless and dangerous being’ into ‘a serviceable member of the community’ (Evison 2007, p. 62).

This attitude would see itself manifest in Grey’s dealings with Māori. On becoming Governor, Grey received a secret dispatch of £10,000 with which to purchase land from Māori, so as to keep an adequate supply of land for European settlement. This gave Grey the freedom to act without the authority of his New Zealand legislative council. Although Grey had been explicitly instructed to ‘honourably and scrupulously fulfill the conditions of the Treaty of Waitangi’, the £10,000 dispatch from London was really a green light for ‘the style of government that Grey was inclined – secretive, arbitrary and dissembling’ (Evison 2007, p. 62).

Grey’s first purchase in 1848 is referred to as the Wairau Deed and concerns the northern third of Te Waipounamu, or the South Island. The deed was negotiated with only three Ngāti Toa chiefs by Colonel McClevery, excluding a number of important and relevant rangatira with land occupation and user rights. Negotiating this sale with Ngāti Toa was a tactical move given that Ngāti Toa was still a formidable force in the fledgling colony and a potential adversary. Through negotiating with Ngāti Toa, Grey was effectively asserting the mana of Ngāti Toa chiefs over the lands outlined in the Wairau Deed.

Much of land that Ngāti Toa was selling was not actually occupied at the time by Ngāti Toa. Although it had successfully invaded and taken much territory in the northern half of Te
Waipounamu between 1830 and 1840 it had not held and occupied significant areas. Instead, the southern Ngāi Tahu tribe, which had repelled invasions from the north, continued to maintain and occupy much of the area.

It was clear from reports in Grey’s government that there was awareness that Ngāi Tahu currently occupied and held the regions of both Kaikōura and Kaiapoi within the Wairau purchase. However, these communities were not consulted about the Wairau purchase and as a result failed to be provided with any reserves on which to live. It is also clear that protests were made to Governor Grey from Ngāi Tahu concerning the purchase. In response, Grey outlined that he did not wish to disturb or reopen arrangements with Ngāti Toa. In this manner Grey had knowingly breached the conditions of the Treaty of Waitangi by failing to guarantee to Ngāi Tahu the undisturbed possession of their lands. Instead, Grey was putting political demand from the New Zealand Company (the private corporation charged with delivering settler schemes) ahead of Māori interests. Further, Grey preferred to operate with political expediency in regard to maintaining and building an alliance with a politically stronger tribe, Ngāti Toa, at the expense of Ngāi Tahu.

Kemp’s Deed
Grey’s land negotiators continued to use the Ngāti Toa/Ngāi Tahu division to its advantage in a second major land purchase referred to as Kemp’s Deed. Kemp’s Deed was negotiated by Henry Kemp, and concerned the sale of all territory south of the Wairau purchase to the Otago region, and all land from the eastern coastline of Te Waipounamu to the foothills of the Southern Alps. This is the region that makes up part of the region of Canterbury today. Initial negotiations regarding the purchase occurred with a number of key Ngāi Tahu chiefs in Akaroa – in the presence of about 500 tribal members. The claim to areas of Ngāi Tahu territory by Ngāti Toa were used by Kemp as a bargaining chip, with threats that if negotiations did not follow a successful line then the negotiators would leave to make negotiations with Ngāti Toa.

The price offered for the land was £2000, which was significantly less than the £3 million requested by Tikao – one of the negotiating chiefs. Given that the price was so low, the Ngāi Tahu chiefs outlined that they would only sell the land on the condition that they would have continued access to their mahinga kai, or traditional food gathering and cultivation areas.
Further they requested that adequate lands be set aside for their settlement and future needs. In this way the Ngāi Tahu chiefs considered that their ‘user rights’ and ‘occupation rights’ would be guaranteed into the future. This was agreed to by Kemp and written into the Māori version of Kemp’s Deed. However, in the English version of the Deed, provision was only made for leaving aside ‘lands for cultivation and places of residence’ excluding all of the traditional hunting and gathering areas (Evison 2007, p. 82).

Kemp managed to get approximately 16 signatures of chiefs on the sale deed, which was significantly short of the 40 signatures he desired to obtain to make the sale legitimate. More signatures were required to complete Kemp’s Deed, and surveying was required to identify the location and size of reserves, consequently a second round of negotiations was required to complete the deed. The completion of Kemp’s Deed was left to Walter Mantell.

Mantell found it difficult to obtain all of the signatures required to complete the deed given opposition from some chiefs. He made a promise that schools and hospitals would be provided to Ngāi Tahu within their settlement areas. This proved to be a positive draw-card for gaining signatures. However, Mantel acted in questionable manner in the allocation of land reserves. Mantel informed chiefs that, having taken money from Kemp following the signing of the deed, they had forfeited their right to land, which meant that it was then up to Kemp to allocate reserves as he desired. Mantel then presented survey maps of the reserves to the chiefs, who on taking the map were considered to have agreed with the reserve allocation. If Mantell met with protest regarding the size and location of reserves he would outline that more reserves were coming in the future. Needless to say this did not happen.

The reserves set aside by Mantell were far smaller than that required to sustain Ngāi Tahu, consisting of approximately 5 acres per head – half the amount ‘recommended’ to Mantell by his superiors – although indications suggest that this hard bargaining was being encouraged by Grey. Furthermore, the land was located in marginal areas away from ports and other important commercial hubs. In the end the New Zealand Company settlement did not allow for more reserves, failed to guarantee access to mahinga kai as outlined in the Māori version of the deed, and did not provide the promised schools and hospitals. In addition, a number of chiefs had refused to sign the deed but their territories were nonetheless included in the deed, swindling these occupants from their land.
The enactment of laws to control the process of sale, divide and conquer

The examples above demonstrate the primary tactics used to extract land from Māori. In cases where chiefs were either unable or unwilling to participate in negotiations, they could find land sold from underneath them without their mandate. In cases where there was an unwillingness to sell promises might be made to induce a sale that would never be fulfilled. In most cases, ‘divide and conquer’ tactics were used by negotiating with select and allied ‘land-selling’ chiefs, while excluding other chiefs mandated to represent the interests of user-right holders within a territory. Once excluded, the Crown could pressure marginalised chiefs to sell by making it clear that they were going to purchase the land from the ‘land-selling’ chiefs with or without their consent. This prompted marginalised chiefs to sell their user rights simply to receive some sort of compensation for land that was going to be sold anyway.

The threat of sale by the Crown to allied chiefs also directly threatened the mana and prestige of chiefs marginalised through the sale process, given that failing to negotiate with them was tantamount to denying their power and control over a territory. Consequently, the act of selling also reaffirmed the mana of marginalised chiefs by demonstrating their ability to sell land. It also confirmed the chiefs’ expectations that new British immigrants would settle under their patronage.

The land purchasing techniques of the Crown had the effect of generating strong resentment within and among tribes, and growing resistance to sale was forming. Also, the Crown was conscious that the legal and moral grounds on which many sales were being conducted were somewhat tenuous. The Crown needed to gain access to more land and speed-up the colonisation process in response to the continued arrival of new settlers. In order for sale to proceed swiftly a legal process would need to be established that streamlined and expedited sales in a way that conferred a sense of legal legitimacy (Williams 1999). The Crown’s response was to pass the Native Lands Act 1862 (Williams 1999).

The Native Lands Act 1862 removed the Crown’s right of pre-emption and attempted to create a free-market for land (Williams 1999). For many Māori this was a positive initiative because it was considered a mechanism by which fair prices could be gained for land – free
from the monopoly enjoyed by the Crown. However, it also circumvented the process of negotiating land sales with chiefs, or legitimate mandated representatives. It did this by permitting any individual in a tribe, with user rights in a territory, to make a claim of land title to the newly established Native Land Court. This could occur without any evidence that the claimant enjoyed the support of their whānau or hapū in making the claim. Given that the new titles were issued by the Crown, via the Native Land Court, the land became immediately converted from aboriginal title into a Crown-derived title. Of course, the Crown could assert its right to convert title in this manner given its position as sovereign, which gave it exclusive rights to extinguish native title.

The result was that disaffected individuals, and rival Māori groups with claims to land, were sought out by speculators and financially supported in making title claims to the Native Land Court. Once a claim of title was lodged for land it was then up to others with user-rights in the territory to provide proof that they also possessed ownership interests. The Land Court possessed full discretion as to what evidence it would rely upon in ascertaining who ‘according to native custom’ were ‘possessed of, or entitled to’ any land (Williams 1999, p. 134). Obtaining evidence to prove ownership interests required expensive surveying of the land and litigation to prove claim to title. In some cases the cost of undertaking land surveying and litigation was worth more than the land itself – leading to the land being sold simply to repay debts.

The Native Land Act also had the effect of greatly reducing the number of individuals that could claim title (Williams 1999). The 1865 amendment, for example, established a maximum number of owners at ten. Although later amendments of the Act repealed this section, the Court favoured limiting the number of interests to below ten in 79% of cases (Williams 1999, p. 140). The usual effect of this law was to vest land in a few individuals of higher social rank, who were charged with acting as kaitiaki, or as guardians, over the land on behalf of all other tribal owners.

Once in the title of a small number of individuals the land could be easily sold if agreed to by all interests, or partitioned into individual sections for private sale. In situations where rangatira did act as land guardians on behalf of their people, the interests of their people were not protected after their death. The Native Land Act only permitted the division of land
between heirs, who on inheriting land were entitled to partition and sell their share. There was a fixed determination by the Crown that individualised title would not be subverted by a re-communalisation process, which was reflected in the Act (Williams 1999, p. 143). The effect on individuals, who were not given legal title in the court, was to become completely disenfranchised from their land – often finding themselves landless.

The implicit effect of this Act, when considered in relation to Article II of the Māori version of the Treaty of Waitangi, was to effectively undermine the tino rangatiratanga, or local self-government. This was because any land converted into titles derived from the Crown would cease to be managed according to local custom, but according to laws established by parliament. Given that the economic and political organisation of Māori was largely dependent upon a customary property rights system, and having access to adequate resources for economic independence, the effect of the act was to signal a significant change in culture, and the undermining of the chief’s tino rangatiratanga.

The Native Lands Act also had the effect of sowing significant internal divisions and conflicts within Māori communities. It placed the legal onus on Māori to initiate the land-selling process – which removed any onus or guilt from the Crown. There were no safeguards to ensure that those initiating a claim of title in the court were legitimate or enjoyed support from the broader community of owners and, once the claim was initiated, it was inevitable that the land would be transferred into title derived from the Crown. This sowed internal divisions and conflict as individuals sought either to assert their rights by gaining title through the court, or sought to defend their rights to title in response to claims from rivals. The overall effect of the Act was to focus the attention of Māori on internal disputes and divisions, which reduced focus on the actual cause of division – unjust legal processes.

The ‘land leagues’, war and confiscations

The huge influx of settlers, the rapid loss of land through duplicitous sale negotiations, the introduction of unjust legal processes for the transfer of Māori land into Crown title, the lack of any serious Māori political representation in the settler parliament, the lack of any legal recourse for injustices, and the tribal economic contraction, stimulated the emergence of Māori nationalism (Boast and Hill 2009). In the central North Island unity under a Māori
King grew, which became known as the Kingitanga movement (Ward 1999). Further, large regional hui were conducted among chiefs agreeing not to sell land (Gilling 1999). The drive for unity, and in some ways nationalism among Māori, was a response to the threat posed by the settler government. In particular, it was a means of combating the ‘divide and conquer’ tactics being employed by the Crown to obtain land.

The increasing drive for unity was taking place simultaneously with armed resistance to British settlement from various pockets around the North Island, which in some areas developed into war (Gilling 1999). Although the vast majority of Māori seeking unity were peaceful and were simply attempting to stem the sale of land, settlers and government officials saw the increasing armed resistance, with the development of what they termed ‘land leagues’, as a serious threat to the settlement of the colony (Gilling 1999). It was also interpreted as a direct challenge to British sovereignty and imperialism. In response, new legislation was drafted to stem what was thought to be an emerging rebellion. The purpose of the legislation was to punish rebels and traitors through confiscating their land.

The legislation consisted of three acts (Gilling 1999); the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863, the Suppression of Rebellion Act 1863 and the New Zealand Loans Act 1863, which together established a confiscation system that gave the government three powers:

1. To crush rebellions and insurrections;
2. To make blanket confiscations of rebel lands; and
3. To compensate non-rebels caught-up in land confiscations.

This final power was established in recognition that the division of proprietary rights between individuals, whānau, hapū and iwi, did not match the political positions of individuals, whānau, hapū and iwi. Māori society was fractured between Crown loyalists, passive resisters, and militant resisters (Gilling 1999). Consequently, like the Native Lands Act, it would be up to those with proprietary rights in confiscated land/s to prove that they possessed those rights before the Compensation Court and receive compensation. Under the Suppression of Rebellion Act 1863, they would also need to prove that they were loyalists (Gilling 1999).

The way in which the confiscation system worked was that loans were taken under the Loans Act, to fund imperial troops, militia, and military settlers to crush rebellions and insurrections (Gilling 1999). The land confiscated through military action was sold to speculators and given...
to military settlers (including Māori tribes fighting with the Crown) who would create ‘buffer zones’ around hostile territory. Revenue generated from sales met the costs of military action, and created a compensation fund for loyalist Māori. The entire system was less about suppressing rebels than about acquiring land. Virtually any sign of resistance resulted in excessive force, collective punishment, and large confiscations. In the Eastern Bay of Plenty, for example, the killings of a government official and a missionary resulted in a brutal military ‘scorched earth’ response and the confiscation of 200,000 acres of land, including the land of loyalists (Gilling 1999).

The confiscation system also imposed a terrible injustice upon many tribes. First, all Māori in areas where resistance was present were considered ‘guilty until proven innocent’. Second, the financial compensation provided to loyalists was significantly less than the resources lost through confiscation. For example in the Waikato region the total financial compensation to loyalists totaled £23,000, yet actual claims totaled £421,000 (Gilling 1999). Third, when compensation funds for non-rebels were expended, poor quality land in remote and marginal areas was given in compensation for the confiscation of rich fertile lands. In addition, the land provided in compensation was not typically the ancestral land of loyalists, so often lacked spiritual and cultural affinity. In the Waikato region, for example, a total of 1.2 million acres was confiscated, although one third of this land was returned to loyalists it was predominantly marginal and not ancestral (Gilling 1999). Fourth, land given in compensation was typically vested in individual chiefs under title derived from the Crown rather than aboriginal title, leading to all those with proprietary rights in these lands being disenfranchised.

**Virtually landless**

The processes used by the Crown to obtain land for settlement, and undermine Māori political and economic organisation were comprehensive. The combination of duplicitous land purchase negotiations, the enactment of the Native Lands Act, and the practice of confiscations resulted in the vast majority of Māori land transferring into Crown ownership by 1890 (Williams 1999). In addition, areas that had not been transferred by that date were primarily in marginal areas from an economic point of view.

The Native Lands Act remained in different versions up until 1905 (Williams 1999). Although changes were made at times to stem the loss of Māori land, whenever demand grew
for more land for settlement the act would be amended to expedite transfer. Throughout the 20th century the amount of land in Māori ownership fell further, through various acts that facilitated transfer out of Māori hands until today only 1,515,000 hectares of land remain in Māori ownership, out of an original 29,880,000 hectares (Coleman, Dixon et al. 2005). Nearly all of this remaining land is held in Crown-derived title apart from a few off-shore islands in Foveaux Strait off the Southern Coast of Te Waipounamu.

In regards to recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi, it was not until the Treaty of Waitangi Act of 1975, that laws enacted by the Crown became subject to judicial appeal according to their inconsistency with the Treaty of Waitangi (Ward 1999). However, this Act was not retrospective and only provided redress against future actions that ‘prejudicially affected Māori’ (Ward 1999, p. 25-28) The aggrieved party could make claims to a new tribunal referred to as the Waitangi Tribunal. The tribunal did not have the power of a court to make awards but acted as a commission of inquiry with the power to make recommendations; including redress compensation.

The Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act in 1985 extended the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal to hear historic land grievances of Māori back to 1840 (Williams 1999, p. 30). Since this enactment many iwi and hapū have lodged Treaty claims, and a number have settled grievances with the Crown. There are nonetheless serious questions raised by Māori writers, academics and activists regarding the legitimacy of the Crown’s sovereignty (Ward 1991). Many maintain that Article II of the Māori version of the Treaty placed sovereignty with tribes, and gave a guarantee of rangatiratanga, or the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages, and all their property and treasures. Furthermore, they consider that the Māori version of Article I only provided the British with a general administrative authority subject to ongoing Māori right of consent rather than sovereignty.

This position has not been completely supported by the Waitangi Tribunal through its intensive investigations. The tribunal has asserted that ‘Māori chiefs were trying to preserve a form of autonomy that did not amount to complete sovereignty but a kind of local self-government in Māori districts’ (Waitangi Tribunal 1988, p. 179). Regardless of the position taken, it can be assumed that the chiefs intended that the Treaty would preserve a level of autonomy and self-government – including control over their lands. It is also clear that the
Crown acted to undermine this autonomy through the erosion of aboriginal title, upon which the ‘semi-autonomy’ or ‘district self-government’ of tribes depended.

**Conclusion**

In conclusion, the traditional Māori property right structure was complex. According to Māori tradition the land itself was not ‘owned’ as such, but the different resource areas on the land, or mahinga kai, were owned by individuals, whānau and hapū through a complex array of rights dependent upon genealogical linkages, status, and occupation. Ownership of tools and objects tended to follow economic groupings associated with the scale of the activity, which had the effect of generating economic efficiencies and surpluses. These surpluses were not held by individuals but were continually re-distributed by rangatira between and within hapū. Significant emphasis was placed upon giving, and redistribution in a process of reciprocal obligations.

In the early contact period between Māori and Europeans the traditional forms of political and economic organisation combined with the adoption of new technologies generated rapid tribal economic expansion, and novel models of development. This early economic development was short-lived. The settler government systematically violated the Treaty of Waitangi signed with rangatira by disenfranchising Māori from their economic base through the transfer of land into Crown ownership using duplicitous purchase techniques, legal mechanisms, and confiscations.

The process of making Māori virtually landless also undermined Māori autonomy and freedom to self-govern according to their own forms of political organisation. Also undermined was their mana which involved deep humiliation as well as personal, psychological, and spiritual denigration. Since this time there has been a concerted effort by Māori to regain a level of autonomy and have their grievances addressed. Since 1985 an avenue has opened for this to occur through the passing of the *Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act*. 
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CHAPTER TWO: Fourth World and Māori Development

Introduction

The purpose of Chapter One was to provide a broad historical and cultural context for contemporary Māori land ownership. The purpose of this Chapter is to provide further context to this thesis by exploring Fourth World Development literature with a particular emphasis on successful methods employed by indigenous people for reaching their development goals in current contexts. The first section of this chapter explores development literature primarily from Fourth World contexts similar to New Zealand, principally the United States, Australia, and Canada. The literature demonstrates that indigenous peoples have an increased chance of successfully achieving their goals when four key development platforms are in place – self-determination, culturally matched self-government, effective bureaucracies, and independent sources of revenue.

The second section of this chapter concentrates on exploring the history of Māori development to determine the extent to which Māori have in place the four development platforms outlined above. From this historical overview a contemporary picture of Māori development is generated. This is followed by the third section of this chapter which looks at how different Māori theorists are imagining new ways of understanding development from a Māori perspective.
Development in the Fourth World

Defining the two terms, ‘nation-state’ and ‘indigenous people’, provides a conceptual framework for defining the field of Fourth World Development. The term nation-state is made up of two words. The first word, nation, refers to an ethnic geo-political unit, while the second word, state, refers to a political unit that serves as a sovereign or supreme independent authority, over a territory. The term nation-state is a combination of these two words, which together describe the existence of a single ethnic political authority that expresses sovereign power over a territory.

The term ‘indigenous people’ is defined by a number of different institutions and organisations (ILO 1989; United Nations 2004; Asian Development Bank 2010). Although each of these definitions differ slightly they generally contain two core elements. The first is that indigenous people descend from populations that inhabited a given area at a time when people of other ethnic origins arrived and became dominant through conquest, occupation and settlement. The second element is that indigenous people maintain distinct social and cultural identities and social, economic, cultural and political institutions that are separate from the mainstream dominant society. Based on the above definitions the field of Fourth World Development explores the development of people that possess different identities and institutions than that of the settler majority ethnic group which possesses political authority over the territory in which they reside.

Indigenous people residing in nation-states confront a unique set of challenging circumstances that pertain to their development. First, indigenous people tend to have their autonomous power, legitimacy and authority curbed by settler-nations leaving substantially limited political space for indigenous nations within nation-states (Nietschmann 1994; Close 2002, p. 7). The second is that the process of nation-state building is also a process of ‘nation destroying’ for indigenous people, as the state is built upon the economic, political and cultural institutions of the settler-nation (Nietschmann 1994; Close 2002, p. 7). A third challenge is that indigenous people have typically been deprived of their territory and resources through conquest or acts of settlement, and are therefore typically disadvantaged in comparison to others in the settler nation. A fourth challenge is that the nation-state has usually assumed fiduciary obligations (trusteeship), or paternal responsibility toward the indigenous people (Anaya, Falk et al. 1995). In New Zealand, for example, Article III of the
Treaty of Waitangi places fiduciary responsibility on the Crown to extend ‘to the Natives of New Zealand...royal protection’. Finally, the boundaries of nation-states, although often reflecting the geo-political boundaries of the colonising/settling nation, do not reflect those of the indigenous people’s nation or nations (Anderson 1991; in Close 2002, p. 7). The national and regional governance boundaries in New Zealand, for this reason, do not match the tribal boundaries of Māori nations.

Each of the above challenging circumstances has implications for indigenous development. The process of nation-building by a settler political authority is unlikely to incorporate the development visions and aspirations of indigenous people. Instead, the way in which the nation-state imagines itself, both now and in the future, is likely to reflect that of the dominant settler nation. Furthermore, when a settler-colonial nation assumes a fiduciary role toward indigenous peoples within the state, it is likely to hold assumptions of what is beneficial for its principals. The fiduciary state typically adopts a tutelage role, and assumes that benefit will accrue to the indigenous people if they become more like the settler-colonial nation. As a consequence, assimilation policies are usually developed, while indigenous nations are assisted in developing institutions that reflect those found within the fiduciary state.

**Sovereignty and Cultural Match**

There is a growing body of evidence that suggests that development improvements across social and economic indices occurs within indigenous nations, when the fiduciary states ceases to maintain its tutelage role, and instead provides indigenous nations with the capacity to self-govern. The most comprehensive study undertaken that illustrates this phenomenon is the Harvard Study on American Indian Economic Development (Cornell and Kalt 1993; Cornell and Kalt 1998; Taylor and Kalt 2005). This comprehensive research programme has studied economic development on Indian Reservations over a ten-year period. The study clearly shows that in the United States of America Indian Reservations that have remained under the tutelage of the Bureau of Indian Affairs have fared less well across a range of economic development indicators including poverty, income, education, and housing, than those who have managed their own affairs, and have secured significant levels of political autonomy – or what Cornell and Kalt (1993) refer to as ‘de facto’ sovereignty.
The study also demonstrates that sovereignty alone does not deliver economic development. Also required is the second condition – the existence of culturally suitable political, economic and social institutions (Cornell and Kalt 1993; Cornell and Kalt 1998). Given the wide cultural variation between indigenous peoples, a wide variety of institutions are likely to develop – if they are to be ‘culturally matched’ (Cornell and Kalt 1993; Cornell and Kalt 1998). Some Native American nations, for example, were built upon traditional, small nomadic hunter-gatherer bands that, despite historically sharing the same culture and language, were politically autonomous. Although political institutions traditionally existed at the national level, with councils of band leaders/representatives convening to make collective decisions, power was not consolidated at this level in an organised way and remained primarily decentralised. According to the Harvard Study, a nation consisting of largely autonomous hunter-gatherer bands, whose identity is primarily centred at the band level, should develop political institutions that are decentralised and ensure accountability at the band level (Cornell and Kalt 1993; Cornell and Kalt 1998). Furthermore, economic institutions that facilitate micro-enterprise at a family or band level are more likely to be successful than economic institutions that consolidate capital at a national level. This is because politically autonomous bands are unlikely to provide political stability at a national level. Additionally, representatives will attempt to repatriate capital (patronage) back to their bands, because that is where their primary identity and loyalty will be centred (Cornell and Kalt 1993).

Conversely, some indigenous nations can develop centralised political and economic institutions if this culturally matches historic political patterns of power (Cornell and Kalt 1993). Some Native American nations were hierarchical with developed centralised institutions of government controlled by ruling elites. The primary source of identity for the constituents of these nations was the nation itself, rather than the band or kinship group. In addition, accountability of leadership was back to the nation itself rather than to smaller social units. Consequently, contemporary governance structures that consolidate power at a national level are likely to work well through, for example, a chief executive officer appointed for their capabilities by a national parliament or senate. In terms of economic institutions, corporate
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5 Micro-enterprise approaches may not work at a family level if there is a strong cultural emphasis on wealth redistribution and social sanctions against the accumulation of individual wealth. In such cases band level enterprise may be most effective.
scale enterprises can operate successfully under stable political institutions and specialist boards.

Other research also confirms the findings of the Harvard Study in relation to establishing a match between the political institutions and indigenous culture. The Indigenous Community Governance Research Project in Australia found that governance structures and institutions need to be built upon local realities if the odds of success are to be increased. In particular, governance needs to be developed based upon ‘relationships and hierarchies which resonate with traditional relationships, jurisdictions, laws, customs, and specific histories. As a result there is no single governance model suitable for all communities; each must be actively designed to reflect differing community aspirations while also meeting people’s needs.’ (Reconciliation Australia 2006, p. 7).

While there is enormous variety in the type of political institutions generated through cultural matching, Hunt and Smith (2008) have tentatively identified some effective design principles that apply across indigenous cultures in Australia. First, effective political institutions are typically built upon federal governance that emerges from dispersed regionalism. Second, institutional leadership should represent nodal points connected and accountable to wider networks of leaders, families, and communities within regional contexts. Third, the political institution should be embedded within the formal wider governance environment including governments, bureaucratic and policy networks, private sector companies, and voluntary organisations. Fourth, roles, powers, and decision-making should be defined and held by the least centralised authority across social networks capable of exercising responsibility. Fifth, the political institution should possess the capacity to transition between hierarchical and non-hierarchical modes. Finally, the institutional self, or identity, should be based on group membership and representation defined by internal relationships, networks, and connections. Each of the features outlined above assumes that a decentralised approach to governance is most effective with aboriginal contexts, which is likely to be reflective of the band-level kinship characteristics of aboriginal cultures.

Within the Australian context there has been less scope to study the impact of ‘de facto sovereignty’ on indigenous development, given that, unlike the United States government which has moved to provide some First Nations with devolved autonomy, the Australian
government has been reluctant to move in this direction. Like most other Fourth World nation-states it has tended to adopt ‘command and control’ style hierarchical governance over indigenous communities, in an attempt to mainstream and normalise these populations (Hunt 2008, p. 40). Consequently, indigenous nations in the Australian context are confronted with culturally incongruent policy and laws that are applied through bureaucratic process and institutions (Hunt and Smith 2008). In response, indigenous self-determination is sought through negotiating a narrow, contested space between the nation-state bureaucracy and aboriginal nations (Smith 2008). As a consequence the indigenous governance environment is heavily embedded, and over-weighted, within the networks of the nation-state governments and bureaucracy.

**Establishing competent and effective bureaucracies**

Beyond establishing self-determining and culturally matched political institutions, it is also recognised that indigenous nations should set about establishing effective and competent bureaucracies if they are to increase their odds of successfully meeting their development goals (Cornell and Kalt 1993). There are challenges to achieving this goal within indigenous contexts. Hunt and Smith (2008, p. 14) warn of the resistance that can come from indigenous leadership when the development or reform of indigenous institutions involves the introduction of transparency and accountability measures that may threaten their power base and access to resources. Martin (Martin 2003, p. 11) argues that indigenous organisations can view the presence of outsiders in their institutions as a threat to their autonomy and as a consequence view self-determination as institutional indigenisation, which may involve the exclusion of outsiders with skills required to operate effective bureaucracies. Martin argues that ‘indigenous organisations do not lie within a distinct and autonomous indigenous realm but rather within a contested intercultural field’ (Martin 2003, p. 11). Consequently ‘the presence of ‘outsiders’ in indigenous organisations is, in many circumstances not just required because of the relative lack of relevant managerial and administrative capacities, but is also required for the intercultural nature of these organisations’ (Martin 2003, p. 11).

Reinforcing and broadening this theme, Cornell and Kalt (1998: p. 18) outline that indigenous nations successfully pursuing their development ambitions typically build their human resource management capabilities by developing their internal capacity (i.e., among tribal members), attracting skilled externals, and retaining valued personnel in tribal bureaucracies.
Building this human asset capacity is considered central to developing any natural assets owned by an indigenous nation and for recognising and developing opportunities. This approach is further reinforced by Manuel (2007) whose study of Canadian First Nations, which won Economic Developers of the Year awards from a National Aboriginal Organisation, demonstrated that these nations placed building internal capabilities as a top priority in their development strategies. Interestingly, these top-performing nations also placed in their top-four development goals: building their traditional culture into their contemporary institutions (cultural match); and building sovereignty. This once again reinforces the link between successful development outcomes and an emphasis on sovereignty and cultural match.

The establishment of effective and competent bureaucracies is also dependent upon some other systems common to democratic government and organisational management. First, separation of powers is considered important to establish checks and balance between government, bureaucracies and business enterprises (Cornell and Kalt 1993; Cornell and Kalt 1998; Martin 2003). In particular, it has been found indigenous nations who place their business activities under specialist boards do significantly better in reaching business development goals than those that do not. Furthermore, it is stressed that indigenous institutions should ensure that agreed decision-rules, policies, transparent processes, and procedures are in place; including professional financial, personnel and record systems (Cornell and Kalt 1993; Cornell and Kalt 1998; Martin 2003). This is crucial for building accountability back to indigenous communities. However, it is not suggested that there is ‘one way’ of establishing these systems and that traditional knowledge can be authentically built into contemporary institutional settings.

Even with devolved political authority and the development of culturally appropriate institutions indigenous people have typically become deprived of their territory and its resources through conquest and settlement. Indigenous communities are also short of the human capital required to commit to development – given that within their community’s education systems have not been tailored for cultural match but to fulfill the assimilation goals of the nation-state. As a result there is often limited success for indigenous people within education institutions, which translates to shortages in natural and human capital to build political and bureaucratic institutions, as well platforms for economic development.
This scenario also creates a double bind in which the inability to build adequate political and bureaucratic institutions means that necessary external financial capital (for example from outside investors) cannot be attracted into the indigenous nation due to risks associated with institutional instability. As a consequence of these conditions, indigenous nations are likely to be dependent upon fiduciary state welfarism to achieve their development goals (Close 2002). Such resources typically come with special demands and limits on the way in which they can be expended and without incentive to build politically autonomous and culturally distinct institutions within the nation-state. As stated by Close (2002: p. 12): ‘This is part of the Catch-22 of indigenous self-determination movements, which need both Western resources and Indigenous autonomy to achieve their ends.’ Consequently, the development of independent revenue streams is paramount for the development of bureaucratic institutions. This in turn creates a double bind as the development of independent revenue streams for indigenous nations, from enterprises and economic activity, requires the development of culturally matched governance and bureaucratic institutions.

**Welfare Colonialism and Co-optation**

Throughout Fourth World development contexts in Western nation-states, a further barrier to self-determined development is ‘welfare colonialism’. Welfare colonialism is the integration of the native population into the nation-state economic system in ways that radically undermine their previous livelihoods, and is followed by the nation-state establishing welfare policies that economically support the indigenous population and often unwittingly incentivise economic dependency (Paine 1977; Peterson 1998; Reinert 2006). On the surface welfare appears to be ‘well-intentioned’ and ‘generous’ but it also preempts and diffuses potential social unrest and the mobilisation of indigenous drives for autonomy as indigenous populations become paralyzed through dependency (Paine 1977). In the words of Beckett (1987, p. 17; Close 2002) ‘Welfare colonialism is the state’s attempt to manage the political problem posed by the presence of a depressed and disenfranchised indigenous population in an affluent, liberal democratic society’.

The problem is compounded by the process of co-optation (Taiaiake 1999). Co-optation involves indigenous leaders and elites assuming paid roles within the nation-state as ‘brokers’ and ‘aboriginal experts’ in the design and implementation of state welfare and development
programmes (Taiaiake 1999). Co-optation is also thought to protect the fiduciary state from the pressure of conflict with indigenous leaders managing the interface between the nation-state and indigenous communities (Taiaiake 1999). This is particularly apparent in cases of selective participation where community leaders supportive of controversial projects are provided with leadership roles and payments at the expense of other community leaders – a process referred to as community renting (Botes and van Rensburg 2000, p.45). The impact of co-optation is that many of the leaders that might be placed in positions to drive and lead sovereignty movements, and development initiatives, are employed in developing and implementing nation-state policies that fail to fully capture the ambitions of indigenous populations.

However, criticism of leaders co-opted by the nation-state may be misplaced. It may be unlikely that nation-states would ever devolve full political authority to indigenous nations. Consequently, working from the inside to transform nation-state laws and policy may be an effective means of approaching self-determination in the actual political space offered between the nation-state, bureaucracy, and aboriginal nations. Certainly the analysis of Hollinsworth (1996) suggests that indigenous leaders working within agencies of the Australian nation-state can use these agencies as vehicles for increased political influence to bring benefits into their communities.

**The level of indigenous sovereignty in the Fourth World**

From our discussion above it is clear that differences in the level of autonomy of indigenous nations within nation-states differs considerably across contexts. Indian tribes in the United States have the most explicit recognition of their autonomy, where courts have recognised tribes as ‘domestic dependent nations’ (Imai 2008, p. 37). Tribes in the United States generally have power to make laws in all areas until they have been overridden by an Act of Congress (Imai 2008). In Canada and Australia there are self-administration and self-management models, where indigenous nations receive delegated responsibilities from federal or state governments to administer services to their constituents (Imai 2008).

Some advanced models are found in Canada, where Indian bands have some power to make by-laws in the administration of their reserves and settlements, and receive funds from the nation-state to deliver social services and economic development projects (Imai 2008). In
Norway the Sami have a parliament, which receives nation-state funding to implement initiatives associated with education, language and enterprise. In Australia aboriginal groups have the power to create associations that have regulatory powers over the protection of sacred sites, management of wildlife and access to aboriginal land (Imai 2008). Finally, in most Fourth World development contexts co-management and joint management arrangements are in place between indigenous tribes and nation-states in the management of resources.

There is, therefore, a wide variation between levels of self-determination within Fourth Nations contexts. Furthermore, the manner in which self-determination manifests can be quite different between contexts, with some nations permitting full de facto sovereignty, while others delegate authority to indigenous parliaments to design and implement programmes, while others may only devolve authority to implement State-designed programmes. Imai (2008) considers that the level of self-determination is determined by three factors:

- The degree to which an indigenous group has participated in the development of, and consented to, the governance model utilised by their community or nation;
- The degree to which indigenous people have the autonomy to conceptualise, design and implement their priorities; and
- The degree to which initiatives are transparent and accountable to the indigenous community itself.

When seen through these lenses it is only the Native American nations that have achieved significant levels of autonomous-authority in Fourth World contexts. In other nation-states there is much less capacity for indigenous nations to autonomously design their own forms of accountable-governance, and implement their priorities.

**Māori Development**

So far this chapter has only explored Fourth World Development contexts outside of Māori development and the New Zealand nation-state. It has been argued that the odds of indigenous nations successfully meeting their development goals are increased through indigenous nations having four development platforms. Each of these platforms is outlined in Table One below.
The second section of the chapter concentrates on exploring the history of Māori development in relation to the four themes of self-determination, cultural match, effective bureaucracies, and independent funds, to arrive at a contemporary picture of Māori development.

**The early period – post Treaty of Waitangi**

As outlined in chapter one, the Treaty of Waitangi under Article II guaranteed to Māori tribes ‘te tino rangatiratanga’ or the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages, and all their property and treasures. Subsequently, the Māori resource base was rapidly eroded through the conversion of Māori land from aboriginal to crown title, which simultaneously undermined the autonomy and independent political authority of tribes. Conflict emerged as attempts were made by Māori to retain their autonomy and self-determination through movements such as the Kingitanga. At the same time successive administrations of the new colony were very reluctant to share power with Māori in the developing nation-state (van Meijl 2003, p. 4).

Nevertheless, there were brief periods, usually associated with increasing tension and conflict, when the settler government sought to include Māori in nation-state decision-making. At a Conference of Chiefs at Kohimarama in 1860, Governor Brown proposed legislation that would permit a council of chiefs to scrutinise proposed laws that might affect Māori people. This proposal was never put into action (van Meijl 2003). In 1861, Grey on his return to New Zealand, resumed the role of Governor and sought to develop a system that included Māori in the Pākehā polity. He aimed to do this by establishing district tribal councils, based loosely on the traditional rūnanga model (Wickliffe and Dickson 2001; van Meijl 2003). In this manner

| Table One: The four development platforms for Fourth World development |
|---------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Self-determination              | A level of autonomy and self-determination is required to establish development priorities. |
| Cultural Match                  | Autonomous government that is culturally matched and accountable is required. |
| Effective Bureaucracies         | Bureaucracies are required that are culturally matched, accountable, professional, expertly-staffed, and inter-cultural, to implement development plans. |
| Source of independent funds     | Sources of independent funds that can be used to operate bureaucratic and governing structures effectively. |
there were some early attempts at cultural matching. These councils could make by-laws relating to sanitation, fencing, wandering stock, development of housing, protection of property, alcohol control and to suppress ‘injurious native customs’ (Wickliffe and Dickson 2001, p. 6). Disputes were mediated by Māori assessors and juries. Further, the councils were responsible for making recommendations to the Governor regarding laws they required (van Meijl 2003). The scheme was largely rejected by Māori who were in favour of retaining their own political autonomy rather than being governed indirectly by the Crown via rūnanga (van Meijl 2003).

As outlined in Chapter One, in 1866 four Māori seats were created in the New Zealand Parliament, which gave Māori some voice within the nation-state. However, by the 1880s Māori were facing the threat of full assimilation, and it was commonly believed that Māori might become extinct due to the impact of disease. Desperate to counteract this decline and cultural loss, the Māori parliamentary members sought to revive the kotahitanga movement of the 1850s, which aimed to bring tribes together to address common grievances against the Crown. As a result, a Māori parliament was established in June 1892 to present pan-tribal grievances to the government. Unlike the Kingitangi, which sought traditional sovereignty, the Māori Parliament accepted the European parliament and was only asking for independent control over a limited range of affairs. However, the Māori parliament never gained wide support among Māori, and tended to be divided along tribal and generational lines and it disbanded in 1902.

In 1900 the Māori Councils Act established Māori councils, made-up of elected representatives, which could exercise law-making and administrative functions in villages and districts. Māori Councils were authorised to control the 'health and welfare and moral well-being' of Māori. ‘They would operate at regional level, laying down rules of social control through bylaws valid within their own boundaries, which were designed to reflect meaningful tribal clusters. Beneath them, elected village committees/komiti marae would supervise and enforce their rules in the small communities in which most Māori lived’ (Hill 2004, p. 52).

The councils also exercised limited power over fisheries (van Meijl 2003). However, the councils were never properly funded and were initially only permitted to raise revenue through a highly unpopular dog tax⁶ and through executing fines from failing to comply with

---

⁶ This was a tax levied on each dog owned.
council by-laws. This made the councils unpopular. Furthermore, Māori who had sought to make use of the councils in pursuit of autonomy had found the state's parameters too constraining to do so effectively, and consequently support for the councils waned (Hill 2004). Nevertheless, the reforms they carried out led to considerable improvements in Māori health, so much so that they contributed to the demographic revival of Māori (Hill 2004).

It can be concluded that in this early period, the Crown offered Māori a level of autonomy and self-determined government at the local level. However, the powers of these authorities were highly limited to managing domestic issues of health and welfare. Further, the design of these governing structures was determined by the fiduciary state, albeit culturally matched loosely with traditional rūnanga. Initially these powers were rejected by Māori because they effectively diminished and failed to acknowledge their existing powers of tino rangatiratanga. However, because the autonomy of hapū was undermined, the powers offered by the Māori councils were assumed. These councils were independently funded, which provided for some level of autonomous operation, nevertheless they were under-funded and dependent upon highly unpopular methods of revenue-raising within Māori communities. Despite these constraints, they were very effective in improving the health of Māori and halting population decline. This success could well be attributed to their local autonomy, independent revenue streams, and culturally matched structures. There were also attempts to establish a national Māori authority to counteract the settler nation-state but this structure rapidly fractured along tribal divisions, which suggest that the model replicated settler forms of government based on consolidated power rather than the decentralised forms common to Māori culture.

The post 1945 urbanisation period

Another attempt was made in 1945 to revive the Māori Council concept, and Māori aspirations for self-government, when a multi-layered scheme of tribal administration from the local to the regional was established (Wickliffe and Dickson 2001). This administration had similar powers to the earlier tribal councils, with the ability to make by-laws but, once again, funding was an issue. Additionally, after World War II Māori migration from rural areas to urban areas grew as industrialisation and economic expansion created job opportunities within cities. Many Māori left their traditional tribal districts and villages, which began to call into question the relevance of district-self-governance (Hill 2004, p. 260). The nation-state government saw this as an opportunity to fully integrate Māori into the
mainstream culture and in 1962 removed the powers of councils to make district by-laws under the Māori Welfare Act (Hill 2004).

The New Zealand Māori Council was created by the Māori Welfare Act 1962 to replace the Māori councils. This council was initially made-up of twenty-four delegates from eight District Councils, each of which comprised executive members of Māori Committees who represented the interests of Māori within local settings (Booth 1963). The function of the New Zealand Māori Council, since its establishment, has been to make submissions to government on many matters affecting Māori interests – thereby providing some influence on the development of law and policy to reflect Māori interests. The New Zealand Māori Council system is still operating today.

A parallel set of governance structures was also being established at the same time as the Māori Councils (Wickliffe and Dickson 2001, p. 4). Some iwi seeking compensation for the unjust dispossession of their resources were, from the 1920s, achieving relatively small Crown settlements – usually in cash. Tribal governance structures were established under special acts of parliament to administer the settlement assets (Wickliffe and Dickson 2001, p. 4). These structures were referred to as Trust Boards and were made-up of elected tribe-based representatives, as opposed to the elected territory-based representatives of the Māori Councils. There was some criticism that these structures were designed so that the Crown could retain some control in the way in which iwi assets were administered (Wickliffe and Dickson 2001, p. 4).

In both the New Zealand Māori Council and the Māori Trust Boards representation was still primarily tribe-based. Māori Council representatives were elected primarily from traditional marae-based communities, while the Māori Trust Boards were elected from tribal constituents. However, with growing urbanisation many Māori left their traditional tribal areas. The new urban Māori had few tribe-based support networks in their day-to-day lives and lacked the institutions to identify and address their welfare needs as cultural dislocation caused social and economic problems unique to urban areas (Hill 2004, p. 261). There were urban-based representatives in the New Zealand Māori Council governance structure but they were elected from their tribal district rather than from their urban residence.
In response to the need for welfare and support, urban Māori constructed non-tribal marae complexes to act as cultural centres and as hubs for social networking and support (Hill 2004, p. 261). As the population of Māori living in urban areas grew from 15% in 1945 to 75% in 1970 Māori became largely an urban population. As new generations emerged only knowing urban environments many Māori ceased to identify with their traditional territories and kinship groups and developed a generic Māori identity (van Meijl 2003, p. 10). By the 1980s, Urban Māori Authorities developed to represent urban Māori, foster economic and development of communities, and forge links with central government and local bodies to deliver a number of social services. These new authorities posed a challenge to traditional tribal authorities as they emerged to claim rights of representation without links to the traditional tribal structures or territorial boundaries.

It can be concluded that in the post-WWII urbanisation period Māori district autonomy and self-governance came to an end. This was largely driven by urbanisation, whereby Māori populations no longer resided in marae-based district territories. Replacing the local government model was a hierarchical system, at the apex of which sat the New Zealand Māori Council – a body designed to make submissions to government on many matters affecting Māori interests. This body did not have the self-determination required to establish its own development priorities, but was instead dependent upon the final decisions of the Crown. Further, this institution lacked the ability to raise its own revenue or independent funds. It also lacked any bureaucratic institutions to implement its priorities but was instead dependent upon nation state agencies. The council structure was to some extent culturally matched – given that at its foundation was the local marae committee, which represented the primary social unit of Māori – the hapū. Also, during this period relatively small compensation settlements with tribes began, which saw the transfer of cash assets to iwi Trust Boards to administer for the beneficial interests of the iwi.

**Devolution**

By the early 1980s very wide economic and social disparities were widening between Māori and Pākehā across a wide range of development indicators. This can be attributed to Māori being denied the key platforms for their development by the nation-state. A loud demand for change came from an increasingly active Māori political front that resulted in the first Hui Taumata in 1984, which brought together Māori leaders and prominent parliamentary
representatives (Puketapu 2000). The hui identified the strong need among Māori for economic self-reliance and tino rangatiratanga, and also tools to facilitate economic development. As a direct result of the Hui Taumata the government announced the MANA loan scheme in 1986, a programme designed to facilitate Māori business access to financial capital, and the ACCESS scheme, which was set-up to assist people disadvantaged in the labour market (van Meijl 2003, p. 13). The schemes would see full devolution of substantial government funding to tribal authorities to design, administer, and manage the schemes for the first time in colonial history. Devolution took place in the sectors of health, social welfare, education, justice, labour, and housing.

Although the devolution policy created opportunities for Māori tribal organisations, it created new problems for the new urban authorities of pan-tribal Māori groupings in urban areas, as outlined by Van Meijel (2003, p. 14) below:

They (urban Māori) did not want the local, host tribes in cities and towns to become responsible for the social problems of urban centres largely populated by members of other tribes. For them the reliance of immigrant Māori communities on the benevolence of host tribes in urban environments did not substantially alter their possibilities of self-management: it would simply divert their dependence on a European dominated state-system to dependence on a system controlled by tribal organisations, which would still imply dependence.’

The urban/tribal split also created an interesting debate regarding exactly what a Māori tribe was. Traditionally it was not uncommon for new hapū to form by breaking away from existing hapū. Strong arguments could be made that the new urban Māori collectives were in effect contemporary hapū that had broken away from their original hapū to form new urban Māori tribes. As a consequence they felt a right to claim ‘tribe’ status. This of course was threatening to the existing tribes, particularly when it meant that new tribes might emerge within the tribal territory or takiwā of a pre-existing tribe – threatened their manawhenua status over the land and their potential Treaty of Waitangi claims to resources within an area.

The urban authority/tribal authority split, or contemporary neo-traditional tribe/traditional tribe split, was demonstrated clearly when, in 1989, the New Zealand Government introduced
the Rūnanga Iwi Act. The Act was designed to allow tribal groupings to register as tribal authorities (rūnanga), which would become empowered to administer government programmes. The government was anticipating selecting only between 12 and 15 authorities but over 200 Māori organisations applied for rūnanga status (van Meijl 2003). Not only were there multiple urban authorities registering for rūnanga status, there were also multiple rural Māori organisations. Many rural hapū refused to surrender what they considered their authority to their iwi tribal authority existing at a higher level of their traditional hierarchical structure and sought independent legal recognition of their autonomy. Similarly, many iwi were reluctant to recognise super-tribal or pan- iwi authorities, as the larger and more powerful iwi were likely to dominate such authorities (van Meijl 2003). The Rūnanga Iwi Act had the effect of illustrating the nature of Māori culture and, in particular, the continued predominance of de-centralised forms of Māori autonomous self-government at a hapū, or band level, that is characteristic of Māori traditional forms of governance. The approach of the nation-state to develop a centralised governance model exposed the lack of cultural-match between the model and Māori culture, and the need for models that better aligned with indigenous tradition.

The devolution policies of the New Zealand government were short-lived, and primarily a product of the fourth Labour Government’s experiment with the decentralisation of state-services to induce competition between providers and create efficiencies – in line with its free-market ideology (Puketapu 2000). A number of urban authorities also benefited from this period as they won competitive contracts from the state to deliver public services to Māori. The result of devolution to Māori tribal authorities did provide some real successes but generally the results were mixed (van Meijl 2003). However, it was a difficult time to test the effectiveness of tribal public-service provision to Māori, given that the New Zealand economy at the time was in a period of rapid economic contraction and Māori unemployment had risen to its highest point in history – sitting at around 25% (Coleman, Dixon et al. 2005, p. 29). Consequently, a fair assessment of the devolution policy may not have been possible.

With the economic contraction also came the need to tighten budgets and the new National government moved away from the decentralised model. It consolidated public services again in an attempt to reduce costs through efficiencies associated with scale (Puketapu 2000). Māori public services were once again brought back into the government ministries in a
process referred as mainstreaming (Puketapu 2000). A limited level of public-service delivery through Māori authorities and private Māori providers was maintained, without the large budgets and autonomy to design, administer, and manage the schemes formerly enjoyed. A policy of limited decentralisation continued with the ad hoc transferral of executive duties to Māori authorities and private providers to deliver public services according to policies prescribed by the nation-state.

Overall it can be concluded that the devolution period saw some movement toward Māori establishing the four development platforms identified as key for achieving development outcomes in Fourth World contexts. For the first time a level of self-determination was awarded to tribes as resources and decision-making transferred to tribal authorities in the design and implementation of state services. Further, many Māori tribes were provided with an opportunity to become registered as tribal authorities empowered to deliver state programmes. In this manner iwi could access significant revenue streams to develop and build their own bureaucratic institutions for public-service delivery, and independent tribal governance structures to guide programme design and implementation. However, the state government desired to keep the number of tribal authorities empowered to deliver state services small and at an iwi level. There was also a lack of cultural match in this design, which was demonstrated when hundreds of hapū sought to have their autonomy recognised.

The experiment in devolution was short-lived and the urban authority/tribal authority split was never adequately addressed. The promise and hope delivered to many Māori by devolution was undermined by the withdrawal of devolution policy. Furthermore, significant doubt was generated that power would eventually be decentralised to Māori communities. At the end of the day it was felt that devolution was in many ways a ‘ruse’, in that the nation-state will never meet Māori aspirations for self-determination. As outlined by Henare (2000, p. 3):

‘The key lesson on devolution is that it is a deductive concept and practice and will not be a principle that will contribute to Māori aspirations for sovereignty, self-determination and freedom. Its fundamental political ethos is the retention of power and decision-making at the centre.’
The Treaty of Waitangi into legislation

Despite the government’s withdrawal from the policy of devolution, the Treaty of Waitangi began to be incorporated within a raft of legislation. Today, government ministries and local governments are required under law to adhere to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Exactly what this means has not yet been ‘teased out’ in many contexts but it has led to a significant increase in engagement and the co-development of policy between central government bureaucracies and Māori authorities. Of particular importance is in the resource management and conservation areas, where policy is in some cases co-developed and co-management arrangements with local and central government have emerged regarding the management of particular areas of cultural importance including harbours, ports, parks, reserves, beaches, marine areas and coastlines (Cheyne and Tawhai 2007).

The real impact of building the Treaty of Waitangi into legislation came from the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act in 1985, which extended the jurisdiction of the Waitangi Tribunal to hear historic grievances of Māori back to 1840 and to make recommendations regarding compensation to the Crown. This Act has created an avenue for tribal authorities to obtain significant compensation packages that have provided ongoing independent revenue streams that have been used to build effective, culturally matched bureaucracies, and strategically influence the Crown on key policy issues.

It is worthwhile to briefly explore the first settlement completed with the iwi, Ngāi Tahu, to illustrate outcomes generated from the Treaty settlement process. In 1998 the tribe Ngāi Tahu received compensation of $170 million in cash as well as a number of Crown assets including forest estates and high country stations (Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu 2010). A body-corporate governance structure, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (TRONT), was established in 1998 under an act of parliament to receive the settlement assets. Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu is made up of 18 constituent rūnanga, or Papatipu Rūnanga, each of which provides an elected tribal representative onto TRONT to make an 18-member tribal council (Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu 7

7 In 1995 the Treaty of Waitangi Act was amended to only permit mandated hapū or iwi to make claims to the tribunal. Essentially this precluded individuals and pan-iwi groupings from making claims over collective assets without the authority of hapū or iwi (van Meijl 2003). This has of course been controversial – given the tension between urban and tribal authorities.

8 The Rūnanga are territorially centred in the old marae-based communities.
Each Papatipu Rūnanga is also composed of elected officials who represent the descendants of particular kaumātua (elders) who resided in one of the 18 Ngāi Tahu territories in 1848. TRONT is charged under Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act to administer its assets for the benefit of present and future members of Ngāi Tahu whānui (i.e., all those descended from the 1848 kaumātua) (Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu 2010).

Following the 1997 settlement Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu established a Holdings Company with a specialist board to invest and manage its assets (Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu 2010). According to the Harvard Study outlined previously, tribes that take this approach are more likely to achieve their development goals than are others. This appears to be the case with TRONT, where the asset base has increased from $170 million to around $650 million over an 11-year period (Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu 2010). Furthermore, the Holdings Company has paid dividends of $205 million to this tribe (Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu 2010). This dividend is transferred to TRONT’s development arm, an expert-staffed and inter-cultural bureaucracy that is charged with: Running indigenous development programmes; engaging with central and local governments in policy development, resource management and public service delivery; and, providing direct financial distributions to tribal members.

A similar story to that of Ngāi Tahu can also be repeated across a number of other iwi contexts. It is through this settlement process that tribes have obtained independent streams of funds to establish bureaucracies and implement their development plans within the policy and legal constraints of the nation-state. It is now estimated that the Māori economy as of 2006 is worth $NZ16.5 billion (Māori Economic Taskforce 2010). As a consequence, Māori now constitute a powerful economic force within the nation-state, which also translates into power to influence government policy. In this manner, increasing economic independence is a strategy for building political independence. Furthermore, rapid demographic changes will mean that Māori will constitute a significant proportion of the New Zealand population by 2050 (Māori Economic Taskforce 2010). Given this trend, in two generations Māori may possess not only the primary economic base in the country but also a significant political base.

In this manner the tribal settlement process has enabled some tribal authorities to establish two of the four platforms for development in Fourth World contexts, namely; expertly staffed bureaucracies to implement development plans and streams of independent revenue.
Nevertheless, autonomous self-government has not been achieved, and there are real questions as to whether iwi governance is culturally matched and accountable. In particular, there are questions as to whether the centralisation of human and financial capital at the iwi centre divorces and excludes hapū and whānau from settlement assets. Elisabeth Rata (2000) is highly critical of what she calls ‘neo-tribal capitalism’. She argues that Māori corporations are organisations of capitalist accumulation that create class divisions within tribes common to capitalist societies. She is particularly critical of the manner in which the new corporate structures in tribes are framed in precolonial Māori terminology, which legitimises capitalist class division as traditional.

Both Jones (2000) and Rata (2000) consider that bureaucratic and capitalist tribal elites control access to tribal revenues and are the primary beneficiaries of these institutions – at the expense of those who are socially or economically disadvantaged within post-settlement iwi or hapū. Furthermore, Rata’s (2000) argument can be extended to the many urban Māori who are disenfranchised from the new tribal economies, given that their tribal connections are no longer in place. From Rata’s perspective, neo-tribal capitalism cannot adequately address fundamental social justice issues, and is therefore an inadequate vehicle for Māori economic development.

A problem with Rata’s thesis is that the capitalist or bureaucratic institutions of Māori tribes are not necessarily the tribe itself. These institutions may be simply used as instruments for fulfilling tribal development aspirations, which may be social and cultural in character. Furthermore, if tribal institutions are to be effective in accumulating capital or delivering development services, they should be staffed by capable specialists. As such, the bureaucratic and corporate instruments of tribes are likely to be staffed by both tribal and non-tribal members capable of being employed as capitalist or bureaucratic elites in any other capitalist society. Consequently, the tribal class divisions Rata refers to, may well be inherent within Fourth World capitalist countries whether or not tribal corporate institutions exist.

Nonetheless, Rata’s concern that tribes may begin interpreting themselves through corporate institutions using precolonial terminology, may be valid and something those tribes could look to avoid in their development. Furthermore, if tribes wish to avoid cronyism and the
inequitable distribution of wealth generated from Treaty of Waitangi settlements they should ensure that adequate policies and processes are in place that combat this phenomenon.

Further warnings about the new forms of corporate tribalism are made by Materoa Dodd (2002). She suggests that some tribes have adopted international benchmarks of good corporate governance rather than ensuring cultural match between their governance and existing cultural structures. This causes structural problems within institutions as constitutional frameworks and organisational charters fail to be adequately rooted in Māori ethics. She is concerned that this will lead to similar problems as experienced in other Fourth World contexts where indigenous corporations have become almost completely unaccountable to their tribal owners. This also serves as a warning to post-settlement Māori tribes to ensure that their constitutional frameworks and organisational charters are rooted within their own cultural frameworks.

**Looking into the future**

Despite concerns with the current model of iwi-led development it appears that a significant increase in decision-making authority is possible in future as tribal authorities increasingly grow in economic and political power as a result of the Treaty Settlement process and demographic changes. However, there is a challenge in re-imagining exactly how a future relationship between the nation-state and Māori might look under a different system of government. As outlined above, the current approach of the central government is increasingly to acknowledge the place and role of traditional iwi and hapū authorities, which has ramifications for the urban ‘tribes’ that represent significant numbers of Māori but would be alienated from any process that might devolve decision-making to preexisting tribal entities. Further, as the tribal entities attract urban Māori to register with their iwi or hapū (so as to access benefits delivered by the new tribal corporations and bureaucracies) a process for reconnecting urban Māori to their tribal identity is established, which in turn reduces the relevance and political strength of urban Māori authorities. Consequently, a future debate is likely over the modes of Māori representation, and in particular the efficacy of elected tribe-based representative structures versus elected governments constituted of district or regional representatives.
There are also questions regarding the level of centralisation or decentralisation required to develop effective policy to support Māori development. It is clear that de-centralised forms of autonomous self-government at the hapū social scale was culturally the norm and may therefore be a more suitable model in contemporary settings. Consequently, one of the tentative conclusions drawn in the Hunt and Smith (2008) studies in the aboriginal context may also apply in the Māori context – that roles, powers, and decision-making should be defined and held by the least centralised authority across social networks capable of exercising responsibility. There may nevertheless remain a requirement for the centralisation of some decision-making in the interests of collective planning and efficiency.

Political debate will be required to establish the optimal balance between centralisation and decentralisation and tribal representation and geographical/population-based representation. Balance is required to establish government structures that are culturally matched, structured appropriately to social scale, and adapted to contemporary Māori settings. Constitutional arrangements between Māori and the nation-state government might be developed as models that re-imagine appropriate Māori governance structures are formulated. Constitutional arrangements would define levels of integration and separation of decision-making between the nation-state and Māori, and the level of authority expressed at different scales. Within the Māori development field there have been numerous models proposed and thinking about alternative government arrangements (Wickliffe and Dickson 2001) including:

- ‘Full-blown’ Māori sovereignty and nationhood;
- A Three House Parliament made up of a Māori House, a Pākehā House and a Treaty House (combined house);
- An elected Māori Parliament with similar powers to that of the Sami in Scandinavia;
- A National Policy Body to provide independent advice to the Crown on issues of national concern;
- The development of a written constitution that would require the Crown to adhere to the Treaty of Waitangi;
- Increasing the number of Māori seats within the existing parliamentary system;
- Establishing tribal self-government at local/regional levels; and
Empowering Māori tribes to become local governments under the Local Government Act 1974.

However, it is clear that without some sort of constitutional change a persistent pattern of disadvantage is likely to remain between Māori and Pākehā. Under current constitutional arrangements Māori have been subject to policies that rapidly undermined their early economic expansion and prosperity, attempted to extinguish their culture and identity and integrate them into the settler society, and encouraged economic dependency. Further, Māori have really only been working on the fringe of much larger national social and economic development agendas such as the development of the welfare state in the first half of the 20th century and the neo-liberal reforms of New Zealand’s economy and state services in the 1980s (Puketapu 2000).

The result of inappropriate policy is represented in a number of social and economic disparities between Māori and non-Māori in New Zealand. In terms of life expectancy in 2005 to 2007, male life expectancy at birth was 79.0 years for non-Māori and 70.4 years for Māori, a difference of 8.6 years. Female life expectancy at birth was 83.0 years for non-Māori and 75.1 years for Māori, a difference of 7.9 years (Ministry of Social Development 2010). In regards to the imprisonment, Māori experience six times the imprisonment rate of Pākehā (Policy Strategy and Research Group 2007). In terms of education, Year 11 numeracy and literacy skills were attained by 60% of Māori as opposed to 80% of non-Māori in 2008 (Ministry of Education 2010). Furthermore, as of 2008, 20% of Māori secondary school leavers are qualified to attend University in comparison to 50% of non-Māori (Ministry of Education 2010)

**Imagining Māori development**

Within the first two sections of this chapter the four key frameworks required for indigenous peoples to realise their aspirations have been explored. These platforms when in place establish the political autonomy required to build appropriate development policy and obtain independent revenues, expert knowledge and skills to implement initiatives. However, there has been no exploration of how initiatives should be designed or what they should look to achieve from a Māori perspective. This third section looks at how different Māori theorists have constructed development through Māori lenses.
Imagining new forms of development is a complex and contested space, given that multiple forms of development are likely to emerge horizontally across different hapū, and also vertically between hapū, iwi, national pan-iwi organisations, and national non-iwi Māori authorities (Durie 1998). It is clear that a number of overarching development concepts is likely to be of widespread relevance given the cultural similarities between Māori tribes and communities. Tikanga Māori (Māori culture) underpinned by mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge and philosophy) at its core prescribes a moral or ethical system which enables and restrains everyday behaviour and action (Mead 2003). Consequently, Māori knowledge and ethics, or the Māori world view, is likely to be the principal guide in the formation of Māori development theory and practice.

Manuka Henare (2001; 2005) identifies the key moral or ethical system of Māori for guiding self-determined development. He argues that tikanga Māori can provide a world view that is distinct and ‘with cosmic dimensions that can inform us about nature and the use of natural resources, about the unity of the material and the metaphysical worlds, and about what it means to be human.’ (Henare 2005, p. 124). Henare summarises this interconnected system as a core set of cardinal ethics, which are outlined in Table Two below.

Similarly, Davis (2006) identifies interconnected dimensions of te ao Māori (the world of Māori) that are relevant to Māori wealth creation and economic sustainability, which are outlined in Table Three below. Davis centres the development models in Māori spiritual wealth and, in particular, in the creative force of life emanating from the uncreated (Te Kore) into the created (Te Ao Mārama). For him this is the origin of development manifested as life itself unfolding. This unfolding is continually revealing in the world of light (Te Ao Mārama) that exists as a vital physical environment (Mana taiao), an interdependent whole, that all living beings share. He considers that understanding and respecting this whole is crucial to environmental sustainability. Human beings also have special responsibilities toward one another and follow ‘the original law’ of unconditional care and regard for one another. This is the key for the building of social wealth. Finally, maintaining and revitalising the tikanga, language and mātauranga of Māori is considered a priority as without this knowledge and philosophical footing ancient understanding of the aforementioned domains will not be maintained.
### Table Two: Cardinal ethics (Henare 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethic</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Te Ao Mārama</td>
<td>Ethic of wholeness, cosmos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Te Ao Huri Huri</td>
<td>Ethic of change and tradition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Mauri</td>
<td>Ethic of life essences, vitalism, and reverence for life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Tapu</td>
<td>Ethic of being and potentiality, the sacred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Mana</td>
<td>Ethic of power, authority and common good actualisation of tapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Hau</td>
<td>Ethic of spiritual power of obligatory reciprocity in relationships with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>life nature; life force; breath of life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Wairua</td>
<td>Ethic of spirit and spirituality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Tika</td>
<td>Ethic of the right way and quest for justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Manaakitanga</td>
<td>Ethic of care and support, reverence for humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Whānau – Whanaungatanga</td>
<td>Ethic of belonging, reverence for the human person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga Kotahitanga</td>
<td>Ethic of solidarity with people and the natural world and affirmation of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the common good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table Three: Dimensions of Te Ao Māori (Davis 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mana Tupuna – Ancestral Wisdom</th>
<th>Ancestral wisdom as a guide for future development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mana ātua – Spiritual Wealth</td>
<td>All life is created and guided from Te Kore (the starting place/energy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(whakapono, wairua)</td>
<td>source) to Te Po (the confusion), from Te Po to Te Ao Mārama (the world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of light).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana taiao – environmental wealth</td>
<td>The domains between Ranginui (Sky father) and Papatūānuku (Earth mother);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(kaitiakitanga, tikanga)</td>
<td>The physical environment is an integrated whole requiring understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and respect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana tangata – social wealth</td>
<td>Rooted in the original law of the people – aroha tetehi ki tetehi –</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(whakapapa, whānaungatanga)</td>
<td>to acknowledge unconditional care and regard from one to another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enabling strong interrelationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mana reo – cultural wealth</td>
<td>Resurgence and revitalisation of traditional knowledge, language, arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(nga taonga tuku iho, te reo)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both Davis and Henare look to Te Ao Māori to provide the ethical framework for development, which should be used to shape priorities within Māori development contexts. However, Henare’s model is static given that it simply states core Māori ethics. Conversely, Davis’s model is dynamic in that it shows a similarly set of ethics and values spiraling out from spiritual sources into an interconnected creative whole in which humans have certain roles and obligations. The notion that Māori development should be fundamentally rooted in spirituality is also repeated by Durie (2005).

Durie (2005) establishes a multi-dimensional ‘endurance’ model of Māori development rooted in tikanga that consists of a set of five interconnected domains. The first domain is Te Tai Atua, the spiritual domain, which is considered central to the organisation of Māori knowledge and experience, and the foundation of human dignity and identity. This domain flows into the second domain, known as Te Tai Tangata, which is the social domain and refers to the internal capacity of people and the level of their well-being. This domain includes, for example, education and health status, level of social cohesion and interaction, the presence of political leadership, knowledge of tikanga and te reo, and levels of entrepreneurship. Overall, the health of Te Tai Tangata domain indicates the current strength and level of resilience a community or society might currently contain.

The third domain is Te Tai Tini, which refers to the resource domain and more particularly the quality and quantity of material and non-material resources accessible by Māori. This domain in the New Zealand Fourth World context is predominantly political as it is the space where the assertion of rights to ownership, use and access to resources is sought. Furthermore this domain also concerns the development, restoration, governance and sustainable management of resources. The fourth domain is Te Tai Ao, or the global domain that encompasses the external threats as well as possible opportunities emerging from change processes external to Māori communities. It is these external threats that will impact Māori nations in multiple ways, both positive and negative. The fifth domain is Te Tai Hono, or the navigational domain. This refers to the need for leadership to identify opportunities, imagine, negotiate, plan, and forge new futures in a way that maintains the relationships and bonds that hold together Māori kinship groups and their wider networks of influence.
All of the domains outlined above interact with each other, which is outlined in Figure One below, a diagram developed from Durie’s (2005) theory. The spiritual domain provides the ethical foundation for guiding action, the social domain provides the internal capacity for action, while availability of resources from Te Tai Tini can either increase or decrease capacity for action depending upon the quantity and quality of resources available. Furthermore, the global domain can either constrain action or provide new opportunities for development. A global economic downturn, for example, can produce unemployment, while the development of a new industry aligned to Māori interests may be an opportunity for investment. Finally, Te Tai Hono domain is the source of strategic guidance, leadership, and thinking to realise new opportunities, manage risks, and vision new futures.

Durie’s (2005) model, like that of Davis (2006) is dynamic in that it prescribes movement emerging from spiritual sources into the world. However, it is not predominantly rooted in a Māori ethical framework but looks at Māori access to resources and opportunities offered by different domains, as well as the threats to accessing these necessary components. In this manner, Durie picks up on many of the key elements required to fulfil development aspirations, whereas Davis and Henare do not. Additionally, Durie also highlights the exceptionally important element of vision and leadership in the navigational domain for guiding and identifying opportunities.

**Figure One: The Five Development Domains (Durie, 2005)**
There are also examples of development models that have emerged at hapū and iwi levels to drive social and economic development (Winiata 2000). First, the Confederation of Te Āti Awa, Ngāti Raukawa and Ngāti Toarangatira (ART) is a formal cooperative that was established over 30 years ago between hapū and iwi to plan development. A number of diverse and successful development initiatives have been established since then including the development of a spiritual, cultural and educational centre, a Māori college and Church. The confederation, according to Winiata (2000), has based its development models on four values: The first concerns building the capacity of the people; the second is maintaining and developing Māori language; the third is maintaining marae as the hub of Māori culture and social life; and, the fourth is self-determination. These values are described below in more eloquent terms by Winiata (2000, p. 135):

‘Our people are our wealth: Develop and retain
The reo is a taonga: Halt the decline and revive
The marae is our principal home: Maintain and respect
Self-determination’

The level to which these values are being fulfilled are measured according to a set of pragmatic indicators which demonstrate the health and well being of hapū and iwi at a local level. The condition of marae facilities, for example, is considered an important development indicator of cultural health. These indicators identified by Winiata (2000, p. 137) are outlined below in Table Four and concentrate on identifying the cultural strength and levels of health, spirituality, education, leadership, and assets held by hapū and iwi – capturing similar themes to that outlined by Henare.

Having strength and capacity in each of the component areas above according to Winiata (2000) provides hapū and iwi with mana and the key ingredients for development. He considers that mana is not something that is held by the hapū or iwi, it is instead something that can only be conferred upon them by other hapū and iwi that witness the enhancements of their well-being – and in particular their ability to host and give to others. Winiata believes that enhancement through mana is a concept that Māori can understand and should be the primary motivating force behind development. It appears that the idea of motivating development through mana generated by the ability to give is a clear continuance of Māori
tradition in terms of reciprocal obligations, which led to rapid economic expansion from 1840 to 1860. Winiata (2000) refers to this development approach as Mana-a-hapū or Mana-a-iwi.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Four: Hapū development indicators (Winiata, 2000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakapapa (Genealogy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairuatanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whanaungatanga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tikanga and Kawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Reo Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumātua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, it is worth mentioning the development approach employed by Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK 2007c), the Ministry of Māori Development. This approach states that Māori development is built upon three pillars – Mātauranga (knowledge), Whakamana (influence) and Rawa (resources), which are outlined in Table Five below. There are significant similarities and alignment between these three pillars and the four key platforms of development outlined in the Fourth World development literature. Similarities include the emphasis on self-
determination, access to resources, as well as building and acquiring specialist skills and knowledge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Five: Māori development based on three pillars (TPK 2007c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pillar</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mātauranga (knowledge)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Whokamana (influence)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rawa (resources)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, what is not prescribed is the need for independently funded and culturally matched bureaucratic instruments for development, or an emphasis on culturally matched institutions of self-government. One of the key principles underpinning the three pillared approach is ‘Māori Capability’ which emphasises the importance of strengthening the organisational and infrastructural capacity of Māori institutions (TPK 2007c). Nonetheless, culturally matching these institutions or supporting self government is not emphasised, which suggests some reluctance from the nation-state bureaucracy to support initiatives that encourage diversity and decentralised decision-making – initiatives that would lessen central state authority and power.

It can be concluded that a number of common themes can be identified across each approach to Māori development illustrated above. The first common characteristic (apart from Te Puni Kōkiri approach) is that development involves spirituality that establishes an ethical framework for socially and environmentally responsible action and provides boundaries determining what development pathways are acceptable or unacceptable. A second common characteristic is that development involves maintaining cultural strength and building self-determination. Third, all approaches acknowledge the importance of Māori access to quality resources and opportunities in the face of threats and constraints. Fourth, the importance of building social wealth in communities is acknowledged with particular emphasis on giving,
health, social cohesion and internal capacity to realise opportunities. Fifth, the important role of leadership, or navigation, is identified with the ability to plan and drive development initiatives. Sixth, from a Te Ao Māori perspective, as outlined by Henare, Davis, and Durie, all of these elements are interconnected in a dynamic whole, of which human beings are one part with particular duties and responsibilities to other parts.

Conclusion

Throughout this chapter a number of common themes have emerged. First it has been illustrated that the Fourth World Development literature identifies four key platforms for development that when in place increase the odds that indigenous nations will reach their development goals. The research also identifies key constraints to achieving these outcomes including resource dependency on the nation-state, co-optation, welfarism and liberalism. A brief exploration of the history of Māori development through the four themes of self-determination, cultural match, effective bureaucracies, and independent funds, demonstrates that only post-settlement tribal authorities have in place independent funding streams and culturally matched, expertly staffed bureaucracies. Despite the experimentation with devolution and the inclusion of the Treaty of Waitangi within a raft of legislation significant movement toward culturally matched self-government has not been achieved. Nevertheless, demographic changes combined with growing economic power may translate into increased political power in future.

The current iwi-centric development approach of the nation-state has generated criticism from a number of quarters. Of particular concern is the alienation of urban Māori from the development process. There are also questions as to whether the centralisation and consolidation of assets at an iwi level will create a tribal elite that will increasingly grow in power and wealth while alienating those most vulnerable and in need of development assistance. Further concerns are expressed that there is a lack of cultural match between the iwi corporate and bureaucratic structures and the traditional forms of decentralised self-determined government at the hapū level. Both of these points serve as a warning to ensure that tribal assets are equitably managed and that development institutions match traditional patterns of government and accountability.
Finally, it can be concluded that the Māori Development literature provides a dynamic and interconnected model for understanding and interpreting development. Like all Fourth World Development literature it emphasises the need for self-determination or tino rangatiratanga. Further, it emphasises a development approach based on the following principles; a spirituality-based ethical framework for determining development priorities; building community strength and cultural resilience; asserting rights to access and control over quality resources; building capacity and capability; and, leadership to forge and plan development.
CHAPTER THREE: Māori Land Development

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to explore historical events that have constructed barriers to Māori land development and the key ingredients required to overcome barriers. The chapter begins by exploring the constraints on Māori land development created by imposed land tenure laws. These laws were primarily designed to facilitate the transfer of Māori land into settler ownership. It is explained that from 1909 legislation was introduced to support the development of Māori land as a vehicle for economic development. Nonetheless, legislation was still tilted toward the alienation of Māori from their land. It was not until Te Ture Whenua Māori Act in 1992 that substantive legislative changes were enacted to stem Māori land alienation. This Act also introduced a wide range of governance structures to assist Māori in dealing with complex problems around decision-making created through over a hundred years of inappropriate tenure legislation.

The chapter then explores the key ingredients required to develop Māori land in the challenging environment of culturally mismatched tenure arrangements. Although the literature concerning Māori land development literature is relatively light and sparse, eight platforms for successful Māori land development are identified. It is argued that although the key platforms for land development have to some extent been identified the constraints on Māori landowners building these platforms is absent. In light of this argument, the research questions and focus of this thesis is established.
Bilateral succession and fragmentation

Following the passing of the Native Lands Act 1862 the vast majority of Māori land was converted from aboriginal title to Crown-derived title through dubious and unethical legal processes. However, the Crown-derived title was not a freehold, or a general form of title, that provides owners with a significant array of rights in the use, enjoyment and alienation (i.e., the power to dispose) of land. Instead Crown-derived Māori title was subject to specific legal regulations controlling the nature of Māori tenure. As outlined in Chapter One, the Native Lands Act introduced the individualisation of title and limited the number of owners that could be incorporated on the title once converted from aboriginal title. Only briefly mentioned was that the Native Lands Act 1862 also introduced the system of bilateral succession.

This system established that all of those born to the owner/s of Māori land would succeed to an equal proportional share of the land as other siblings (Williams 1999). The effect of this system was that as each new generation succeeded to the land the number of owners increased, many of whom acted to individualise their own title. The effect of bilateral succession was to rapidly increase the number of owners within a block of land, and to fragment the land into numerous individual titles. Once individualised these titles were often converted from Māori title to European freehold title and sold. This caused areas of Māori land to become discontiguous and fragmented into smaller and smaller units.

The main effect of bilateral succession was to rapidly increase the number of owners per unit of land. It became steadily apparent that this was becoming a problem. As the authority of chiefs declined and the old proprietary customs of user rights no longer applied to Māori land title, each owner with a share now possessed an equal right to utilise the land and resources procured from it. This created a decision-making vacuum as methods of allocating resources according to custom no longer applied, and the authority of chiefs to make decisions had been undermined (Williams 1999). It can be concluded that the new form of tenure and property rights was poorly matched to traditional forms of tenure – causing cultural mismatch.

By the 1890s the issue of bilateral succession was also becoming a problem for settlers (Williams 1999). In areas where Māori landowners had refused to partition land and individualise title, land was becoming scarce. Given the number of owners succeeding to these blocks was increasing the ability of settlers to negotiate sales with the ascent of owners
was declining (Kingi 2002). As a consequence, the Native Land Court Act of 1894 established a system whereby owners could incorporate and establish a committee of management (Williams 1999). The idea was to streamline decision-making among communal owners, and establish a single authority through which land sales could be negotiated.

Although the idea of incorporation was initially established to facilitate the sale of Māori land, Māori also saw it as an opportunity to overcome problems created by a decision-making vacuum, and to use the incorporation structure as a vehicle for Māori development. Sir Aparana Ngata, a prominent Māori academic and politician, was strongly supportive of Māori land development, with a particular emphasis on agriculture. Ngata led the development of the Native Lands Act 1909, which established regulations regarding the formation and administration of Māori incorporations (White 1997). This included the ability to amalgamate fragmented units of land too small to be managed economically into a single incorporation. He also pushed for a number of welfare reforms that would assist Māori in developing their land through farming. Since this time the legislation surrounding Māori incorporations has been altered many times but the general principle of collective ownership and delegated management remains intact.

The incorporation model worked well in some circumstances, but also failed to achieve desired outcomes in others (White, 1997). In general, Māori land was still being continually subdivided into individual title and sold. Further, as land blocks became too small to be operated as economic units it often made sense to sell the land, particularly when the burden of rates\(^9\) could not be met due to the uneconomic size of units. To counter the problem of increasing land alienation, Māori land reform occurred in the 1950s and 1960s (Kingi 2002; Brady 2004, p. 24). The reforms attempted to improve the situation by giving the Māori Land Court (previously known as the Native Land Court) a stronger focus on protecting Māori land from alienation through placing limits on land sale, and the extent to which it could be partitioned (broken into smaller units) (Brady 2004, p 24). The Māori Land Court, assisted by the 1953 Māori Affairs Act, and the 1955 Māori Trust’s Board Act also established a new range of organisational structures, in addition to the incorporation, to assist Māori in dealing with complex governance issues resulting from multiple ownership (Kingi 2002; Brady 2004, p. 31).

---

\(^9\) Local government land taxes based on land value
However, land alienation continued to occur as land owned by five shareholders or less could still be changed to General Ownership, allowing it to be sold (Brady, 2004). Further, the reforms allowed the Māori Land Court to vest uneconomic interests (very small shareholders) in the Māori Trustee (a government sanctioned administrator). This was seen by some Māori as the Crown attempting to seise control of Māori assets (Brady, 2004). Consequently, the land reforms did not entirely achieve all of the desired effects, and were not satisfactory to Māori. In response, an extensive round of reforms in 1993 established Te Ture Whenua Māori Act, which currently stands today (Kingi 2002; Brady 2004). Te Ture Whenua Act provides guidance to the Māori Land Court to exercise the act in a manner that ‘facilitates and promotes the retention, use, development and control of Māori land as taonga tuku iho (passed on treasures) by Māori owners, their whānau (families), their hapū (subtribe), and their descendants’ (New Zealand Parliamentary Counsel Office 2007).

The primary feature of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act is that it provides a suite of organisational structures to assist in the administration of Māori land. These structures are designed to act as tools to deal with the decision-making vacuum created by bilateral succession. The main organisational structures are outlined in Table 1 below.

A second useful legal tool, enacted by Te Ture Whenua Māori Act, gives Māori landowners the ability to obtain reservation status on Māori title. Obtaining reservation status enables landowners to set aside areas of land for a multitude of purposes including: village sites, marae, sports grounds, church sites, urupā (burial site), areas of scenic interest, catchment areas, or for any other specified purpose. Land set aside for such purposes is referred to as Māori Reservation land (Te Puni Kōkiri 2004). The Māori Reservation structure is important because it enables a number of different land uses and development options on Māori land without having to be subject to various planning constraints to which general land in rural areas is subject.
There is also another important component of Māori land management that is often referred to in discussion surrounding Māori land ownership. This is the Māori Trustee. The Māori Trustee administers Māori land through the Māori Trust Office (MTO), which is part of the Ministry of Māori Development, Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK) (Te Puni Kōkiri b 2007). The Māori Trustee can be employed by Māori land shareholders to administer affairs on their behalf. The function of the Māori Trustee is essentially to manage assets on behalf of shareholders/Trusts and distribute benefits (Brady 2004, p. 58). Trust and land shareholders are not obliged to keep their land under the administration of the Māori Trustee (Brady 2004, p. 59). However, for many Māori landowners it is in their benefit to have the Māori Trustee administer land given that many blocks are uneconomic, or do not generate enough profit to meet rates.¹⁰

¹⁰ Uneconomic units are typically blocks of land that are landlocked. Landlocked blocks are not provided with services (e.g. roads) and are surrounded by private property. 30% of Māori land is landlocked (Brady, 2002: p.28). Despite not being serviced, and uneconomic, these blocks must still pay rates for services.
Finding mechanisms to develop Māori land

It can be concluded that the nation-state in New Zealand has, up until fairly recently, focussed its policy on alienating Māori from their land and finding mechanisms to transfer that ownership to settlers. However, from 1909 there were also periods when emphasis shifted to supporting Māori to develop their land as a means of supporting economic development (Thorpe 1976). The focus of this policy was primarily establishing laws and regulations that enabled Māori to form organisational structures to manage land in the decision-making vacuum created by a culturally mismatched tenure system. In many cases these organisational structures have been successful in facilitating economic development through agriculture and horticulture (Thorpe 1976; Kingi 2002).

Thorpe (1976), in his study of successful Māori Incorporations, also found that there were other key factors that determined success – apart from the establishment of appropriate organisational structures. First, landowners needed to have full control over their lands without interference from external bodies. Second, capable and accountable governance was required to make decisions on behalf of all owners. Third, there was a prerequisite that strong and able management be in place with sufficient expertise. Fourth, access to financial capital was essential for investing in land development. It might be noted that there are close similarities between the four primary ‘platforms’ for Māori land development outlined above and the four platforms for indigenous development at a macro scale outlined in Chapter Two. These similarities are demonstrated in Table Seven below.
Since 1976 the findings of Thorpe’s study have been reaffirmed in different ways. A manual written by Baynham (2009) outlines similar key factors for success based upon the anecdotal experiences of a team of experienced and successful consultants, rural professionals, scientists, Māori land trustees and board chairs. Within Baynham’s manual there is also emphasis on strong leadership within Māori land governing bodies. The key factors for success include the following:

- A strong chair and accountable governance team to undertake strategic planning, manage relationships, and establish clear objectives and direction for the management team;
- An accountable management team separated from governance and reinforced by a committed team of rural professionals that bring in skills and expertise; and
- Confidence within the governance team that they are making the correct decisions.

However, the two factors outlined by Thorpe – that landowners have full control over their lands and access to financial capital – are not highlighted within Baynham’s manual. This may be a product of social transformations since Thorpe’s study in 1976 given that changes in government policy have led to less government control over Māori land ownership. Further, financial capital has been easier for Māori to access due to a decline in prejudice against

Table Seven: Similarities between indigenous development platforms at macro and micro scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Four Development Platforms for Fourth World Development</th>
<th>Four Development Platforms for Māori Land Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A level of autonomy and self-determination is required to establish development priorities.</td>
<td>Landowners need to have full control over their lands without interference from external bodies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous self government that is culturally matched and accountable is required.</td>
<td>Accountable governance is required capable of making decisions on behalf of all owners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective bureaucracies are required that are culturally matched, accountable, professional, expertly staffed, and inter-cultural, to implement development plans.</td>
<td>Strong and able management with sufficient expertise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of independent funds that can be used to effectively operate bureaucratic and governing structures.</td>
<td>Access to financial capital to invest in land development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Māori within financial institutions, and the institutional structures under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act reducing lending risk (Wedderburn, Pikia et al. 2004).

Restrictions on transferring or selling Māori land under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act still makes it difficult for land to be used as collateral, while multiple ownership can reduce clarity regarding who is responsible for paying back loans, under what conditions, and when (Munn, Loveridge et al. 1994). Nonetheless, Wedderburn, et al. (2004, p. 9) outline that financing is possible ‘with strong governance and the ability to demonstrate to lending institutes a well developed strategic plan and the capacity to deliver’.

Another paper by Steele and Kanawa (2009) on Realising the Productive Capacity of Māori Land also identifies a similar set of key ingredients for Māori land development to Baynham which are outlined below:

- **Strong Governance** – a governance structure is in place with individual trustees/directors that bring a range of business and technical expertise and experience, combined with independent directors with specific agriculture knowledge;
- **Planning and Strategy** – effective planning and monitoring systems that bring a strategic outlook for management as well as evaluative measures for assessing management performance;
- **Skills Development and Training** – access of Directors/Trustees, Managers, and farm staff to continuing professional development and training course work opportunities that further develop the depth of agriculture and agribusiness skills;
- **Collective Action** – forming joint venture opportunities between Māori businesses, and non-Māori businesses; and
- **Legislative Environment** – having a legislative environment that does not impose heavy compliance costs on Māori landowners.

Consequently, in a similar manner to Baynham and Thorpe, Steele and Kanawa identify the need for strong governance, effective management with good strategic direction, and an excellent set of skills and knowledge both internal and external to the Māori business.

Steele and Kanawa (2009) also note opportunities associated with collective action. Many Māori land blocks are too small to be managed as commercial farming enterprises. It is
suggested that this issue can be addressed through collaboration and networking between Māori and non-Māori landowners to amalgamate land units (Barr 2000; Vallance 2003; Wedderburn, Pikia et al. 2004, p.4). Further, some authors have suggested that the pathway for development for small blocks is through innovation and, in particular, the production of high-value niche products for select markets, such as organic crops, that have relatively low capital start-up requirements and high returns (Peters 2001; Wedderburn, Pikia et al. 2004, p. 4).

Steele and Kanawa also note that change is required in the legislative environment surrounding Māori land ownership – highlighting the compliance burden that Māori landowning bodies carry in maintaining their share registers and getting decisions on key issues from the Māori Land Court. Peters (2001) similarly points out that government policy is not conducive to supporting the development of Māori land in isolated locations. Isolation gives rise to a number of specific issues including shortages of skilled professionals, high transportation costs to markets, and a lack of a service industry (Peters 2001; Wedderburn, Pikia et al. 2004).

If we combine all of the key ingredients for successful development on Māori land, from the different research studies, we arrive at a list of eight platforms for Māori land development including; control, governance, management, leadership, skills, collective action, innovation, and legislation. Each platform and a definition are provided in Table Eight below.

By contrast, White (1997) is critical of the type of approach that each of the above studies has taken when assessing the success or failure of Māori land development. Each study has had a narrow idea of what success is – essentially equating success with the degree to which the land is efficiently utilised and its ability to generate financial surpluses. Essentially the studies equate success with the level to which Māori landowners have developed business acumen. This interpretation of success derives from a value system common to Western culture (Heidegger 1977). White (1997) wished to investigate whether the actual owners of Māori land.

---

11 Māori Land Trusts and Incorporations must maintain a share register. Given that these are ever-growing due to bilateral succession laws they can be an administrative burden – particular when beneficiaries may number in the thousands.
Incorporations shared these values, and wanted to explore what these owners considered success to be.

White (1997) found that the owners of Māori land did expect the land to be effectively utilised and generate good financial surpluses through operating efficiently and in a financially prudent manner. These were considered by the landowners to be important indicators of success. However, White also found that landowners also expected their incorporations to succeed in four further areas, identified as follows:

- **Cultural Importance** – guarding, protecting and retaining the land in the continuous ownership and control of the hapū;
- **Physical Considerations** – striking a balance between development, conservation and restoration of natural areas;
- **Political Involvement** – representing and protecting the interests of the hapū within external political settings to guard against external threats; and

White (1997) found that the owners of Māori land did expect the land to be effectively utilised and generate good financial surpluses through operating efficiently and in a financially prudent manner. These were considered by the landowners to be important indicators of success. However, White also found that landowners also expected their incorporations to succeed in four further areas, identified as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Landowners have full control over lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>A strong, confident and accountable governance team with capable directors/trustees both internal and external to the institution to direct land development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Capable management that has strong strategic direction, access to a team of rural professionals, and is accountable to governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>A strong chair within the governance team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Skills development and training is in place and specialist support is available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action</td>
<td>Collective action through joint ventures, collaboration and networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Identifying unique and innovative development options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducive Legislation and Policy</td>
<td>A conducive legislative and policy environment to development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Annual General Meetings of the Incorporation provided a chance for individual and whānau shareholders to get back together as a hapū from their various homes around New Zealand and overseas.
• Social Contribution – providing employment and funding community projects.

White (1997) argues that for Māori land to be managed successfully a careful balance of all factors is required. In particular, there is a need to develop an equilibrium allowing for all factors of success to be addressed, which White (1997) suggests is achieved through capable leadership. Further, White found that these indicators of success are not hierarchical, with each being ranked of equal importance. The consequence of this is that successful management of Māori land is much broader than generating utility and financial surpluses. In fact, it is likely to be critical that governors of Māori land achieve the other factors of success for an Incorporation to function effectively, as failing to do so would cause political instability – undermining the Incorporation’s ability to generate utility and financial surpluses in the first place. In this way, Thorpe, Baynham, Steele and Kanawa, through viewing success from a different cultural perspective, may have failed to identify a number of key elements of Māori land governance required to achieve commercial success, namely cultural, environmental, political and social success.

If this form of successful development is to be achieved, it is clear that the goals of Māori land governance and management institutions should match cultural expectations. In line with this perspective Harmsworth (Harmsworth 1997; Harmsworth 2002a; Harmsworth 2002b) has worked over a number of years with governors, operating on behalf of their beneficiaries, to create development strategies that are matched to cultural expectations. Using participatory methodologies Harmsworth assisted these organisations to articulate their values as a guide for determining their development goals – or indicators of success. Harmsworth found a common set of values emerging through this process across different organisations. These values are outlined in Table Nine below (Harmsworth 2002a). Together they demonstrate a common commitment to guarding and protecting natural resources for future generations; concern for the well being of others; self-determination and control over resources; as well as recognition of spiritual beliefs and identity.
If the insights of White and Harmsworth are combined it can be concluded that the governors of Māori land should establish and follow development strategies that aim to fulfil the values of their constituents and meet their definition of success. These insights can also be integrated into the Eight Key Platforms Model for Māori land development outlined previously by indicating in the model that governance should establish a culturally matched development strategy. This can be viewed in Figure Two below. The evidence suggests that by having all of these eight development platforms in place, Māori landowners will increase the odds that they will be successful in reaching their development objectives.
From the literature reviewed above it can be concluded that the ingredients for achieving development success on Māori land are to some extent understood – albeit based upon a fairly light body of research concerning successful Māori landowning organisations. Even though there is knowledge of such key ingredients, this knowledge has clearly not been adopted, or is unable to be adopted in many circumstances. It is estimated that over 40% of Māori land is not being utilised to fulfil the development aspirations of its owners. Some of this land will consist of small dispersed blocks that may be landlocked, marginal, or even abandoned by

Figure Two: Eight platform model for Māori land development
owners, and therefore unsuitable for development. However, a significant area of unutilised Māori land does have good development potential. In Te Waipounamu, for example, there are 13,341 hectares of high production grass land of which less than 2000 hectares is under the control and management of its owners (Reid 2008).

**Research Questions**

There has been little research exploring why so many Māori landowners are either unwilling or unable to build the institutions and platforms they require for land development. It is clear, for example, that strong leadership is important for realising development potential yet there is still the question of why leadership might not be present, or why it may be unable to act effectively. Nonetheless, it might be suggested that the constraints must be fairly self-explanatory and are primarily related to levels of knowledge and understanding within Māori land owning whānau and hapū of the platforms required for development. By building awareness among landowners in key areas it could be concluded that unutilised Māori land will reach its development potential.

It could also be suggested that it is the legislative and policy environment that constrains development, so that even if awareness levels are high among landowners they are unable to put the required development platforms in place. There is some evidence, as presented in this chapter, that economic policy may not be conducive to Māori land development in remote rural areas, and that the legislative environment might place excessive compliance costs on landowners. Conversely, the key problem may be that education systems do not identify and cultivate Māori leaders, or fail to facilitate training specifically targeted to Māori in farm management and governance due to access issues or culturally inappropriate methods of teaching.

However, in all likelihood it is probable that a combination of factors is constraining the owners of Māori land from establishing the platforms required for development. It is therefore contended that in-depth research is necessary to focus on the multiple constraints experienced by the owners of unutilised or underutilised land in meeting their development aspirations. This argument is supported by a call from the New Zealand government research funding agency, the Foundation for Research, Science and the technology (2007, p. 6) for research ‘on the constraints on (Māori landowner’s) freedom to operate’. Consequently, this thesis
focuses its efforts on those landowners who have strong development aspirations for either unutilised land, or underutilised land, but are constrained in their ability to unlock its potential. I refer to this category of landowners as Aspiring Owners.\textsuperscript{13}

In light of the argument above, this thesis is guided by three research questions that provide structure for exploring the constraints on development experienced by Aspiring Owners. The first question is designed to identify the development goals of Aspiring Owners as a means of establishing their intentionality. The second question seeks to focus attention on the constraints on Aspiring Owners fulfilling their intentions or development goals. To avoid deficit thinking, and find positive methods for overcoming constraints, the third question guides the research into exploring solutions to the problems identified. The three questions guiding this research are outlined below:

1. What are the development goals of Aspiring Owners?
2. What are the constraints on Aspiring Owners in fulfilling their development goals?
3. What are mechanisms for overcoming constraints?

Through answering these three questions it is anticipated that a development pathway may be established for Aspiring Māori landowners. The intention of this thesis is to identify sustainable development pathways. The notion of sustainability has not yet been mentioned in the discussion so far. It is contended that sustainability will be implicit within development aspirations of Aspiring Owners of Māori land. This assumption is based upon the Māori development models outlined in Chapter Two, and the work of White in this chapter, which emphasise that Māori are likely to already include strong environmental and social values within their development aspirations. This assertion will be tested in this thesis by answering question one.

\textsuperscript{13} Aspiring Owners can be differentiated from other owners of Māori land. Other Māori landowners may be fully utilising their land, and therefore do not come under the definition of Aspiring Owners. On the other hand many Māori landowners do not have development ambitions for their land, having either abandoned the land, or having simply decided to let the land revert to forest. In such cases these landowners would not come under the definition of Aspiring Owners, as they do not wish to implement a development intervention.
Conclusion

This chapter provided an overview of the contemporary challenges created in the development of Māori land as a result of historical events, and the mechanisms that have developed to overcome challenges. It is outlined that inappropriate land tenure, in the form of bilateral succession, created a situation where the number of owners per unit of land rapidly increased. This led to the poor utilisation of land for development as a decision-making vacuum was created when the methods of allocating resources according to custom no longer applied and the authority of chiefs was undermined. Despite the generally hostile legislative environment, laws were introduced from the 1900s onwards to assist Māori in developing their land. Nevertheless, laws still tended to be weighted toward Māori land alienation.

A key form of legislation that assisted Māori land development was the introduction of the incorporation, which permitted delegated decision-making to management on behalf of the collective. Other legislation to assist with collective ownership was introduced from the 1950s onwards to decrease levels of alienation, and offer alternative governance structures such as Land Trusts. The relatively sparse research on successful Māori land development shows that these types of organisational structures are important for delivering development outcomes, but that a suite of other ingredients are also required. It is argued in this chapter that there are eight platforms including; control, culturally matched governance, management, leadership, skills, collective action, innovation and supporting government legislation and policy.

It is concluded that there has been little research exploring why so many Māori landowners are either unwilling or unable to build the institutions and platforms they require for land development. It is argued that there is likely to be a combination of factors that constrain owners in reaching their development aspirations. In light of this argument three broad research questions are proposed that provide structure for exploring this topic.
CHAPTER FOUR: Combating the Internalisation of Colonialism

Introduction

In Chapter One the historical process of Māori colonisation through land expropriation was explored, while in Chapter Two the structures and platforms for increasing the well-being and prosperity of indigenous nations were evaluated. Through this critical discussion it became apparent that building indigenous self-determination and culturally matched self-government is important for increasing the well-being and prosperity of indigenous people. Similarly in Chapter Three, on a micro scale, it was made apparent that self-governance and effective management was crucial for successful Māori land development. However, in Chapter Two it was also outlined that there are barriers to indigenous people mobilising and taking coherent actions toward realising their aspirations. These barriers included; resistance to indigenous self-determination, colonially induced deficits in human, financial and natural resources, and the presence of cooption and welfarism.

It could be proposed that overcoming these barriers might involve increasing levels of political independence, financial and natural resource compensation, investment in indigenous education to build technical skills, developing, cultivating and supporting indigenous leadership to serve within indigenous communities, and re-thinking and re-creating new forms of welfare that encourage independence. However, I would argue that although such changes
are likely to be necessary and are important, they would not deal with a significant constraint on indigenous development not yet discussed.

This constraint is the psychological harm caused by the internalisation of subtle and denigrating colonial concepts within the minds and actions of indigenous peoples. This chapter discusses the origin of these concepts, and the manner in which they act to cause psychological harm and socio-political instability within indigenous communities and nations. The chapter also explores methods for reducing psychological harm through theory from the field of liberation psychology, which offers socio-therapy to address socio-political and psychological problems resulting from ‘mind-colonisation’ within indigenous communities. However, it is also demonstrated that these colonial concepts continue to be perpetuated within development theory and policy by nation-states. The effect of this phenomenon is to perpetuate the marginalisation of indigenous peoples.

The fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment are then reviewed. The attempts of both fields to uproot and expose denigrating colonial concepts within current development theory are outlined. It is explained that their ultimate goal is to strip colonial paradigms from the field of development and demonstrate that current development theory is neo-colonial and immersed within a Western monocultural paradigm. Through exposing this prejudice both fields hope to challenge development theorists and practitioners to open their discourse to indigenous voices, with the ultimate goal of creating diverse approaches to development, which reflect the cultural and ecological diversity present globally. In this way the psychological harm caused by colonial narratives can be addressed through the emergence of development approaches that are self-defined by indigenous people.

However, it is argued that although the fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment undertake a profound deconstruction of the development field, they do not offer any form of reconstruction. This is to avoid creating a new monocultural development paradigm that dominates and suppresses the emergence of local self-defined approaches. This position is partially supported by the literature review in Chapters Two and Three, which suggested that imposed development by Fourth World Western states does not work for indigenous people, and that development approaches need to be culturally matched and localised if indigenous peoples are to achieve their development goals. Nonetheless, it is also outlined in Chapters
Two and Three that there are key development ingredients that are transcultural and can be used to assist indigenous peoples in identifying and constructing their own development approach. In light of this evidence I outline a set of development meta-theories that transcend localism, yet can support, accommodate, and dovetail with local development aspirations. I argue that these theories when synthesised with the theoretical perspectives outlined in Chapters One and Two establish seven key development themes for Māori development.

**Internalising colonialism**

According to Hogan (2000, p. 10) the internalisation of the colonial concepts within the minds of indigenous people damages sense of self and creates ‘*sharp and painful conflicts in one’s self-understanding, aspiration, expectation, and action*’ which can leave a person ‘*almost entirely unable to take coherent actions toward humanly fulfilling goals*’. I would suggest that within indigenous nations the internalisation of colonial concepts, and the corresponding damage to sense of self, is a significant constraint on indigenous people reaching their development goals and building prosperity.

I contend that the colonial theory of progressive developmentalism is central to perpetuating denigrating stereotypes that become internalised within indigenous people. The origin of this theory, Heffermen (2002, p. 328) argues, is found in the writing of the early French philosopher Anne-Robert-Jacques Turgot (1727-1781), through which human progress became ‘*conceived as the inevitable onward and upward march of civilisation through a number of discrete levels*’. The theory situates and categorises Western societies into a modern and advanced category, which establishes a cultural template, toward which less developed societies are thought to be evolving (McEwan 2001, p. 94; Richards 2003; McFarlane 2006; Sharp and Briggs 2006, p. 6). This creates a bifurcation between ‘backward’ societies which are materially and culturally deficient and ‘forward’ societies that are materially and culturally superior. This bifurcation automatically establishes a paternalistic relationship between modern/Western nations and indigenous nations; given that it is presumed that the latter should take the former as their role model.

The concept of progressive developmentalism provided colonisers with distinct categories that they could apply to the indigenous populations that they were encountering and
subjugating. Colonisers assumed a paternal/fiduciary role in the guidance and tutelage of indigenous peoples into ‘culturally advanced’ and ‘further evolved’ states. However, the belief of colonisers in the superiority of their culture was not just something held within settler society, it also became internalised within the minds of some colonised people. This process is referred to as subalternisation\textsuperscript{14} whereby the indigenous person begins to see and understand their own culture and identity as inferior to that of the settler (Fanon 1961; Fanon 1967; Freire 1972; Bhabha 1994; Martin-Baro 1994; Escobar 2002). The nature of this phenomenon is encapsulated by Hogan (2000, p. 10) when he states that the ‘economic and political domination of colonisers, their widespread control of the structure of work, their system of education, and so on – impels one (the colonised) to accept the colonial categories’ applied to them. As a consequence, many colonised people begin to understand and view their culture as both inferior and weaker than that of the coloniser.

In order to overcome the feelings of inferiority some indigenous people may attempt to adopt the cultural practices and discourse of the coloniser to gain a sense of power (Fanon 1967), which is referred to in the postcolonial literature as mimeticism. However, the colonialist’s economic and political domination ensures that members of the indigenous group can neither attain, nor be accepted, as full members of the colonising society (Fanon 1961; Fanon 1967). This is because racial and cultural stereotypes objectify and fix the colonised into inferior categories, while political and economic structures ensure that most of the colonised population remain in class categories lower than that of colonists.

Consequently, the colonised neither truly identify with the coloniser, nor fully identify with their indigenous tradition, given colonial assimilation practices force a disassociation between indigenous people and their customary practices. This creates the experience of living in two worlds, but not being able to identify or belong in either (Fanon 1967). This results in ‘no identity’, which is often described by postcolonial scholars as invisibility (Khana 2003). In response, indigenous people seek to reclaim their pre-colonial culture and tradition as a source of identity through cultural renaissance and indigenous nationalism. This nativism is propelled by the sense of loss, and indignity experienced through exploitative and oppressive

\textsuperscript{14} Subaltern was a term used by Gramsci (1891-1937) to refer to an individual that is subordinated and excluded from any consequential role in power.
colonial practices, designed to eliminate indigenous traditions and encourage assimilation under the guise of humanitarianism.

This type of cultural renaissance can be viewed positively, for example Taiaiake (1999) sees nativism as important for reclaiming indigenous identity, while Fanon (1967) saw it as a crucial development stage in indigenous people’s liberation. However, nativism can also be based on a reverse developmentalism, in which the coloniser is demonised and fixed into a category of moral inferiority while the precolonial indigenous tradition that was lost, and is now mourned, is elevated into a category of moral purity. The precolonial tradition is reified, in what is termed reactionary traditionalism within the postcolonial literature, and is held in a fixed binary relationship with knowledge originating from the colonial metropole, or centres (Hogan 2000). An example of reverse developmentalism is demonstrable in the plea of Mayan intellectuals to eradicate all colonial influences, including chicken raising, to maintain the purity of Mayan tradition (Siebers 2004).

In the New Zealand context examples also exist of reactionary traditionalism in the early period of colonisation. As outlined in Chapter One there was rapid economic expansion within Māori tribes from 1840 to 1860, which can be attributed in large part to the rapid adoption of European technologies, which had much to do with the adventurousness and openness of traditional Māori culture to new influences. However, Toft (1984) identified a growing reaction against European control with the emergence of nationalist Māori movements. These movements also began to reject European technologies in reaction to European political control, given that there were difficulties in separating European material benefits from politics.

Consequently, the impact of colonialism on indigenous people can be to generate a complex and contradictory interplay of narratives and practices that can lead the colonised to idolise the colonising culture as superior and civilised, despise and distrust the coloniser as morally corrupt, idolise indigenous tradition as morally pure and civilised, and despise indigenous tradition as uncivilised. Bhabha (1994, p. 41) refers to this as ‘the native fixed at the shifting boundaries between barbarism and civility’. The psychological dissonance regarding conflicting identities gives rise to internal conflict which affects the individual’s self-understanding and aspirations.
Although varying from context to context, the noted psychological effects of the internalisation of colonial narratives within indigenous populations include: loss of self-mastery; loss of autonomous personal dignity; loss of trust; loss of personal adequacy; loss of self-efficacy; negative self-opinion; self-doubt; and fractured identity (through loss of cultural memory, and imposed memories from cultural assimilation) (Comas-Dfaz, Lykes et al. 1998; Moane 2003; Nelson Varas-Diaz 2003; Kessaris 2006). The effects on the personal level generate psychological patterns of behaviour including pervasive distrust, inaction, inertia, silence, indecision, fatalism and ambivalence (Comas-Dfaz, Lykes et al. 1998; Moane 2003; Nelson Varas-Diaz 2003; Kessaris 2006). Together these symptoms create significant barriers to indigenous people mobilising and taking coherent actions toward realising their aspirations.

**Social and political instability in postcolonial contexts**

Internalisation of colonial concepts does not only generate noted psychological effects within individuals, it also creates significant social and political problems within indigenous nations. This is because oppressive disempowerment and loss of control can cause an opposite reaction among subalternised groups – the need to regain power and control. This reaction is usually genuine and can be seen as an attempt by the indigenous people to regain their freedom to self-determine. However, the drive for self-determination and freedom can also mask another driver. This phenomenon is described by Freire (1972) in the scenario that oppressed individuals may not want to be freed from oppression, so that they may free their fellow oppressed, but to capture power and control through the oppression of their own people. In other words, the powerlessness that is experienced through oppression can give rise to individuals who mimic the coloniser through controlling and dominating others, in order to regain a sense of power and control. Fromm (1942) refers to this desire to gain control through domination as social sadomasochism.

In indigenous contexts social sadomasochism can emerge as *mimeticism* whereby the leaders of indigenous nations (and communities at a micro scale) can mimic the coloniser by dominating their own people based on the view that as a people they are inferior. However, given their fragmented identity, leaders can at the same time view their own indigenous nation as superior to the coloniser, and as a result be strong supporters of indigenous nationalism.
This scenario is outlined in detail by Said (1993), who points out that neo-colonial power can emerge within indigenous societies and communities as indigenous elites (typically allied to imperial powers) fill the power vacuum left when colonisers either withdraw from a former colony, or where a level of power to self-determine is conferred.

**Addressing the psychological trauma of colonialism**

Together the social, psychological and political problems generated by the internalisation of colonial concepts places significant constraints on indigenous communities meeting their development goals. Conflicting identities establish conflicting development aspirations and goals, which in turn generate turbulent politics that may at times be characterised by mimetic leadership. Hogan (2000, p. 10) suggests that addressing the underlying psychological trauma requires that an indigenous subject takes ‘some sort of stand on the issue of identity’. There are two pathways for overcoming a fragmented identity, which have been alluded to previously. The first involves embracing indigenous tradition and rejecting Europeanisation (*reactionary traditionalism*); the alternative is to embrace Europeanisation and reject indigenous tradition (*colonial mimeticism*).

However, these first two options do not resolve the psychological dissonance resulting from identity fragmentation. This is because the progressive developmentalist narratives are still internalised within an indigenous community causing one culture to be devalued and the other idealised. The devaluation and idealisation binary, or ‘splitting’ in psychological terms, may continue to cause psychological dissonance given that the blanket rejection of either indigenous, settler, or metropolitan culture (the centre of imperial power) requires that an individual ignore any experience that does not support the blanket devaluation of a culture. For example, an indigenous *reactionary traditionalist* may unreasonably reject a valuable technology on the basis that it is not part of the indigenous culture, despite evidence that the technology would be very helpful. This would be likely to cause psychological dissonance.

It should be noted that the term ‘psychological dissonance’ is being used in a way that is related to but not identical with the term ‘cognitive dissonance’, which is perhaps more familiar to psychologists (Festinger 1957). ‘Cognitive dissonance’ refers to the unpleasant state of tension often generated when one becomes aware of having freely chosen attitude-
discrepant behaviours and arises from having two cognitions (thoughts) that are inconsistent. ‘Psychological dissonance’ refers more to a lived (social) psychological dilemma surrounding one’s personhood and socio-culturally embedded identity.

A third option for overcoming identity fragmentation is offered by the ‘father’ of postcolonial studies, Fanon. Fanon sought means to address psychological dissonance through a liberatory socio-therapy that aimed to build new identities through the hybridisation of indigenous tradition without completely abandoning the knowledge, technologies and insights offered by European tradition (Fanon 1967). In other words he sought to move beyond both reactionary traditionalism and colonial mimeticism to establish contemporary post-traditional identities through hybridisation. Unfortunately, postcolonial scholars have failed to continue Fanon’s ‘hands-on’ pragmatic socio-therapy in indigenous contexts.

However, Hogan (2000) has theoretically explored the notion of hybridity further by breaking it down into two components, syncreticism and orthodox traditionalism. Orthodox traditionalism contrasts with reactionary traditionalism in that it does not hold onto reified precolonial ‘forms of tradition’, but embraces new ideas and technologies that remain nestled within large ethical or social principles common to indigenous traditions. In this manner the principles of indigenous tradition remain, but the forms representing the tradition change. However, Syncreticism involves a new, and often conscious, synthesis of metropolitan, creole and indigenous cultures, to create a new culture that takes the ‘best’ from each.

The Māori psychologist Mason Durie (1999) can clearly see the requirement within the Māori postcolonial context for the fusion of conflicting identities. As Durie (1999, p. 366) states:

‘The challenge is to live in two worlds, to cope with two psychological constructs, and yet to emerge with a unified sense of identity and a code of thinking and behaving which will aid adaptation to the multiple environments within which contemporary Māori live.’

However, Durie does not explore the conflict between the identities generated when a developmentalist narrative is still at play, which continually causes the identities to shift between inferior and superior modes. This is because it positions the narratives into inferior
and superior categories, demanding that a choice be made between narratives. The choice is to be either indigenous and traditional, or modern and colonial. As a result no combination, duality, or hybrid is deemed as viable.

Nonetheless, liberation psychologists have continued the ‘hands on’ socio-therapy work of Fanon, and work to overcome the deleterious psychological effects of colonial oppression in indigenous communities using a number of techniques. Comas-Diaz (1998, p. 788) looks to psychosocial education strategies that improve awareness of racism, sexism, colonial scapegoating, racial projection, denial, victimisation and the historical and societal contexts of colonialism. Additionally, Comas-Diaz (1998), outlines the importance of rescuing cultural memories, archetypes and metaphors with which to construct new and transformed identities beyond the fractured self. Rebuilding history in this way is viewed as important for developing autonomous personal dignity, and overcoming pervasive self-doubt and uncertainty in personal abilities to solve pervasive problems.

Nelson Varas-Diaz (2003) recognises the need to disassociate negative emotions from an identity as colonised, while Moane (2003) identifies the requirement to protect ‘the psyche from the negative messages associated with oppression, and nourishing the psyche through seeking positive messages, strong role models, and positive images’. However, she also points out the necessity of colonised communities to build skills and experiences to find avenues for challenging oppressive structures. Furthermore, the value of creative outlets including theatre is highlighted by Moane (2003) as important for generating consciousness of internalised forms of oppression among Irish women.

**Combating theories that perpetuate the social psychological trauma of colonialism**

The fields of postcolonialism and post-development attempt to address the problem of internalised colonial concepts through an alternative means to liberation psychology. Both fields are attempting to uproot and expose denigrating colonial concepts within development theory that they consider are still being applied to indigenous peoples and marginalised communities by nation-states, causing psychological trauma and social dislocation. The goal of these fields is to strip colonial paradigms from the field of development and demonstrate that current development theory is neo-colonial and immersed within a Western monocultural paradigm. Through exposing this prejudice both fields hope to challenge development
theorists and practitioners to open their discourse to indigenous voices, with the ultimate goal of creating diverse approaches to development, which reflect the cultural and ecological diversity present globally.

Currently, the fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment challenge the theory of progressive developmentalism, which currently manifests as Modernisation theory within the field of development. Modernisation theory emerged from the seminal work of Rostow (1960) – *The Stages of Economic Growth: A non-communist manifesto*. Within this work Rostow (1960) describes societal change as a unidirectional and irreversible process, in which traditional societies evolve into technologically, socially and politically sophisticated civilisations characterised by industrialisation, urbanisation and democracy. From the 1950s to the 1970s development policy-makers attempted to apply this theory in practice by manipulating structural transformations within indigenous and postcolonial societies to set them on an evolutionary path toward modernity (Gore 2000, p. 794; Richards 2003, p. 56-59). However, the enterprise failed in the contexts that it was applied (Gore 2000, p. 794; Latham 2000; Blanchett 2001).

Despite its failure, the theory of modernisation still remains a dominant narrative within the development field, despite failing to withstand serious intellectual scrutiny and becoming ‘revealed as political ideology’ (Richards 2003, p. 59). Attempts to explain this remaining prominence have been made by postcolonial authors such as Edward Said (1994) and Guatri Spivak (1988). Both of these authors explore the political, intellectual and linguistic representations of indigenous peoples, to demonstrate the manner in which these populations are still implicitly stereotyped into inferior positions. They demonstrate, for example, that representations common to modernisation theory, such as ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’, prescribe and place indigenous people into lower categories of existence, so that societies existing higher in the order of existence can continue to rationalise interventions in their lives.

In essence the field of postcolonialism has taken on the task of challenging development theorists by uprooting and exposing the prejudicial assumptions used to construct their theories. In particular, postcolonialism identifies the negative stereotypes, ‘metaphors, images, allusion, fantasy and rhetoric’ within the ‘representational language of development texts’, which categorise the ‘Other’ into reduced categories of existence (McEwan 2001p. 96).
By exposing the concepts underpinning the development-as-modernisation agenda to deconstruction, the postcolonial theorists aim to disrupt the logical coherency and question the factuality of the current development paradigms, and expose the power inherent within them. It is anticipated that by engaging in this activity that development theorists and policy makers will be unable to logically and reasonably defend their theoretical positions.

The obvious effect of destabilising the developmentalist worldview is to counter its hegemony and allow other development worldviews and paradigms to emerge. In particular, it is hoped that the histories and imagined futures of oppressed and marginalised indigenous peoples are able to emerge, which will lead to the recognition that multiple, unique and legitimate pathways for development exist. This should translate into new and diverse development theory and policy at international, national, regional and local scales that empower marginalised communities, such as indigenous peoples, to identify and formulate their own development agendas. This goal is represented in Chakrabarty’s (2000) call to ‘provincialise’ Europe, or reorientate accepted wisdom that places European thinking on a pedestal at ‘world centre’ replacing it with a new worldview of the globe as a landscape of biologically diverse thought centres. Certainly Chapter Two supports the notion that indigenous peoples should be supported to formulate their own development agendas, given that this is a prerequisite for achieving successful development outcomes. Consequently, at the core of postcolonialism is the desire to see culturally matched development approaches and strategies that offer alternatives to Western monoculturalism.

The field of postdevelopment has taken a similar path to that of postcolonialism, and also seeks to see culturally diverse development approaches and strategies (Simon 2006). Like Chakrabarty (2000), Escobar (1995) provides an alternative development vision to that of European modernity, imagining a world in which a meshwork of local knowledge centres becomes a reality, which permits hybridisation between different cultural ways of knowing, generating multiple unique development pathways centred in local knowledge. This is to challenge, as Latouche (1993; 1996) expounds, the drive toward global uniformity through globalisation-as-modernisation. Furthermore, in a similar fashion to the postcolonial scholars, Escobar considers that this outcome is only possible by changing the international development discourse. Through changing this discourse to a new worldview of multiple
modernities the current spatial view of modern societies producing knowledge at the centre, for consumption by traditional societies on the periphery will be challenged (Escobar 1995).

**Postcolonialism and postdevelopment – the cults of localisation?**

Postcolonial and postdevelopment scholars do come under attack for promulgating a cult of localisation. There are fears that many of the benefits of modernity may be rejected simply because they are not locally derived, even if communities wish to avail themselves of these benefits (Sylvester 1999, 709-711). This concern is, of course, highly relevant to indigenous peoples, where the existence of *reactionary traditionalism* can cause the rejection of ideas and technologies, not because they are not good or helpful, but because they are from the outside, or not part of pre-existing tradition.

A similar criticism is made by Goncalves (2006), who criticises postdevelopment theorists in general, including Sachs (1992), Escobar (1995) and Latouche (1993; 1996) for having fallen into a postmodern cognitive relativism – the equality of all thought styles. She suggests that standards of rationality differ, and that particular rationalities can be built upon false factual assumptions, and may therefore be falsified. However, Goncalves’ argument does have a problem, in that postdevelopment theory has its origins in liberation movements that predate postmodernism. Colonised people all over the world have sought their own self-determination, in which there has been a need to assert that their own thought-style and rationality is equal to that of their coloniser. Consequently, it is more a case of postmodernism emerging to align with the pre-existing position of marginalised peoples.

Nevertheless, it is argued by Goncalves (2006) that if all thought-styles are equal then hybridisation between rationalities is not possible, given that if all cognitions are equal, one form of rationality does not need to test its validity through engagement with another because the truth of its own rationality is already known and therefore fixed. Consequently, cognitive relativism risks giving rise to fixation on particular constructs as true – given that each form of knowledge is true to its own context, and is therefore not open to critique. It might be concluded that this would give rise to the emergence of *reactionary traditionalism* and indigenous fundamentalism as indigenous knowledge becomes closed to critical examination.
Nonetheless Goncalves’s argument does not hold. The alternative position to an indigenous person assuming that their own thought style is equal to another is to assume that their rationality is neither inferior or superior to another. If they assume that it is inferior, then they would only be in a position to learn from their coloniser – perpetuating the fiduciary relationship. Conversely if they considered their own rationality superior, as in reactionary traditionalism, then there would be no need to learn from another. This would give rise to the precise situation that Goncalves is concerned about, cultures becoming fixed, uncritical, and unable to adapt or change. It is an interesting paradox that only through continually starting from the assumption of equality, which presumes that one form of rationality is as valuable as another, that hybridisation through mutual learning and engagement between cultures becomes possible. This is because once mutual respect is present between cultures it is likely to become apparent that each culture has valuable insights to offer the other. Certainly the existence of both orthodox traditionalism and syncreticism highlights the possibility that indigenous cultures can adopt new rationalities, or consciously merge with settler cultures. However, in doing so, they need to maintain a sense of equality and the value of their own tradition.

However, Goncalves’ concern that the field of postdevelopment has become a cult of localisation does appear to have some validity. Escobar (1995) does seek to cleanse indigenous knowledge from the concepts of modernity by engaging what he refers to as ‘border thinking’ or invoking ‘border epistemologies’ (Escobar 2002). He attempts to peel away the layers of Western influence to find the pure and unsullied pre-colonial worlds, from which he considers that new and original development designs can emerge. This appears to be a type of reactionary traditionalism whereby pre-colonial tradition is reified, which ultimately implies that traditional cultural forms are superior to modern forms. Goncalves (2006) is critical of romanticising tradition and points out that most cultures and societies have undergone waves of conquest, invasion and colonisation. Consequently, eradicating the narratives of modernity is unlikely to reveal the ‘pure tradition’ anticipated.

Furthermore, the fields of postdevelopment and postcolonialism also come under direct attack from development theorists for concentrating only on deconstructing development and not engaging in helpful reconstruction. Muller (2006) suggests that postdevelopment’s decision to completely deconstruct the whole notion of development altogether, and refuse to create
another development paradigm leaves it in a precarious position. Any effort at reconstruction that postdevelopment takes ‘would compromise the validity of the preceding construction, and again assemble a new narrative, whereas refusing to reconstruct exposes it to the criticism of being nihilistic, anti-political and amoral’ (Muller 2006, p. 310). Muller outlines that the only attempt at reconstruction is found in postdevelopment’s insistence that local and marginalised forms of development will emerge. Muller considers that this is naïve and romanticises the local in way that ignores local power dynamics.

In this way Muller (2006, p. 310) suggests that postdevelopment ‘parallels postmodernism both in its acute intuitions and in being directionless in the end, as a consequence of the refusal to, or lack of interest in translating critique into construction’. Gibson-Graham (2005, p. 6; in Sidaway 2007, p. 349) ‘sums up’ the challenge of postdevelopment by suggesting that it ‘should not see all development practice – past, present and future, in wealthy and poor countries as tainted, failed, retrograde, as though there were something necessarily problematic and destructive about deliberate attempts to increase social wellbeing through economic intervention as though there were a space of purity beyond or outside development that we could access through renunciations. The challenge is to imagine and practice development differently.’

However, these criticisms of postdevelopment unfortunately fail to hold water. Postdevelopment does not reconstruct alternative development theories because it is attempting to create space into which marginalised worldviews and paradigms can emerge. If it were to create a replacement paradigm to developmentalism, then it would illogically undermine its own goals. The second criticism, that the field of postdevelopment is naïve in its dependence upon the emergence of localised approaches to development, is also inadequate. There are many valid and interesting marginalised development theories, such as the Māori development theories in Chapter Two, which can be tested and explored by development theorists.

Development theorists also challenge postcolonial scholarship to move into the development field and offer workable solutions to those that really require help. Postcolonialism is accused of ‘offering overly complex theories which are largely ignorant of the real problems characterising everyday life’ of those in poverty (Sharp and Briggs 2006, p. 6). In other
words, postcolonialism is accused of being a facile academic exercise, without any practical tools required by development practitioners to make real changes in the life of those subalternised. In this manner the goal of postcolonialism ‘to recover the lost historical and contemporary voices of the marginalised, oppressed and dominated through a radical reconstruction of history of knowledge production’ (McEwan 2001, p. 95) is largely brought to nothing, if no practical changes are generated in the lives of the marginalised, oppressed and impoverished. As stated by Sylvester (1999, p. 703) ‘postcolonial studies does not tend to concern itself with whether the subaltern is eating’.

Nonetheless, the above criticism that postcolonialism does not deal with the day-to-day issues faced by the marginalised and poverty-stricken is contestable. It can be argued that many of the challenges underpinning development in postcolonial contexts, including poverty, stem from the internalisation of colonial narratives. By working to address the implicit presence of colonial narratives within development theory and policy, postcolonial theorists are ‘digging out’ and exposing potentially significant causes of marginalisation and poverty. The primary difference is the scale on which each field is operating, with the focus of postcolonialism directed at stripping broad colonial narratives out of development theory over long time periods, rather than addressing ‘hands-on’ day-to-day poverty issues relevant to some development theorists.

Criticism is also directed at the effectiveness of postcolonialism in generating institutional change in the ‘global ‘development’ architecture’ given its rejectionist stance, which places it outside the mainstream development discourse (Simon 2006, 12). Simon argues that the seminal postmodern, poststructuralist and radical development theory of Streeten (1995) and Norgaard (1994) has been effective in transforming conventional development discourse through their technique of communicating in a subtle, convincing and powerful manner from within the conventional development discourse. Conversely, Simon (2006) argues, the combative rejectionist attitude of postcolonial theorists means that they fail to influence, or be incorporated within the conventional development discourse, precluding a potentially useful exchange. Given the post-structural approach of postcolonialism to confront power by dredging through the representational language of development texts and deconstructing the paradigms of those in power, the failure to actually participate in, or influence, the development discourse, means that the field is ineffectual in making necessary changes.
This criticism of postcolonialism does appear a little disingenuous. Citing the use of combative communication techniques as a reason why development theorists reject postcolonial theory tends to illustrate high levels of defensiveness and fear of responding to robust and coherent critique within the development fraternity. The rejectionist stance also tends to highlight that the development field has become ‘fixed’ and ‘stuck’ in a particular paradigm, and is not changing in response to new and valid evidence. It might also suggest the reluctance of current power structures to shift and change in light of a new, complex, and sophisticated paradigm.

However, a criticism of postcolonialism that gets ‘close to the bone’ is that the field has lost its way, forgotten its purpose (Dirlik 1994, p. 329; in Sylvester 1999), becoming more preoccupied with its credentials within Western academe as poststructuralist scholarship, than representing the subaltern (Darby 1998 p. 216; in Sylvester 1999). Furthermore, postcolonialism is considered to be coming out of a privileged position in the first world, having forgotten about those they claim to represent. As stated by Sylvester (1999, 713), the postcolonialist ‘is not living in and among the people (their) work is supposed to represent’. Graioud (2001, p. 1) suggests that the real ‘task of the post-traditional researcher is not to conceptualise hegemonising views of history’ represented in colonial texts and third world literature ‘but to document the fractured histories and life-stories of groups and communities as they surface in people's everyday practices’. In other words there is a need for postcolonial theorists to engage in the day-to-day life of the impoverished and marginalised, if they wish to capture and act in their interests.

This final criticism that postcolonialism is now a discipline of elites that have lost touch with their origins may have some validity. Certainly the founder of the field, Fanon (1961; 1967), did spend his time deconstructing colonial texts, although he also actively pioneered socio-therapy through praxis that reconnected traumatised indigenous peoples to their cultural backgrounds. However, postcolonialism has abandoned this hands-on praxis and in doing so has lost touch with the history of life stories of communities in everyday practice. Nonetheless the field of liberation psychology, mentioned before, has continued the praxis and socio-therapy of Fanon. Further, the field became influenced by other liberation theorists including Martin Baro (1994), Dussel (1981) and Freire (1972). This applied field of
psychology has remained committed to confronting internalised forms of oppression and has emerged to fill the gap left by postcolonialism’s failure to continue to apply its theory in practice.

A transcultural theory of development

Given the above discussion it is clear that theorists within the conventional development have generally failed to find reasonable grounds on which to reject the criticisms of postcolonial and postdevelopment theory, and have instead sought to silence criticism through non-engagement.

There is nonetheless validity in the argument that postcolonialism and postdevelopment have fallen into deficit thinking. Through their postmodern emphasis on deconstruction, they have failed to find that there are theories that are helpful and useful within the development field that are not immersed within a modernisation paradigm. It is clear from discussion in Chapters Two and Three that there are common development ingredients that when in place can greatly assist indigenous peoples in reaching their self-defined development goals. Consequently I would suggest that there are meta-theories of development that transcend localism, yet can accommodate, support, and dovetail with local development aspirations. Nonetheless, I still respect the fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment for their caution in not suggesting new development paradigms that might suppress marginalised voices.

However, I argue that development meta-theories are not just important because they can assist indigenous peoples in identifying and constructing their development approach. They also identify the common aspirations and challenges experienced by all human beings regardless of their culture, and therefore provide a point of commonality between societies and communities. It is also important that common human aspirations are acknowledged, so that similarities are recognised as well as difference. This is to avoid problems when individuals fail to commonly identify and therefore fail to experience empathy, compassion and concern for those recognised as different.

There is a set of development theories that are transcultural and can be used to assist indigenous peoples in identifying and constructing their development approach. I consider that these theories identify key development ingredients that extend, align, and accommodate
those outlined in Chapters Two and Three. The first theoretical area concerns a set of development models that I consider are transcultural and translocal, and fall under the category of a human-ends development. The reason I consider that human-ends approaches to be translocal is that they identify sets of human needs that have been consistently shown to exist in all human cultures. For example all human beings need food and water if they are to survive. One prominent theorists working in this area is Max-Neef (1992; 1993) who argues that human beings have a common set of needs. When these needs are not met Max-Neef (1992; 1993) considers that poverty results. However, poverty from Max-Neef’s perspective is not a simplistic notion: there are multiple types of poverty that emerge when particular human needs go unmet. For example, consumer societies might suffer from a poverty of meaning, through not having particular needs met. This poverty might be evidenced by high rates of mental illness and suicide. The mental suffering within these societies might not be present in societies with few consumables. Conversely, non-consumerist societies might suffer from the poverty of food security, through not having their subsistence needs met.

The idea of development as addressing multiple poverties is free from the narrative of progressive developmentalism, because development cannot be a one-way process of a higher society dispensing its knowledge to a lower society. Instead, societies that have successfully combated one form of poverty might share this with another that has not. For example, a society that might suffer from material poverty, but not poverty of meaning, may be in a position to exchange knowledge with a society that does not suffer from material poverty but does suffer poverty of meaning.

Max-Neef (1992, p. 199) identifies and classifies nine interrelated human needs, all of which must be satisfied to generate human flourishing. The needs are: *subsistence, protection, affection, understanding, participation, creation, leisure, identity and freedom* (Max-Neef, 1992: p. 200). Max-Neef suggests that human needs must be understood as a system, in that all human needs are interrelated and interactive. For example, the need for *subsistence* may also provide for the need for *protection*, as in the case of shelter (Max-Neef, 1992: p. 199).

Max-Neef’s human needs approach to development not unique. There have, over the years, been a number of approaches, beginning with the psychologist Maslow (1970), which claim that human beings have certain needs, or requirements, that need to be fulfilled to create a
satisfying existence. Alkire (2002) has explored a number of these theoretical perspectives to demonstrate that uncanny similarities exist between them, despite originating from different fields and disciplines. Alkire refers to these approaches to human development as ‘human-ends’, given that the needs, or requirements, that human beings must fulfil, are ‘ends unto themselves.’ The different models that Alkire explores, and demonstrates the links between, are outlined in the Table Ten below.

The first similarity Alkire identifies between models is that the motivations behind human *being* and *doing* can be reduced to sets of definable human-ends, such as the satisfaction of needs, or the fulfilling of universal human values. The second commonality between approaches is that the human-ends are non-hierarchical, which means that all dimensions are equally important – one cannot be used to replace another. For example Finnis (1983; in Grisez, Boyle et al. 1987; in Alkire 2002, p. 186) identifies that human action is driven by seven requirements all of which are equally important to human development. These seven requirements are as follows: *life* (its maintenance and transmission), *knowledge and aesthetic experience*; *work and play*; *friendship*; *self-integration*; *self-expression*; and *religion*. The third similarity between models recognised by Alkire is that all of the models identify similar human-ends, which suggests that a synthesis between models is possible through collaborative dialogue.

It is striking that all human-ends models identify the strong human need for political self-determination and self-defined identity, which suggests that human-ends theory is congruent with the Fourth World Development theory outlined in Chapters Two and Three, which highlights the need for indigenous peoples to have culturally matched self government and bureaucratic management. What is also very interesting about the human-ends models is their remarkable similarity to the development models created by Māori theorists. Henare, Winiata and Harmsworth all identify quite similar sets of values, most of which can be considered ‘ends unto themselves’. This suggests that awareness of an identifiable set of human-ends already exists within Māori culture, which can be used as a basis for constructing sustainable development strategies.
Table Ten: Human-ends models explored by Alkire (2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model and author/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic human values (Grisez, Boyle et al. 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central human capabilities (Nussbaum 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs matrix (Max-Neef 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions of well being (Narayan and et al 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universal human values (Schwartz and Bilsky 1987)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domains of life satisfaction (Cummins 1996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human needs (Ramsey 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate needs (Doyal and Gough 1991)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political liberalism (Rawls 1993)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human values (Lasswell 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelve life domains (Diener and Suh 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudent values for development (Qizilbash 1996)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although it is well beyond the scope of this thesis to undertake a detailed analytical comparison and synthesis between the human-ends approaches to development identified by Māori theorists, with the human-ends models explored by Alkire (2002), it is nonetheless worthwhile noting that distinct similarities exist between approaches. In the human-ends approaches, outlined by Alkire (2002), it is demonstrated that human beings need to participate effectively in political choices that govern their life. From a Māori perspective this human need is encompassed by the value of tino rangatiratanga (self-determination). Human ends models also outline the human need to give and receive affection, and form affiliations with others. Likewise, the Māori development theorists demonstrate that Māori value; whanaungatanga (togetherness); manaakitanga (unqualified giving); arohatanga (care, love and respect); and tau utuutu (reciprocity). Further human-ends approaches, in addition, outline the human need for a spiritual aspect to life, control over resources, and a solid identity, which are respectively valued by Māori as; wairuatanga (spirituality); manawhenua (legitimacy to control resources); and whakapapa (knowing who you are through genealogical links to human and non-human beings).
From this brief analysis and synthesis I think that it is reasonable to say that the human-ends approach is congruent with Māori culture, and that Māori human-ends models can be safely developed. Furthermore it needs to be noted that identifying human-ends does not define what a person, culture, gender, community or society should be or do. For example, identifying the human requirement for tino rangatiratanga does not determine the governing institutions and cultural practices required to give effect to this human end. Instead, as Alkire (2002) points out, defining human-ends provides a mechanism for individuals to critically look at ways of meeting their needs. They do not define what this existence should be.

In addition, human-ends approaches to development generate an awareness of the right to have certain requirements for human well being fulfilled, for example the right of self-determination. Consequently, it is an approach that encourages the empowerment of those marginalised through advocating for human rights. In this manner this theoretical approach aligns with postcolonial studies and post-development, in that both disciplines already advocate for the right of subaltern communities to self-determine and be free from poverty. Consequently, these postmodern traditions are already implicitly working within a value-framework of human-ends entitlements and rights.

**Capabilities**

Within Chapters Two and Three it was frequently outlined that indigenous communities often face the challenge of not having all the specialist skills, knowledge, financial and natural resources they require to develop opportunities and fulfil their aspirations. In particular, having independent streams of income and access to specialist knowledge within the governance and management of indigenous nations, tribes, and lands, was found to be a key to indigenous peoples reaching their development goals. I consider that this is a challenge that is faced by all humans regardless of their cultural background. This is because resources are always required to satisfy human-ends. For example without skills, knowledge, soil, water, plants, and other natural materials, humans cannot gather/grow food or construct shelter to meet their subsistence needs. In a similar fashion, if an indigenous community wishes to develop new businesses for employment and economic growth, then the appropriate knowledge, skills and natural resources will be required to successfully develop enterprises.
Sen (1999) provides conceptual tools for thinking about the capabilities required to meet human-ends. I consider that these tools constitute a meta-theory of development given that they concern the key resources, or ingredients, required to meet human-ends, and therefore apply to all humans in all circumstances. Greatly simplifying Sen’s (1999) argument, Sen suggests that in order for an individual, family, or community, to meet their human-ends they need to have certain \textit{endowments}, which can be categorised into financial, social, physical, natural and human assets. For example, to secure a farming livelihood requires land (a natural asset), skills as a farmer (a human asset), networks to institutions and communities to gain services and sell produce (a social asset) and farm infrastructure including buildings (physical assets). The \textit{entitlements} to \textit{endowments} are mediated through a society’s legal and social rules and norms. The Māori traditional property right structure outlined in Chapter One provides an example of the rules and norms that traditionally mediated \textit{entitlements} (rights) to \textit{endowments} (resources). However, these entitlements were later redefined under various acts of the New Zealand parliament, which changed the \textit{entitlements}.

Individuals who are rich in \textit{endowments}, according to Sen, have a broad set of capabilities, which refers to the opportunities open to a group, or person, to access \textit{valued functionings} (Alkire 2002, 184). \textit{Valued functionings} are the combination of things a person can do or be. Societies, or communities, with more endowments will have access to more \textit{valued functionings}. This is clearly illustrated within Fourth World contexts, where indigenous people have been largely dispossessed of natural and financial assets, exposed to psychological and social dislocation, and delivered culturally mismatched education, which has led to endowment deficits within communities. As a result, indigenous peoples tend to have a narrow set of endowments within asset categories in comparison to those of settlers. As a further result, indigenous communities have fewer life opportunities, or \textit{valuable functionings}, in comparison to settlers.

Sen does not define which \textit{valued functionings} are more important than others for a society, suggesting that this is best defined through public debate within the culture the question concerns. It is on this point that Sen’s theory is criticised for being vague because it fails to provide an indication as to which \textit{valuable functionings} are more important than others (Sugden 1993; in Alkire 2002). For example, is the capability of accessing water as important as being able to have cell-phone access?
Nevertheless, if Sen was to rank *valuable functionings* into categories of importance, he must immediately make assumptions regarding which ways of being and doing are more important than others. This risks the emergence of a monocultural development model, that like progressive developmentalism, might be imposed on the unwilling. Much like the postdevelopment and postcolonial theorists, Sen is reluctant to provide any sort of normative design.

Although human-ends models do not provide normative designs, one human-ends model does provide an assessment tool for determining which *valuable functionings* are more important than others. Max-Neef (1993) demonstrates that when fundamental human needs are deprived pathological behaviour results. For example, in indigenous contexts, not being able to fulfil the need for participation (having ownership of the political choices that govern one’s life) can cause social pathologies such as pervasive distrust, fear, apathy and xenophobia. Similarly, not satisfying the human need for strong and coherent identity within indigenous societies, can lead to loss of self-mastery, autonomous personal dignity, trust and self-efficacy. On a global level national insecurities can influence the formation of pathologies like arms races. From this perspective I would argue that *functions* that are *valuable* are those that are not pathological, and do not deprive the meeting of human-ends.

Max-Neef (1993) also argues that unsustainable practices are pathologies. For example, within Western countries the accumulation of material goods is much more than what is required to satisfy the subsistence and protection needs of those societies. This excessive consumption might constitute pathological behaviour that provides compensatory pleasure in response to poverty of meaning. This consumer demand gives rise to ever-increasing economic production which, in turn, degrades the environment. Thus identification and promotion of *functionings* that are valuable, on the basis that they are not pathological, and do not deprive the meeting of other human-ends, would confront unsustainable and pathological behaviour.

Similarly, imperialism and colonialism would also be challenged. As Fromm (1942) points out, it is a sense of powerlessness, or absence of control, which gives rise to pathological drives to dominate and control, giving rise to colonialism under which indigenous people are
subordinated. This is why Bhabha (1994) suggests that colonialism is always driven by lack. Once again pathological behaviour in the forms of imperialism and colonialism might be considered the result of unmet needs, such as needs for effective participation.

Although Max-Neef’s theory provides tools to think about which \textit{valued functionings}, are more valuable than others, it does not actually prescribe what human beings should do or be. Instead, like Sen, Max-Neef considers that it is up to participatory political processes in social contexts to determine what the satisfiers of needs should be, and to discern which behaviour is the result of unmet needs. Ultimately, it is up to indigenous, households, tribes, communities, and nations in general, to use the conceptual tools, offered by Max-Neef and Sen, when engaging in dialogue, debate and introspection to arrive at normative designs for their own development.

\textbf{Sustainable Livelihoods Approach (SLA)}

The value of the conceptual tools offered by Sen is that they provide a means of thinking about the \textit{entitlements} that different individuals, and social groups, have to assets, and the manner in which these entitlements create or limit capabilities. This is inherently political as it creates questions as to why one particular individual, gender, culture, household, community, or society has entitlements that others do not have. This is particularly relevant to indigenous peoples, given that the entitlements and endowments between indigenous communities and settlers often differ considerably. This is recognised in Durie’s (2005) development model – discussed in Chapter Two – where he outlines how Māori communities in Te Tai Tangata (the Social Domain) must assert rights to access and manage resources within Te Tai Tini (the Resource Domain), and must assess threats and take advantage of opportunities in Te Tai Ao (the Global Domain). This is an inherently political process, whereby new entitlements are sought so as to expand endowments.

The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF) conceptually elaborates Sen’s and Durie’s (2005) theories by creating an analytical tool for debate about the processes by which macro structures, such as governments and private sector organisations, influence the \textit{entitlements} and \textit{endowments} of individuals, households and communities\textsuperscript{15} at a micro level. Further, it provides analytical tools for thinking about the links between \textit{endowments} and the ability of

\textsuperscript{15} The model can equally be applied to hapū and iwi.
households and communities at the micro-level to cope with social, economic and environmental change – introducing a mechanism to think about the resilience and sustainability of households and communities. This important link is also identified by Durie (2005), who claims that the health of Te Tai Tangata (the human domain) is measured by the resilience of whānau and hapū to external impacts, which is in turn influenced by its ability to access resources and take advantage of opportunities.

The most well-known sustainable livelihoods framework has been documented by The Department for International Development (DFID), an agency of the British government (Cahn 2002). The development of the framework has been influenced by the work of Chambers and Conway (1992) Scoones (1998) and Carney (1998; 1999). It is illustrated in Figure 1 below:

![Figure Three: The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (DFID 1999a)](image)

The central feature of the framework is the asset pentagon (in Figure Three above), which demonstrates the livelihood assets (endowments) required by people to achieve self-defined livelihood outcomes. A brief description of livelihood assets is defined in Table Eleven below according to the DFID sustainable livelihoods sheets (1999b):
Table Eleven: Description of livelihood assets (abbreviated from DFID 1999a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livelihood asset</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human capital</td>
<td>Denotes the skills, knowledge and labour which permit people to pursue different livelihood strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social capital</td>
<td>Denotes the networks, connectedness, relationships of trust, reciprocity and exchange (shaped by rules and norms) that enables people to work together, expand access to wider institutions, and support one another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural capital</td>
<td>Denotes the natural resource stocks from which resource flows and services useful for livelihoods are derived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical capital</td>
<td>Denotes the basic infrastructure and produced goods needed to support livelihoods, including for example tools and equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial capital</td>
<td>Denotes the financial resources people have including available stocks such as cash, bank deposits or liquid assets, and regular inflows of money, such as earned incomes and remittances</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The asset pentagon is used to represent the access to different assets available at a micro level (e.g. whānau and hapū). Each line coming out from the centre of the pentagon is a vector denoting the level of capital present in each livelihood asset category. The shape of the pentagon changes in relation to the level of capital present in each category. For example, the pentagon outlined in Figure Four (below) demonstrates high social capital, average human capital, average physical capital, low natural capital and very low financial capital.

The resilience of a household, community, whānau or hapū, to deal with changes, brought about by trends, seasons, and shock events is improved through the increasing capital reserves (for example high levels of financial assets). The totality of risk that a social group is exposed
Vulnerability is referred to as the *vulnerability context*. A sustainable livelihood is one that is resilient to changes.

I consider that the SLF is a conceptual tool that transcends culture. It focuses on endowments that all cultures require to meet their human-ends. However, it develops the idea of endowments by providing a mechanism for determining levels of endowments and connecting this to the resilience of an individual, household, community, whānau, hapū or iwi. I consider it self-evident that expanding available endowments will increase the resilience, or decrease the vulnerability, of a social group from any culture, whether a hunter-gatherer or an urban professional. A whānau/family that has more financial, social, and human assets, for example, will be able to better respond to a disaster – given that they will have social support networks, the financial assets to deal with a loss of income, and the skills to access support from macro institutions. Further, I would contend that the political practice of negotiating and even fighting for entitlements to endowments is a characteristic of all cultures.

However, criticism of the SLF exists on two levels, first the manner in which it is applied in development practice and second, in its use as an analytical tool. Within development practice, SLF is typically used by Western donor agencies as an operational tool to assist in poverty reduction in ‘developing’ countries (Altarelli and Carloni 2000). As such the language of development practitioners and theorists using the model are embedded within a developmentalist style of thinking with the prevalence of terms like ‘developed’ and ‘undeveloped’, and ‘donor’ and ‘recipient’ being commonly used. In particular Western donor agencies still only understand poverty as a phenomenon existing in undeveloped countries, rather than all countries, which suggests that the definition of poverty being used is restricted to a material category.

Consequently, I would suggest that development agencies using SLF need to adopt a human-ends definition of poverty, whereby a sustainable livelihood would be one that permitted an individual, whānau or hapū to meet all of their human-ends. With a definition of multiple poverties all societies become donors and recipients, given that different societies possess different endowments, or assets, that can be used to address different poverties. This would overcome the criticism directed at SLF by Brocklesby and Fisher (2003) who suggest that the
donor agencies behind the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach are propelled by a technocratic development drive.

To counter this criticism the DFID emphasises its use of participatory methodologies when undertaking poverty assessments using the SLF, and when formulating *livelihood strategies* with stakeholders (DFID 1999a, p.9). The purpose of participatory approaches is to ensure that stakeholders own development designs – not the donor agency. Furthermore, the SLF is used to empower those at a micro level, by drawing attention to many of the capabilities and assets that need to be obtained to create sustainable livelihoods, and, more particularly, the role of macro institutions as enablers and partners in this process of social change. An education institution might, for example, form a partnership with rural landowners to provide technical extension. Nonetheless, it is unclear how these participatory approaches can work when the Western development agencies are immersed within colonial language such as developed and undeveloped, and donor and recipient. None of these terms suggest two-way exchange between equal parties/cultures.

Criticisms directed at SLF as an analytical tool concentrate particularly on the vagueness of its categories. First, Cleaver (2002) and Murray (2002) express concern over aid agencies applying the framework in a top-down managerial manner that is ignorant of the complexity and dynamics of relationships and institutional practices (Korf 2004). Second, criticisms are directed at the vagueness of the category of ‘*institutions, policies and processes*’, and exactly how these influence household capabilities (Korf and Ougton 2006). Third, the framework does not make explicit the power relations existing at the micro-level (e.g., within a household and community) that might limit access to livelihood opportunities to certain individuals (Korf 2004). Fourth, Arce and Fisher (2003) express concern that knowledge within the SLF is located within the category of human capital. This is problematic because the complex manner in which different forms of knowledge interface is not made explicit within the SLF.

The DFID to some extent anticipates the criticism regarding the vagueness of its categories by outlining that the model is not able to encapsulate complexity of all relationships (DFID 1999a). Further it is reiterated that the model is only a tool for stimulating debate and reflection, and that the model is open to change through critical debate (DFID 1999a). It could also be said that the SLF needs to be deliberately vague so that it can be applied in multiple
contexts. This is implied by the fact that the SLF has been found to be a robust analytical tool in diverse contexts, including both ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries (Korf and Ougton 2006).

Overall, the SLF simply provides a tool for conceptualising the endowments available to a whānau, hapū or iwi, and the political structures and processes that mediate entitlements. Further, it provides a means to conceptualise the level of endowments present, and in turn the level of resilience a whānau, hapū or iwi has in relation to environmental perturbations. However, the goal of a sustainable livelihood should be to address all poverties, not just material poverties, if the framework is to be transcultural.

**Synergy and synthesis between theoretical perspectives**

The discussion within this Chapter has highlighted a number of similarities and alignments between the different approaches to development explored within this chapter and with those from Chapters Two and Three. In Table Twelve, below, it is demonstrated that each theoretical perspective sheds different light on the challenge of indigenous development and that together each viewpoint works synergistically to establish a rich and diverse picture. Further, in Table Twelve below, it is also shown that the different theoretical perspectives have areas where they crossover, link and fuse.

The synergy and synthesis between theoretical positions I consider is encapsulated by seven development themes, which are outlined in Table Twelve. The first theme I refer to as *Human-ends*, which encapsulates the human-ends that any development approach should aim to satisfy to meet the needs of indigenous communities. Both Māori development theorists and human-ends theorists identify the need to satisfy human-ends. The second theme concerns the political process of combating colonial power structures that deny satisfaction of human-ends. The human-ends theory of Max-Need recognises that when human-ends are not satisfied pathologies result. This is implicitly recognised by the fields of postcolonialism, postdevelopment, and liberation psychology, which attempt to satisfy the needs of indigenous peoples for self-determination and coherent identity, through challenging the colonial stereotypes that are internalised within indigenous communities and externalised within nation-state development policy.
The third development theme concerns expanding entitlements to resources to meet human-ends through political action. Together Sen, the SLA and Durie (2005) outline the importance of gaining influence over, and access to, the various resources required to meet development goals. The fourth development theme, Te Tai Tini, concerns identifying and assembling the necessary resource endowments required to fulfil indigenous development aspirations. It is clearly outlined in the Fourth World Development literature, Māori Land Development literature, Capabilities theory, and the SLA, that combinations of resources are required to fulfil development goals. Of particular relevance to Māori and Fourth World Development contexts is gaining access to technical, intercultural and specialist skill endowments.

The fifth development theme concerns the construction of institutional platforms for indigenous development. This refers to the development of culturally matched self-government and bureaucratic structures to support indigenous development, which are outlined in detail at a macro scale in the Fourth World Development literature, and at a micro scale within the Māori Land Development literature. The sixth development theme, Te Tai Atua, concerns a unique Māori perspective of development as the spiritual process of life unfolding, which defines human responsibility and ethics. The spiritual nature of development is mentioned and usually highlighted within all Māori development theories. Finally, the seventh development theme, Te Hono, is strongly mentioned in both the development theory of Durie (2005) and in the Māori Land Development literature, and refers to the need for leadership in Māori communities to identify opportunities and imagine, negotiate, plan, and forge new futures in a way that maintains the relationships and bonds that hold together Māori kinship groups. This encapsulates the navigational domain that provides the basis for development direction and collective-action.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Twelve: Indigenous Development themes emerging from the synthesis of development theories from different disciplines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Meta Theories of Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Ends, Capabilities, SLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME ONE:</strong> Human Ends/Tikanga – Identifying and articulating human ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development involves satisfying key human-ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME TWO:</strong> – Disrupting Colonialism – Combating colonial power structures that deny satisfaction of human ends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied human-ends leads to different pathologies (e.g. dissatisfied needs for self-determination and identity lead to loss of self-mastery and clear aspirations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME THREE:</strong> Entitlements – Expanding entitlements to resources to meet human ends through political action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlements to the resources and assets required to satisfy human-ends through mediating societal legal and social rules and norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME FOUR:</strong> Te Tai Tini – Assembling the resource endowments required to fulfil indigenous development aspirations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity of endowments in different categories determine level of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**resilience:**
- Natural resources/assets
- Human resources/assets
- Financial resources/assets
- Physical resources/assets

**whānau/hapū/iwi and their resilience**

**Mātauranga – Building human assets/knowledge and skills within Māori communities through education**

**THEME FIVE:** Indigenous Institutions – Putting in place the institutions for indigenous development

| Within the Māori Land Development literature the important role of culturally matched governance and management structures are outlined. | Institutional platforms are required to assist indigenous development. In particular institutions for self-determination and identity are required in the form of culturally matched self-government and bureaucracies. |

**THEME SIX:** Te Tai Atua – Spirituality as life unfolding defines human responsibilities and ethics

| Te Tai Atua – Creative process of life unfolding into the social domain and resource domain is spiritual, which defines human responsibilities and ethics toward and between both humans and non-humans. |

**THEME SEVEN:** Te Hono – Leadership to forge new futures

| Te Hono/Navigational Domain – This refers to the need for leadership to identify opportunities, imagine, negotiate, plan, and forge new futures in a way that maintains the relationships and bonds that hold together Māori kinship groups and |
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their wider networks of influence
Within the Māori Land Development literature the importance of strong leadership and strategic direction is outlined.
Conclusion

Within a number of fields including postcolonialism, liberation psychology, and postdevelopment, it is noted that internalised colonial narratives cause psychological and social harm to indigenous peoples. Further, this harm can be so great as to disrupt and preclude indigenous peoples from taking coherent actions toward reaching their self-determined development goals. However, in the field of liberation psychology socio-therapy is being explored to disassociate indigenous people from negative stereotyping. Furthermore, the fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment are working to change dominant development paradigms, promulgated particularly by Western nation-states, which continue to implicitly express colonial narratives.

However, the fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment have placed too much emphasis on deconstruction, and have failed to recognise the presence and existence of development theories that provide options for reconstruction that respect and encourage local and culturally matched indigenous development approaches. It is clearly demonstrated within Chapter Two and Three that there are common development ingredients, regardless of indigenous cultural context, that when in place can greatly assist indigenous peoples in reaching their self-determined goals. Further, it is established that there are development meta-theories that are transcultural, and free from colonial stereotyping, which align with development models created by Māori theorists and can be used to assist indigenous peoples in identifying the key ingredients for supporting their own development.

Finally, it is concluded that synergy and synthesis can exist between postcolonialism, postdevelopment, the meta-theories outlined in this chapter, and the theoretical perspectives outlined in Chapter Two and Three. When synthesised seven development themes are generated; Human Ends, Disrupting Colonialism, Entitlements, Te Tai Tini, Indigenous Institutions, Te Tai Atua, and Te Tai Hono. I conclude that together these themes encapsulate the key concepts required to understand and support indigenous development, and in particular Māori land development.
CHAPTER FIVE: Cross-cultural Navigation

Introduction

In the previous chapter, seven development themes were identified that encapsulate the key concepts required to understand and support indigenous development. Out of these seven themes, five have been explored in detail while two themes have not; Te Tai Hono, the navigational domain, and Te Tai Atua, the spiritual domain. The function of this chapter is to concentrate particularly on Te Tai Hono, the navigational domain, and to provide some insight into Te Tai Atua, the spiritual domain.

The metaphor of navigation encapsulates the act of visioning, charting and planning the journey of an indigenous community, tribe or nation. To date, indigenous people have been largely unable to chart their own course, and have instead been subject to the imposed navigation of the fiduciary state. However, it has been clearly demonstrated in Chapters Two, Three and Four, that development navigated by nation-states on behalf of indigenous people does not work, while development charted by indigenous people is more likely to succeed. Nonetheless, it is also clear that indigenous nations and communities are to some extent reliant upon the settler society and nation-state to provide supporting policy, resources, and in particular human assets, that can provide technical and specialist input when charting a development course.

Consequently, it is argued in this chapter that indigenous self-navigation will need to be driven cross-culturally, by both the nation-state and indigenous nations. However, the pervasive colonial dominant/subordinate social psychology that plays out both within, and between, the settler and indigenous cultures inhibits and constrains the intercultural planning and strategic
thinking required to navigate development. Consequently, it is claimed that intercultural frameworks for planning and strategy are required.

It is argued in this chapter that there has been little theoretical work done on frameworks for planning development from an intercultural perspective. The primary theoretical work has taken place in the international development field, which has focused its effort on material poverty reduction at the community scale. The Participatory Development approaches developed in this field provide some insight into potential approaches that can be used in Fourth World contexts.

A critical review and deconstruction of participatory approaches, nevertheless, reveals that their success in the development arena has been limited and that colonial narratives and practices that perpetuate the colonial dominant/subordinate social psychology can be found embedded within them. A reconstruction is therefore undertaken to generate an alternative intercultural framework for navigating indigenous development based on the foundations of wānanga, indigenous leadership and Māori wisdom tradition.

**Negotiating navigation**

The research within Chapters Two and Four highlights the risks faced by indigenous governing bodies in successfully navigating their communities toward identifying and meeting collective aspirations. The first risk concerns institutional indigenisation, or where indigenous governing and bureaucratic institutions reject cross-cultural engagement in the formation and design of their development plans. This rejection is based on past experience which suggests that engaging with settler outsiders may result in the loss of autonomy and control. However, it is recognised that failing to engage cross-culturally can cause deficits in the expertise required to design and implement plans, negotiate the expansion of entitlements, and work with the nation-state to develop appropriate development policy.

A second risk to indigenous governing bodies successfully navigating their communities is highlighted by postcolonialism in Chapter Four. This concerns the emergence of reactionary traditionalism and mimeticism within indigenous leadership, which gives rise to leadership that portrays itself as traditional and authentic, yet acts against the interests of the communities they
lead to secure personal benefit. To combat the emergence of self-serving behaviour, the Fourth World development literature stresses that governing structures navigating development should have strong lines of engagement and accountability back to the social group that the leader represents. This ensures that the development direction and aspirations of leadership aligns with those of the community.

Further it is emphasised that governing structures should ensure that political power is centred at the appropriate scale to ensure that an indigenous community, tribe, or nation, can affectively navigate. For example, if a Māori tribe centres its political power at an iwi scale, yet indigenous leaders identify primarily with their hapū, then there will be a tendency for the leadership to navigate the iwi in a way that meets development aspirations of one hapū, or a group of hapū, at the expense of the iwi collective.

Consequently navigation in the Fourth World Development context is complex. First it requires the presence of appropriate governing structures that establish strong lines of accountability and centre power at the appropriate scale. Second it requires political negotiation and engagement between a number of different actors and parties to determine development strategy and direction. These parties include:

- Indigenous leaders and the families, tribes, communities, that they represent;
- The technical specialists and professionals both internal and external to indigenous communities; and,
- The nation-state, local government, and their agencies with which negotiation takes place to expand access to entitlements, and develop nation-state policy that aligns with, and supports, indigenous development aspirations.

Much negotiation will be cross-cultural, not only within indigenous institutions (i.e., between employed outside specialists and insiders) but also between indigenous governing institutions and settler institutions.

This is likely to be a challenge, as the fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment both demonstrate that colonial narratives continue to dominate development policy in Western nation-states, which automatically places the settler nation-state into a donor position and indigenous peoples into a recipient position. Equality and two-way learning is not possible in an environment where this dominant/subordinate social psychology dominates.
The field of Fourth World Development has not explored mechanisms for successfully transcending the colonial dominant/subordinate social psychology that pervades Fourth World development contexts. Instead Fourth World Development has concentrated on attaining freedom from domination through focussing on re-capturing indigenous autonomy. However, as outlined above, indigenous autonomy is unlikely to be realised initially through decoupling from the nation-state, or the settler culture. This is because indigenous communities are dependent upon the willingness of the nation-state to develop policy and provide resourcing to support indigenous self-navigated development. Ultimately, indigenous self-navigation will need to be driven cross-culturally within a framework of equality and mutual-respect between governing institutions and agencies. This requires that the pervasive colonial dominant/subordinate social psychology that plays out both within and between the settler and indigenous cultures is transcended.

It has been outlined in Chapter Four that the fields of postcolonialism and postdevelopment, attempt to combat the subordination of indigenous peoples through critically engaging with development policy at a macro level that perpetuates oppressive practices. Also outlined is the field of Liberation Psychology, which focuses on psycho-social education strategies within indigenous communities, to generate awareness of internalised colonial concepts. It is anticipated that through this action space for indigenous development will open, and that alternative development approaches will emerge. None of these approaches works to support indigenous peoples in their engagement with settler institutions and specialists.

However, in the field of international development, participatory frameworks for facilitating intercultural planning and thinking have existed for over 40 years. These frameworks emerged as many of the large-scale development programmes, driven by Western countries in their former colonies, dramatically failed (Blanchett 2001). The cause of this problem was identified as the top-down monocultural approach of development agencies, which failed to get local ‘buy-in’ into development plans, account for local attitudes, and to understand local contexts (Blanchett 2001; Campbell and Vainio-Matilla 2003).

An exploration of the lessons learned from Participatory Development might provide some ideas about how frameworks for engagement with settler institutions and specialists can...
proceed. However, it needs to be pointed out that the international development context does not completely align, or fit, with the Fourth World context. Participatory frameworks are typically used by international development agencies undertaking aid projects operating at a community scale. Indigenous development initiatives operating at an indigenous-nation scale are unlikely to align with this community development approach given that the focus of such initiatives is on national policy that constrains indigenous development generally.

The community development approach of international development may nevertheless align with Fourth World development initiatives at a local scale where, for example, a hapū may wish to initiate and navigate a development project within a support framework including local government, central government agencies, and an iwi authority. This type of development initiative is particularly relevant to this thesis given that ownership of Māori land is centred at the whānau or hapū scale.

**Freirian Development**

The origin of participatory approaches within international development can be traced to the initial work of Paulo Freire (1972). These approaches were initially referred to as Freirean development, which sought to develop an alternative to the expert-ignorant donor-recipient relationship common in top-down development approaches (Campbell and Vainio-Matilla 2003). Freire explored an alternative pedagogy where development policy makers and specialists would become co-learners, identifying problems and finding solutions collaboratively with communities (Freire, 1972). Together each participant would bring their own knowledge to build a rich and coherent picture of a context, and then collectively agree on a common development plan and strategy. In this way development would be navigated through the combined knowledge of all participants.

Freire’s (1972) development pedagogy did not just assume that entrenched dominant-subordinate relationships within postcolonial contexts could be immediately overcome, either inside communities, or between subalternised communities and outsiders. Instead it was assumed that an open learning process could only emerge after an initial process of breaking
down internalised narratives that pinned different groups into superior and inferior categories. Freire referred to this process as humanisation (Blackburn 2000, p. 5).

According to Freire, humanisation takes place through ‘encounters’, in a world that is constantly changing (Blackburn, 2000: p. 5). An encounter entails dialogue between individuals, and between individuals and society, in a process of conscientisation, which is designed to increase awareness of the nature of oppression (Blackburn, 2000: p. 6). From Freire’s perspective (1972) the goal of development is not to create but to continually struggle against oppression and toward greater humanisation.

The concept of conscientisation is central to understanding Freire’s liberatory development approach. Conscientisation is brought about through the application of a dialectical and collaborative methodology, involving facilitated group discussion (Blackburn, 2000). The process is led by an educator, or facilitator, whose job it is to stage a dialogical and collaborative learning process. The initial purpose of the community group discussion is to increase awareness of the sources of oppression. Freire (1972) found three interrelated levels of consciousness that progressively emerge as groups involved in the dialogical learning process became increasingly aware of the nature of oppression. This increasing consciousness is referred to as conscientisation and is characterised by three levels; the magical, the naïve, and the critical.

The first stage, the magical, is when a myth of assumed inferiority exists among the oppressed, creating a culture of apathy and silence in the face of domination (Smith 1997). In the previous chapter, this state was articulated based on Fanon’s (1972) theory, which likewise makes explicit the psychological effects of colonialism on indigenous subjects. Freire suggests that those at the magical level of consciousness cannot name their dehumanising problems and so retain a passive acceptance (Smith, 1997, p.193). Awareness that marginalisation need not be a permanent state is not present. Moving out of this mode requires, as Blumefield-Jones (2004, p. 269) articulates, the subaltern becoming aware that he or she is an actor who possesses the ability to change and transform their life through questioning power.

The second stage of conscientisation is the naïve. In this state of consciousness an individual accepts current social, economic and political systems (Smith, 1997). However, they identify
the cause of their oppression as originating with particular individuals or groups, within the structure. They manoeuvre to defend themselves against these individuals, and seek empowerment through attaining positions of power and privilege. Their underlying political motivation is not driven by a desire to create a shared power alternative, but to maintain existing power structures (Freire, 1972). Within postcolonial literature this phenomenon, with indigenous communities, as explained in Chapter Four, is referred to as *mimeticism*.

The third stage of *conscientisation* is the development of the critical consciousness, which involves full intellectual awareness of the oppressed-oppressor dynamic (Smith, 1997). In particular, this involves increasing consciousness of the internal oppressor (the self-belief of one’s own inferiority) which reduces the subject into restricted categories of existence (Freire, 1972). Further it generates awareness of how this sense of inferiority has provided personal complicity in the structures of oppression. This includes the seeking of superiority to compensate for inferiority, characteristic of the naive consciousness (Freire, 1972). Within indigenous communities and settler society attaining this third stage involves the eradication of all internalised colonial concepts that are self-oppressing or self-aggrandising.

**Participatory Development**

Frierean development remained predominantly marginalised until it was popularised by Robert Chambers (1991) in Michael Cernea’s (1991) famous development text, *Putting People First*. Chambers (1991), referred to the emancipatory methodology as Participatory Development (PD) (Hackenberg and Hackenberg, 2004: p. 388). Within development circles PD became embraced and was seen as progressive, given that it significantly changed the roles of development agents and the communities they work with from a one-way donor-recipient dynamic, to a two-way process. (Hackenberg and Hackenberg, 2004: p. 387; Blackburn 2000, p. 3). The approach also became popularly referred to as bottom-up development, while development experts leading pedagogical learning processes came to be termed facilitators, change agents, or change catalysts (Blackburn 2000, p. 3; Hackenberg and Hakenberg 2004, p. 388). This terminology made its way into development policy throughout the world, including Fourth World contexts.
However, since this initial popularity it has become increasingly apparent that there are significant challenges to implementing participatory processes as envisaged by Freire. First it is clear that many cultures are unable to adequately accommodate dialogical and collaborative learning processes. Blanchet (2001) suggests that participatory methods do not work in communities with marked hierarchical relationships, and where significant differences in educational levels exist. Elites tend to dominate communication and open learning processes in these contexts, while those of lower social rank refrain from engaging in discussion according to custom (Blanchet, 2001). In this manner the dominant/subordinate dynamic within the traditions of many cultures automatically inhibits participatory process.

Second, Cook and Kothari (2001) demonstrate how participatory processes can be promoted, coopted, manipulated and distorted, by local elites and outside actors. This is reiterated by Platteau and Abraham (2002), who describe how local elites, in poor and marginalised communities, often operate using the logic of patronage to retain popularity and support within their communities, and find it relatively easy to manipulate participatory processes to channel resources in the direction they wish. Campbell and Vainio-Manilla (2003, p. 420) also outline that in some cases participation has become used simply to establish communication channels into marginalised communities, through which tailored information can be fed to obtain buy-in for development initiatives that meet the political goals of outside actors. This is also supported by Escobar’s (1995) critical analysis of international development projects, which demonstrated that participatory approaches were commonly used to achieve externally identified goals rather than for true local empowerment.

Conversely, Williams (2004) defends the outcomes of PD and argues that although its outcomes have not been perfect, it should not be abandoned. The general outcome of PD has been neither individual liberation, nor hegemonic subjugation. Instead, she suggests that PD does have the capacity for opening new spaces for political action, which lead to improvements in people’s lives. Simon (2001) also argues that those in the anti-development sphere concentrate on the failures of PD. Success stories, which could be used as examples for others to follow, are often ignored.

Despite these encouraging views on participatory development Kapoor (2005) calls for a radically new way of thinking about PD. Kapoor (2005) undertakes an exploration of the
psychological dynamics underpinning PD to demonstrate that PD is still immersed within a colonial mentality. He is primarily critical of the role of development agent or facilitator whose role it is to empower the marginalised (Kapoor 2005, p. 1207-1208). He considers that the development agent acts as ‘master of ceremonies’, who conducts the ‘behind the scenes stage management’ to empower and emancipate others. Therefore he, or she, does not step down from power, but actually reinforces power and privilege.

To create the ‘power-free’ conditions of participation, in which all voices equally contribute to development navigation, Kapoor (2005, p. 1207) demonstrates that the powerful involved in the process ‘must disempower themselves to empower the others’. This is the job of the development practitioner as the ‘change catalyst’ by bringing about personal transformations in those who express authority unjustly over others, or those who fail to realise that they allow power to be expressed over them.

To do this, Kapoor suggests that the development practitioner needs to have developed ‘astringent powers’, ‘like an ascetic monk who has overcome worldly attachments’ (Kapoor 2005, p. 1207). At its core Kapoor sees PD as a religious ceremony in which the ‘facilitator-as-priest presides, privilege and power are purged, and the community is reborn’ (Kapoor 2005, p. 1207). Furthermore Kapoor (2005, p. 1208) demonstrates that the role of facilitator not only allows a person to see themselves as a humanitarian liberator it also gives rise to narcissistic pleasurability as they not only ‘get to stage the empowerment process, but also get to be the centre of attention, deriving joy and praise for it’. Kapoor (2005) refers to this as narcissistic humanitarianism, which he sees as a contemporary version of the Western colonial Christian mission.

**The Shortcomings of Freirean Pedagogy**

Consequently, although Freirean pedagogy does provide useful insights, it does not provide an optimal process by which indigenous communities can self-navigate within an inter-cultural context. First it does not provide a complete solution to the challenge presented by the settler-indigenous superior-donor and inferior-recipient dynamic found in Fourth World contexts. Second, it appears that Freirean pedagogy has not been fully effective in uncovering and addressing dominant/subordinate power relationships at a community level, particularly in circumstances where custom will not permit dialogic debate and open participation. Generally
speaking, there appears to have been little motivation for those in positions of power and privilege to engage fully in participatory processes.

It might be suggested that an alternative approach would be to establish effective governing structures at the community level, which would establish strong lines of accountability between indigenous leaders and communities. In this way dominant-subordinate power relations internal to the community might be addressed. However, it was outlined in Chapter Two that indigenous leaders are often resistant to changes in governance that might decrease their privilege or decision-making capacity. Consequently, *conscientisation* of communities is likely to be necessary to draw attention to internal power dynamics and the structures required to address problems.

However, overall I consider that Freire’s analysis of the oppressor/oppressed dynamic and *conscientisation* is theoretically sound. Nonetheless there are some significant problems with his focus on facilitated dialogical and collaborative learning processes led by an *educator*, or *facilitator*. In the following section of this chapter I would like to identify what I consider the key problem with his approach through continuing a theoretical deconstruction of Freirian pedagogy. Once this key problem is identified, I consider that an avenue for reconstructing an alternative participatory development approach is possible, which may be more effective in assisting indigenous communities to self-navigate within the inter-cultural contexts they find themselves.

**Deconstructing Freirean Pedagogy**

To begin with Freire always claimed that the role of the outside emancipator or educator was ideologically neutral. Freire considered that he did not teach people what to think, but how to think, simply providing the tools for the oppressed to achieve their own liberation (Miller 1998, p.14; Blackburn 2000, p. 10). Rahnema (1992, p. 123; in Blackburn 2000, p. 10) questions this neutrality on the grounds that it is questionable whether ‘the oppressed have no power in the first place, and that an outsider (the Freirean educator) possesses the secret formula of a power to which they must be initiated’. Additionally Blackburn (2000, p. 10) suggests that Freire’s assumption ‘that there are powerless populations is, on anthropological grounds, highly questionable’. Power, for example, might be being expressed in subtle ways such as non-
cooperation. Consequently the tools offered by Freirean development might actually be imposed over pre-existing strategies of defiance that may be contextually sound.

Likewise Miller (1998, p. 14) also questions Freire’s claim that the only thing Freirean educators seek to share with the oppressed ‘is a critical perception of the world’. Muller (1998: p. 14) points out that this implies that there is ‘a correct method of approaching reality in order to unveil it’. Miller (1998, p. 14) suggests ‘that it is hard to believe that the critical perception of the world Freire seeks’ through his dialogical process of conscientisation ‘is meant to produce anything other than a new citizenry with a new shared set of values’. Miller (1998, p. 14) asks the rhetorical question: ‘What else (other than the development of a new citizenry) could be the outcome of teaching others the way to ‘unveil’ reality, to shed their ‘false consciousness’, to ‘cut the umbilical cord of magic and myth which binds them to the world of oppression?’

Miller (1998, p. 14) also sheds some more challenging light on Freire by outlining that no one can reject Freire’s thesis without becoming accused of failing to divest themselves of their myths, which tie them either into a position of domination or submission. This is outlined by Miller when he states (1999, p. 14):

“Those that reject his pedagogy, on the grounds that they are being led by the hand to certain foregone conclusions, respond in this way because they have begun ‘to realise that if their analysis of the situation goes any deeper they will have to divest themselves of their myths, or reaffirm them.’”

In this manner the Freirean conscientisation process is transformed and might be considered a confessional with Christian overtones – as has been identified by Kapoor (2005). The confessional involves either admitting complicity in a system of oppression or conversely one’s power role in the system of oppression. The confession of participants is made in a group setting (using Freire’s dialogical method) under the tutelage of the group’s emancipator. The person who does not want to go along with the process, and confess to the group (and ultimately to the emancipator) is ultimately doing so because they want to retain their myths and either remain in an oppressed or oppressor state.
The confessional theme is also found strongly among development practitioners that have adopted ‘deep’ Freirean Participatory Action Research (PAR) methodologies (Smith 1997). The development practitioner/emancipator is encouraged to engage in hermeneutic self-reflection, which is communicated in a narrative confessional (Smith, 1997, p. 229-241). The narrative communicates the anxieties, fears, confusion, embarrassments, and guilt felt by participatory development practitioners when in the role of emancipator. It might be suggested that this confessional approach is driven by a need for the practitioner to safeguard and monitor themselves for the emergence of, as Kapoor (2005, p. 1208) refers to it, ‘narcissistic samaritarianism’, that comes from being the emancipator in economically and politically vulnerable communities.

The key problem for Freirean emancipatory development is that it centres far too much power with the *emancipator*. There are few guarantees that the *emancipator* will not use his, or her, position of power to manipulate individuals within a community. As Blackburn (2000, p. 11) outlines, Freire fails...

> ‘to address the possibility that educators may be unable (or even unwilling) to strangle the oppressor within them, and may consequently misuse their position to manipulate those over which they have so much power.’

Similarly, the confessionals of the deep PAR practitioners are equally fraught because this also places significant power in the hands of those to whom they ‘confess’ and makes them vulnerable to manipulation.

Criticism of Freire’s emancipatory approach is also directed at the manner in which the oppressed/oppressor dynamic is essentialised as a class phenomenon due to Freire’s reliance on Marxist humanism (Blackburn 2000). It is for this reason that Jackson (2007, p. 211) criticises Freire for having oversimplified and universalised ‘the oppressed without recognising the multiplicity of social identities and the complexity of structural positioning.’ For example in the case of Māori development self-determination movements to combat settler oppression might be sought at hapū, iwi, and Māori-nation levels simultaneously, which means that the Māori identity can be centred at multiple levels. Further these identities can be in conflict, as for example hapū self-determination may become hampered by iwi authority. She also proposes
that Freire ‘failed to recognise the gendered, classed, racialised subject positions of both teachers, and learners, as well as their structural locations and lived realities.’ The statement appears to be validated by research within international development, which suggests that in many cases local custom inhibited women and the lowly educated from taking part in participatory processes (Blanchett, 2000).

In addition, the dichotomous categories of power found in Freire’s work has translated to the simplistic categories of bottom-up and top-down, found in PD. Cooke and Kothari (2001, p. 10) argue that the essentialist analysis of bottom-up and top-down has actually masked the presence of power. This is because, as Francis (2001; in Hickey and Mohan 2004, p. 11) outlines, focus on participation and empowerment at the local level ‘obscures analysis of what makes participation difficult for marginal groups in the first place, particularly in relation to processes of state formation, social stratification and political economy’. There is consequently a need to reclaim participation, from simply being viewed as a technique used at the local community level, to a method to facilitate engagement across multiple political communities, such as regional and state levels (Hickey and Mohan, 2004). This criticism appears to be particular applicable to Fourth World development. As outlined above, indigenous self-navigation needs to be driven cross-culturally within a framework of equality and mutual respect between indigenous nations and settler nation-states. This cannot just occur at a community level, but must also take place at regional and national scales, to ensure that nation-state policy is developed that supports development at local levels.

Another final line of criticism directed at Freirean approaches to development is that the new citizenry emerging from the conscientisation process, with new sets of values, actually replaces, or removes, existing identity and culture. Bowers and Apffel-Marglin (2005, p. 6; in Jackson 2007, p. 211) go as far as to say ‘the Freirean agents of emancipation were emancipated from the intergenerational knowledge that is the basis of their identity and culture.’ Bowers and Apffel-Marglin (2005, p. 6; in Jackson 2007, p. 208) outline their own shift in thinking – once they understood Freire’s vision of empowerment as a noncolonising pedagogy ‘but as they learned from indigenous cultures, they became aware that Freire’s ideas are based on Western assumptions and that the Freirean approach to empowerment was really a disguised form of colonialism’. This leads to the current irony of where PD practitioners advocate the inclusion of
indigenous knowledge into development designs, having taught indigenous cultures how to think about their own knowledge.

Consequently, at the core of Freirean development elements of colonialism can be found, and in particular the notion of ‘improving’ cognition. According to Blumefield-Jones (2004, p. 260) improvement from a Freirean perspective ultimately involves the development of Western intellectual rationality, which concerns becoming aware of the oppressed/oppressor dynamic conceptually and theoretically. It is assumed that once an indigenous person has developed this cognition, they are then in a position to consciously develop plans and strategies to take ownership of their own development, and combat oppression. However, the reliance on intellectual rationality as a mechanism for creating a critical consciousness is due to an overreliance on critical theory, which also shares this perspective (Blumefield-Jones, 2004; p. 240). Ultimately, this understanding is built upon a developmentalist hierarchy of cognition, with critical theorists assuming Western intellectual rationality to be superior to other forms of rationality.

Consequently Freirean pedagogy is ultimately centred in a Western intellectual rationality approach. Further, it is also influenced by a Western Christian confessional approach, which reflects the influence of liberation theology on Freire. Despite these shortcomings of Freirean pedagogy I consider that the approach is still important for articulating conceptually the nature of oppressed/oppressor dynamics. I also consider that it has more relevance in culturally matched contexts where intellectual forms of rationality and confessional approaches are understood and valued. Nonetheless I also consider that it can be concluded that Freirian pedagogy is not a transcultural theory, and consequently cannot necessarily be applied in all contexts where oppression occurs.

In addition, I do not consider that generating an intellectual understanding of the nature of colonial oppression necessarily establishes the conditions for addressing power. This is supported by Blumefield-Jones (2004, p. 204) who disputes the assertion that developing an intellectual rationality concerning oppression can, on its own, achieve liberation goals. This is because an intellectual understanding of power dynamics does not in itself provide conditions for challenging or addressing power, or creating a critical consciousness. Instead, it might actually have the opposite effect, if those in a position of power understand how domination
and oppression operates; they can manipulate social and political processes to achieve particular goals. Fundamentally I consider that it is the human ability to imagine and identify emotionally with characters caught in oppressive relationships, through sentiments such as empathy or anger at injustice, which ultimately underpins liberatory action. In other words, simply having information about how power operates does not mean that this will effect personal transformations and generate empathy or concern for those who are oppressed (Dhiman, 2002, p. 88).

In the next section I build the theoretical foundations for an alternative critical approach to navigating indigenous development based upon inter-cultural experience, story-telling and leadership. Story-telling and inter-cultural experience permit identification with people caught in oppressive relationships, and the arousal of ethical intuitions and emotions to motivate change. Furthermore, it enables a critical understanding of the development contexts and the identification of key actions to achieve development goals. At the same time, leadership provides clear direction, and mobilises collective energy. From this position ‘improved cognition’ is not necessary for developing a critical rationality.

**Preontological knowledge and narrative learning**

To create an understanding of how critical consciousness emerges, it is first necessary to develop an understanding of the concept of knowledge-in-practice, or preontological knowledge. Preontological knowledge is also referred to as tacit knowledge, or substantive knowledge, and has been identified by Heidegger (1967) as the primary knowledge used by people to orientate their self and understand the world. This can be explained in the following manner. When we learn to ride a bicycle, we learn through a process of action and consequence. For example, when learning to ride a bicycle we may overcorrect our steering because we have not learned yet how to balance. When the anticipated outcome of an action is incorrect, such as overcorrecting steering on a bicycle, we avoid committing that action again and try another action until we achieve the anticipated outcome. In this manner human beings are continually making assumptions regarding the likely outcome of an action (referred to as **intentionality**), taking the action then reflecting upon the consequence. When the assumption used to anticipate the outcome of an action proves to be consistently correct it becomes
established as a rule, or factual assertion. Consequently the act of riding a bicycle, if done correctly, may be understood as a practice premised upon a range of valid factual assertions.

Through making knowledge-in-skill and practice explicit, theorists demonstrate that the primary knowledge people use to orientate their selves in the world is based upon factual assumptions, which have been generated through their experiential learning (Heidegger 1967; Dreyfus 1991). Acts like walking and sitting are based upon very fundamental valid factual assumptions of actuality. For example, every step we take is based upon an assumption that there will be firm ground to place our foot on in the next step. Our most basic and fundamental understandings of the world are formed as this knowledge-in-practice.

However, the important and distinguishing feature of experiential knowledge-in-practices is that it is developed through experience and so cannot be learned in other ways. In the case of a person learning to ride a bicycle, they cannot, for example, be handed an instruction manual and be expected to get on a bicycle and ride. This is because the individual needs to develop experience by learning to accurately anticipate the consequences of particular actions through trial and error, when attempting to achieve their desired goal. However, the acquisition of knowledge-in-practice, or skills, can be guided. For example, a child learning to walk might have their hand held by a parent to steady their balance. In the same manner a novice carpenter may come under the tutelage of an experienced carpenter.

Being guided into skill-based knowledge can occur in at least two ways (Dreyfus 1991; Mulhall 1996). First, an experienced individual in a particular skill-set, for example a carpenter, might provide a set of instructions, or rules, to a novice to guide their experiential learning. This might involve advice on the choice of tools to use to complete a particular task. Second, an experienced individual may simply expect a novice to emulate their practices, and so learn through mimicry and observation. Together, both instruction and emulation form the grounds for guiding people into development knowledge-in-practice, in the form of skills.

**The role of narrative and the imagination**

Building skills in the social sphere is a little more complex than building skills through tacit learning. However, just like building tacit skills, we learn in the social sphere through a process of taking actions and experiencing consequences. Over time we learn that taking certain actions
will have particular consequences, and as a result learn to anticipate consequences. However, the social sphere can be very complex with different individuals, communities, and cultures, reacting differently to different actions, which can make anticipating consequences at times challenging.

Nonetheless, developing knowledge and skills in the social sphere can be enhanced through narrative, or story-telling, which permits the simulation of actual experience (Carrithers, 1992). When told a story, people simulate experience by using their imagination to build characters, plots and situations that trace events and describe situations as they unfold over a period of time. In particular, the plot follows the actions of particular characters and the consequences of those actions (Carrithers, 1992). Consequently, the narrative, through the use of characters, provides a means of guiding practices, by avoiding actions that lead to unwanted outcomes, and engaging in actions that lead to desired outcomes (Carrithers, 1992). If an indigenous community, when planning their development, wanted to avoid taking action that would lead to unwanted outcomes, and take actions that led to desirable outcomes, then accessing narratives that illustrated actions that achieved desired outcomes, and those that didn’t would guide the community into good development practices.

Through following the plot in stories, like those outlined above, tribal members would be led to identify emotionally with, and relate to, characters (Carrithers, 1992). This process takes those individuals out of themselves and through their imagination into the bodies of other characters, in an attempt to experience what they experience, which rouses emotions (Carrithers, 1992).

**When narratives become distorted**

Although the narrative can provide a useful guide to our experiential learning, it can also thwart our learning if a narrative that we adhere to is narrow, or false. For example, Coxhead (2005) and McCreanor (1993) both demonstrated that media in New Zealand tell different stories about Māori than they do about Pākehā. The stories told about Māori are significantly more negative than the stories told about Pākehā, and in particular the stories about Māori concentrate on violent crime (Coxhead, 2005). This negative story telling reinforces stereotypic preconceptions of Māori among Pākehā, and also causes Māori to develop stereotypic preconceptions about themselves.
The impact of distorted narratives is in particular highlighted by postcolonialism, which demonstrates how colonial narratives have created inferiority/superiority dynamics within and between indigenous peoples and settler societies. As outlined in the previous chapter, narratives that portray indigenous peoples as uncivilised, barbaric, primitive, undeveloped and childlike, while illustrating settlers as civilised, moral, modern and developed, significantly truncate reality and give rise to a range of damaging psychological phenomena in communities. They also have another significant effect – they create paranoia or fantasies. For example, a Pākehā who holds a view of Māori as uncivilised and criminally inclined will suffer from paranoid fear when around Māori, whether the fear is justified or not. Similarly, a Māori person who is caught in a state of reactionary traditionalism will view all Pākehā as morally corrupt, whether or not this judgement is justified, while also viewing all Māori as moral. As a result all Pākehā will be viewed from a position of distrust, while all Māori will be engaged with from a position of trust.

It is therefore clear that narratives that are truncated, and do not tell the ‘whole story’, or false stories, can significantly distort experiences of those that believe them, and justify irrational actions based upon paranoia or fantasy. Truncated or false narratives can be addressed through exposure, either through alternative narratives that tell the whole story, or through spending time within a particular context to build actual experience. For example, a marae-stay combined with story-telling that relays a rich and holistic picture of contemporary Māori might address stereotypes or prejudice that Pākehā might have.

It is therefore clear that experiential learning and the broadening narratives to encapsulate the richness and complexity of situations is a mechanism for confronting delusion and paranoia. The role of emulation and mentorship is also important. Mentors can role model particular behaviours that permit the acquisition of skills designed to create desired outcomes. For example, indigenous leaders who have successfully led indigenous development initiatives, will have a range of skills that younger indigenous people can emulate and learn from, so that they may to learn to successfully lead their people’s development.

However, when the presence of mentors and leaders with experience is combined with the development of broad and rich narratives that allow a context, such as a Māori community, to be imagined and understood in its complexity, the grounds are formed for development and
planning based on a critical consciousness. This is because planning will be based upon a rich and informed base, which can be used to identify actions that are far more likely to achieve anticipated consequences.

I therefore conclude that the development of a critical consciousness required for navigating indigenous development involves a continual learning process of mentoring and broadening narratives and experiences. However, as outlined in the first sections of this chapter, navigating indigenous development also requires cross-cultural strategic thinking and planning, given the reliance of indigenous communities on government agencies and non-Māori specialists. I therefore consider that any process of mentoring and broadening narratives needs to occur cross-culturally, to assist in building mutual-respect and equality.

However, the next challenge is imagining how this type of sharing might occur. It was outlined previously that if an indigenous community navigating development could access narratives that described through personal characters success and failure stories a guide to good development practice would be provided. One avenue by which this sharing can occur, I consider, is through what I term a Wānanga Approach. Whare wānanga, or lodge/s of learning, were the traditional forums in which ancient lore, history and genealogies of Māori were passed between generations (Mitira 1972). The concept of the whare wānanga is used more generally today to describe any house of learning, such as a University, and is also used to describe situations where gathering occurs to learn about a particular subject. I consider that a Wānanga Approach to development would involve community-based learning, possibly on a marae, where success and failure stories are told to establish critical thinking as a foundation for designing development strategies.

Evidence suggests that this approach would align well with Māori culturally. Lee (2005) outlines how the Māori tradition of story-telling, or pūrākau, was a central part of traditional Māori pedagogy, or ako. Stories were highly valued, carefully constructed and skilfully delivered to enable learning and the transmission of knowledge. Further, Lee (2005: p.8) considers that there is significant potential in story-telling as an ethnography that enables critical reflection on cultural practices and the communication of experience. This suggests that cultural alignment for storytelling as critical pedagogy may be more effective than a Freirean pedagogical approach to conscientisation, based on intellectual rationality.
Furthermore there is an initial body of research outlining that using narrative as critical pedagogy may well be suited to indigenous contexts (Feldman 2000; Struthers and Peden-McAlpine 2005; Evans, Hole et al. 2009; Austin 2010; Burdick and Sandlin 2010; Wootton and Stonebanks 2010). This research is primarily in the area of education, though in the case of Evans et al., (2009) there is some indication that it might also be fruitful as a method for participatory development. Further, as outlined in the previous chapter, storytelling as pedagogy has already been identified by liberation psychologists as a technique for addressing psychological trauma associated with colonialism.

I hypothesise that narrative-based wānanga approach to critical pedagogy is likely to be a culturally aligned and effective method for facilitating inter-cultural planning within Māori land development contexts. To illustrate this hypothesis it might be useful to imagine a situation where a Māori Land Trust has called a meeting on a marae, for landowners to determine the future of an area of land. A Wānanga Approach would involve ‘preparing the ground’ for this strategic planning, by having a wānanga where a number of knowledgeable and experienced individuals, who have been involved in the development Māori land from various backgrounds (e.g. Directors of Māori Incorporations, Land Trustees and Public Servants), to tell stories of their successes and failures. These stories could highlight key strategic themes of Māori land development, including, for example; identity, history, business, and ecological restoration. The story telling would be intercultural with experienced individuals, regardless of their cultural backgrounds, sharing their stories. However, the wānanga would be immersed within a Māori cultural setting to simultaneously provide a cultural experience for non-Māori.

**Resistance to change**

The Wānanga Approach of generating critical consciousness cannot always work to provide a cross-cultural framework for critical learning. It is clear that many individuals, despite being exposed to different stories, narratives, experiences and mentoring, may still wish to retain a colonial narrative that continues to stereotype or denigrate another culture. In such a case a person has become fixated on a colonial narrative despite evidence that the narrative is either truncated or false. Erich Fromm (1942) has explored the psychology of this phenomenon and suggests that this is a form of social masochism. The reason that he refers to it as social masochism is because the individual who becomes fixated on a narrative that denigrates others
has given-up their capacity for free-thought and action in favour of remaining immersed within the narratives pervasive in their community or culture.

However, the irony is that there is a ‘flipside’ to the masochistic subordination of self to a common narrative. Through subordination an individual loses their personal freedom to grow through experiences beyond the constraints of their narrative. This leads to an individual to feel stifled and ultimately disempowered. A reaction to this disempowerment, Fromm (1942) suggests, is the need to gain a sense of power. However, rather than stepping outside the doctrine, and into the experiences beyond the narrative, empowerment is sought through obtaining authority that can be used as a means to express control and domination.

This fundamentalism leads to extreme forms of intolerance for any individual, or group, that does not share the same narratives. Individuals or groups within different narratives and experiences are considered threatening. This is because the different experiences and narratives threaten the coherency of the fundamentalist’s worldview. The insecurity in turn creates a requirement of the fundamentalist to either convert, or exterminate, those who are different – to generate ‘sameness’. This form of fundamentalism is common to colonialism, whereby imperial powers attempt to convert, assimilate and even commit genocide, to remove the differences presented by indigenous peoples.

Leadership
The existence of individuals that are not open to new experiences and narratives serves to highlight that many people simply tend to follow and adhere to the narratives of their culture without reflection. Consequently, leaders that are able to continually step out of their knowledge framework and learn through exposure to new experiences and narratives are important for creating new narratives within cultures for those who tend to follow. Dhiman (2002) suggests that the leadership required to step out into new and often unknown territory is based on the ability to unlearn on an ongoing basis. He considers that this unlearning is centred on wisdom traditions that provide stories about learning how to unlearn (Dhiman 2002). Dhiman (2002, p. 86) describes this as follows:

‘True learning might more aptly be described as an exercise in unlearning, the emptying of the mind of mistaken assumptions and engrained habits.’
Using Socrate’s famous line, ‘I know only one thing, I know nothing’, Dhiman (2002) proposes that existing in a constant state of unlearning is based on knowledge that one’s knowledge is always deficient and cannot explain everything. What underpins this level of openness to learn I consider is humility, which is required before one is open to really listen, experience, value and absorb the knowledge that others express.

Equally important for learning, particularly in social settings, is the ability to identify with and understand another. As Blumefield-Jones (2004) points out, without this ability it is not possible to confront injustice, or power. This is because one cannot empathise, or have compassion for those who suffer through oppression. This is reiterated by Dhiman (2002) who goes on to suggest that without developing understanding knowledge does not become part of our being. Dhiman (2002, p.88) describes it in the following manner, if knowledge ‘stops at the level of information’ it ‘does not effect transformation. Whereas, understanding transform’s one’s being, in a sort of metamorphosis.’

The ability to identify with others is also based on the presence of narratives that do not objectify others into a lesser category of existence from oneself. The ability to feel empathy or compassion for another is dependent upon narratives that do not dehumanise others, or consider others lesser. This once again is based on the ability to unlearn, or humility, to deconstruct narrow and prejudicial narratives, which dehumanise others and promote oneself into a position of superiority.

In the Māori development area there is clear evidence that Māori wisdom traditions also outline the value of learning to unlearn, and in particular humility. This is understood as the basis of good leadership. Te Puea Herangi (1883-1952), a respected Māori leader commonly referred to as Princess Te Puea, articulated what she considered the ten points of strong leadership based on the wisdom tradition she was raised in. These ten points, outlined in Table Thirteen below, overwhelmingly point to the importance of humility as the basis of leadership and learning (Mitaki and Ra 2004). Herangi identifies that the role of humility is to forget the importance of oneself, and to put others first. She considers it is the role of the rangatira to provide ‘a cloak of duty and responsibility’ to share knowledge in a way that will benefit all (Mitaki and Ra 2004,
However, she warns that many endeavour to ‘restrain the broadening of knowledge to preserve their own image of self importance’ (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 21).

These statements closely match the ideas expressed in this chapter that through humility and putting aside self-interest the sharing of knowledge is made possible. Further, the idea that ‘restraining the broadening of knowledge’ is the product of maintaining a sense of self-importance, supports the notion outlined in the last section that those who seek positions of authority to overcome their sense of inferiority, are unable to broaden their knowledge base (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 21). Herangi also introduces a spiritual element by suggesting that humility removes the barrier of the ego, or self, to the Gods. She consequently states that ‘it is in rangatiratanga that the sharing of the Gods is expressed’ (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 21).

Herangi also emphasises the importance of finding balance between the old world and the new, stating that ‘no longer can we allow ourselves the luxury, or the space, of ignoring the cries of the young for knowledge, leadership and understanding. If we are to survive the vast change now upon us we must adapt and adapt quickly, advantaging ourselves of every opportunity to open the doorways of our ancient sacred heritage’ (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 23). In this way Herangi holds an orthodox traditional perspective, that founds Māori development on a sacred heritage, yet it is still open to new ideas and perspectives.

However, Herangi also outlines some other important elements of leadership that are dependent upon humility. She articulates that it is the role of leaders to guide the will of the people, which comes from possessing the ability to detect their needs and communicate in a way that guides their will (Mitaki and Ra 2004). Nonetheless, she contends that the communication must flow from wairua so that the guidance is free from human self-interest and ego. She maintains that this form of authority is authentic, whereas the new ‘executive leader’ forms of authority, she identified as emerging in her time, were based on the enforcement of authority and power over people as opposed to leadership based on cooperative support (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 21).

Furthermore, Herangi outlines that achievement and progress depends on gaining cooperative support for unified action among those whom one leads. She outlines that the role of leadership is to, ‘maintain a unified body that is disciplined and organised’ without which, ‘the foundation of who we are will not find solid ground’ (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 23). Once again she
maintains that bringing discipline and organisation is based on communication free from human self-interest and ego – the humble nature of which generates common understanding and will. However, the leader should not assume credit for the success but allow the success to be enjoyed by the people. As stated by Herangi (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 26)

‘A true leader is one who acts from the power base of humility, maintaining the leadership role while allowing credit for all success to flow to the people.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Thirteen: Te Puea Herangi (1883-1952) – The ten points of strong leadership (Mitaki and Ra 2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Aranaku ū a tangi ko paki (the humility in forgetting the importance of oneself)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Rangatira tōku a Rā (the place of sharing by the Gods)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Karaku mā Tūrangawaewae a Io (the principle of holding fast to the knowledge that is shared)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Tamaki a Pa (the humility of the sharing process)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Kiawa tū tangata mā iwi (the nature of serving)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Te Kaumaarua – (Council of people)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leadership) five ethical values of sharing all that is Māori.  
kaupapa a tū – the organised nature of what is asked of us as leader.  
rata po tū – sharing the values of understanding  
mirama a tiki – sharing the truth of who we are.  
kotahi mā marunga – the nature of unified action.  
Reo a tū ko iwi – the nature of the acceptance of the people...

The Old People say, pukaku a marani ko iwi – to understand the will of the people, is to advance the cause of all that we are. In that is justice for all.

7. Tūrangawaewae ko Atu a Kingi – the principle of leading as if one were king  
Mana is the principle component by which the one who leads gains respect from those who follow. If it is absent from a leader’s association with the people, all dialogue directed to achievement will fail... A true leader is one who acts from the power base of humility, maintaining the leadership role while allowing credit for all success to flow to the people. In this natural sharing process of all things Māori, the mana of Tipuna and the Gods belongs to all and respect belongs totally to the one who leads.

8. Ngā Tahu Kārero – the influence of correct language  
All success is founded on the correct use of language... While it is important to share the language to maintain its presence, it is also important to share understanding with all, so that those who follow can act with constructive and positive purpose in that which is asked of them... One wise in understanding the nature and purpose of korero says, ‘When you speak to me in words that I do not understand, the doors of our companionship close and I fly away upon my own journey of personal desire. Speak to me in words that I do understand, and I shall follow you to the end of time.’

9. Rama tōku a kingi – understanding the nature of authority and power  
All achievement and progress depends on gaining the cooperative support of those whom one leads. The prime objective, therefore, is to have the strategies of communication clearly in mind before utterances of any kind leave the lips. In ancient days this was known as roku a rangatira – leadership by placing oneself last.

10. Puramaka ko turangi a atu – sharing the credit of accomplishment  
To allow credit to flow to others, instead of taking it for oneself, maintains the mana of the one who leads and encourages those who follow to be a part of the leadership process. Then in their own right, those who follow claim respect and understanding for themselves, and share one with the other the natural wairua of the one who is rangatira – a true focus for the sharing of the mana of the Gods with all.

The general theme of leadership, based upon humbleness that ties and brings people together for unified action still continues to be identified within contemporary studies of Māori leadership. Research from Victoria University’s Māori Business Unit and Centre for the Study of Leadership, has found that modesty, patience and the ability to ‘weave people together’ are the key elements to strong Māori leadership (Pfeifer 2005). Furthermore, related research demonstrates that Māori society values modest leaders who follow a team-orientated approach more so than Pākehā, which illustrates that traditional values concerning leadership persist (Pfeifer 2006). Tuara (1992) found that successful Māori leaders understood that they served the people rather than themselves, and that their strength and mana is given to them by the group rather than being inherent. He also outlined the need to harness all elements of society (including non-Māori) to ensure that decision-making is wise and based on all available knowledge and information, including the knowledge of ‘specialist leaders’.
Nonetheless, other research has also identified other traditional leadership elements in Māori society that act in dynamic tension with rangatira leadership. This information has emerged from the field of entrepreneurship, which shows that Māori culture generates one of the highest rates of entrepreneurship in the world (Maritz 2006). It is claimed that this level of entrepreneurship, generally speaking, is not driven by a desire for wealth as in many other countries, but a desire for independence (Maritz, 2006). This desire for independence and freedom of action may suggest a desire for self-determination in response to colonisation but researchers consider that it reflects a traditional trait among Māori (Keelan and Woods 2006; Tapsell and Wood 2008). This trait is clearly identifiable within traditional mythology and story-telling, and emerges most clearly in the myths of the demi-god Māui (Keelan and Woods 2006; Tapsell and Woods 2008).

Māui as a character is well known as an overindulged youngest male sibling, with a number of traits reflective of his status including opportunism, precociousness, quick-wittedness, trickery, intelligence, resourcefulness, cunning, fearlessness, and at times deviousness (Keelan and Woods 2006; Tapsell and Woods 2008). This younger male sibling, or pōtiki, is known to seek out new opportunities and explore or test the rules and sanctions set and maintained by the rangatira (Tapsell and Woods 2008). In mythology the pōtiki is often celebrated for his ingeniousness and bringing new ideas and technologies into existence, but also often ends up in conflict, sometimes leading to death, in situations where he steps outside of socially sanctioned behaviour, and ceases to be accountable to his kin (Tapsell and Woods 2008).

Tapsell and Woods consider that the pōtiki in contemporary times is active and still pushing social and creative boundaries. They maintain that the pōtiki, as a result of colonisation, is no longer socially accountable to the rangatira and the kinship group, and as a result his entrepreneurialism is not harnessed for collective benefit. Instead Tapsell and Woods maintain that pōtiki have been lured by Crown to pursue financial freedom separate from the collective. They demonstrate how under the Native Land Court system, outlined in Chapter One, that the tribal estates were wrestled out of the rangatira’s control through the assistance of pōtiki. As stated by Tapsell and Woods (2008: p. 198):
These new generation of Māori entrepreneurs were commercially-driven and not averse to transferring kin-associated lands, goods or knowledge into financial self-gain. No longer protected or limited by his rangatira, they exercised their individual rights, seeking new opportunities in the now settler controlled (and manipulated) commercial market.’

However, the problem for the pōtiki was that they could not out-manoeuvre the settler government and its venture capitalists. Despite the devastating outcome of land loss, Tapsell and Woods outlined that rangatira have continued to value and support the development of pōtiki in the interest of capitalising on new opportunities. However, they suggest that pōtiki that leverage advantage off their kinship groups in the development of their enterprises, should be forced into positions of accountability. A Crown or iwi-funded initiative that, for example, supports projects driven by pōtiki should ensure that there is accountability built into the initiative.

**Adaptive leadership and sustainability**

Consequently, the traditional balance between the pōtiki and the rangatira has been disrupted, whereby the young, precocious and creative force of the pōtiki is not moderated by the ethical boundaries and kinship obligations enforced by the rangatira and hapū. However, when working in unison it could be imagined that the combination of the attributes and values of each form of leadership would bring a positive development force to hapū and iwi. The rangatira through humility encourages within hapū and iwi social cohesion, openness to intercultural learning based on Māori tradition, ethical boundaries or values that regulate behaviour, and clear direction. Conversely the pōtiki works to challenge accepted boundaries in the pursuit of self-interested opportunities, which when harnessed by the collective bring benefit and create new ways of thinking.

The open-learning environment is established through spirituality and the virtue of humility, and provides the basis for the Wānanga Approach outlined previously, whereby stories that bring a critical intercultural perspective and understanding on different situations can be used to build knowledge and capacity within hapū and iwi. When combined with the direction and leadership of rangatira, and the creativeness of pōtiki, the grounds are established for the navigation of iwi and hapū. A model from the synthesis of all of these theoretical perspectives is outlined in Figure Five below.
The model also demonstrates high levels of adaptation, given that an environment that encourages continual, critical, open, and intercultural learning provides a strong foundation for navigating development. This type of approach avoids circumstances where communities and societies become rigid and static in their world view. Carrithers terms a worldview that has become rigid, paradigmatic. He outlines that paradigmatic knowledge tends to go through periods where it is held as truth. This is followed by a collapse, when its axioms are negated, and a new paradigm is then reconstructed from new axioms. This is demonstrated by Gunderson, Holling and Light (1995, p. 22) who use an ecological metaphor to describe this process – the adaptive four-phase cycle outlined in Figure Six below.

This cycle demonstrates how ecosystems go through periods of conservation (K) or stability. This may be compared to a period in which a paradigm is stable. This is followed by a period of disruption (Ω), caused by new information, which requires the preconceptions underpinning a paradigm to be negated. A chaotic period follows, before reorganisation (r), whereby a lot of new information requires consideration to formulate a new paradigm. This is followed by
reorganisation \((\alpha)\), or the development of a new narrative. A new state \((K)\) is created from this consolidation.

![Figure Six: The adaptive four phase cycle (Gunderson, Holling and Light 1995, p.22)](image)

Diamond (2000) demonstrates how fixation on paradigms causes civilisations to collapses as they cannot adapt to environmental changes. For example, Diamond outlines the manner in which Greenlandic Vikings were unable to change their culture in response to changing environmental conditions. Despite the Vikings living in close proximity to Inuit they did not adopt Inuit hunting and fishing techniques as a means to survive in a cooling climate, and instead continued to farm cattle and expend labour on building cathedrals. As a result their society collapsed and they died of famine.

Consequently, it is illustrated that being open and critical to new knowledge is important for adaptation to changes in environmental conditions. I consider that this is dependent upon the virtue of humility. It is clear that fixation on particular paradigms, caused by pride, stops adaptation and can cause societal collapse. This is particularly pertinent to Fourth World Development where fixation on colonial narratives can preclude cross-cultural learning in both the settler and indigenous culture.
This perspective is reiterated by Michael’s (1995, p. 484) human ecology research, which suggests that there are two types of learning. The first, paradigmatic learning, is designed for a static world; the second, open and adaptive learning for the world in which we live – the world of change, which is outlined in the following quote:

“Learning appropriate for the former has to do with learning the right answers and learning how to adapt and settle into a mode of being and doing. Learning appropriate for our world has to do with learning what are the useful questions to ask and how to keep on learning since the questions keep changing.” (Michael, 1995: p. 484)

Conclusion

In conclusion, through the discussion in this chapter, it is clear that indigenous people have been largely unable to chart their own development course, and have instead been subject to the imposed navigation of the fiduciary state. Indigenous peoples, have as a result, sought autonomy and self-determination to achieve development aspirations relevant to their cultures and ways of life. It is clear that when indigenous people are empowered to navigate their own development then success is more likely to be achieved. However, indigenous nations and communities are to some extent reliant upon settler society and nation-state to provide supporting policy, resources and, in particular, human assets, which offer technical and specialist input when charting a development course. Consequently it is concluded in this chapter that indigenous self-navigation will need to be driven cross-culturally, by both the nation-state and indigenous nations.

It is also concluded that the colonial dominant/subordinate social psychology that plays out both within, and between, the settler and indigenous cultures inhibits and constrains the intercultural planning and strategic thinking required to navigate development. Therefore it is concluded that intercultural frameworks for planning and strategy are required that transcend this social psychology. However, it is shown that there has been little theoretical work done looking at frameworks for planning development from an intercultural perspective other than in the field of Participatory Development.
A critical review and deconstruction, nonetheless, reveals that the success of Participatory Development has been limited and, furthermore, that colonial narratives and practices can be found embedded within this development approach. A reconstruction is therefore undertaken to generate an alternative intercultural framework for navigating indigenous development that transcends the dominant/subordinate social psychology. It is concluded that an alternative approach should be built on four main features:

- Māori wisdom traditions – to build rangatira through a spiritual process of acquiring humility;
- Rangatira – to organise and discipline social groups into coherent and goal-focussed collective action, create environments for open critical learning, and establish ethical boundaries to regulate behaviour;
- Wānanga – to create environments for collaborative and critical learning based on storytelling, mentoring and experiential learning; and
- Pōtiki – to challenge social convention boundaries and explore new opportunities.

This alternative framework provides further insight into and understanding of Te Tai Hono, or the navigation domain, as explored in Chapter Five. In addition, the framework also generates further understanding into Te Tai Atua, or the spiritual domain, by identifying the role of humility in removing the barrier of self-centredness to accessing the Gods, through which the nature of giving and sharing is expressed. Below, these new insights are incorporated into theme six and seven from Table Twelve in Chapter Five to complete the ‘synthesis’ table in Table Fourteen below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meta Theories of Development</th>
<th>Māori Development Models</th>
<th>Key Platforms for Development Fourth World</th>
<th>Postcolonialism, Postdevelopment and Liberation Psychology</th>
<th>Māori Wisdom Traditions Māori Pedagogy Māori Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human Ends, Capabilities, SLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME ONE: Human Ends/Tikanga – Identifying and articulating human ends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development involves satisfying key human-ends</td>
<td>Tikanga/Cardinal Ethics – Development involves satisfying key Māori values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME TWO: – Disrupting Colonialism – Combating colonial power structures that deny satisfaction of human ends</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied human-ends leads to different pathologies (e.g. dissatisfied needs for self-determination and identity lead to loss of self-mastery and clear aspirations)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The human-ends of indigenous self-determination and identity denied by colonial powers structures. Combating colonial power structures by breaking down colonial stereotyping within indigenous communities and development policy applied by ‘Third’ and Fourth World nation-states.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>THEME THREE: Entitlements – Expanding entitlements to resources to meet human ends through political action</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entitlements to the resources and assets required to satisfy</td>
<td>Working politically to expand entitlements in the resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
human-ends through mediating societal legal and social rules and norms
domain and global domain

| THEME FOUR: Te Tai Tini – Assembling the resource endowments required to fulfil indigenous development aspirations |
|---|---|---|
| Quantity of endowments in different categories determine level of resilience: | Te Tai Tini – Quantity and quality of endowments determine health of a whānau/hapū/iwi and their resilience | The need for appropriate human assets in technical and inter-cultural areas. |
| • Natural resources/assets | • Human resources/assets | |
| • Financial resources/assets | • Physical resources/assets | |

| THEME FIVE: Indigenous Institutions – Putting in place the institutions for indigenous development |
|---|---|---|
| Within the Māori Land Development literature the important role of culturally matched governance and management structures are outlined. | Institutional platforms are required to assist indigenous development. In particular institutions for self-determination and identity are required in the form of culturally matched self-government and bureaucracies. | |

| THEME SIX: Te Tai Atua – Spirituality as life unfolding defines human responsibilities and ethics |
|---|---|---|
| Te Tai Atua – Creative process of life unfolding into the social | | Humility – Through humility the barrier of the self is removed to |
domain and resource domain is spiritual, which defines human responsibilities and ethics toward and between both humans and non-humans.

provide a direct relationship with the Gods. Rangatiratanga is the sharing of the Gods expressed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME SEVEN: Te Tai Hono – Leadership to forge new futures, generate social cohesion and open space for critical learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Hono/Navigational Domain</strong> – This refers to the need for leadership to identify opportunities, imagine, negotiate, plan, and forge new futures in a way that maintains the relationships and bonds that hold together Māori kinship groups and their wider networks of influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within the Māori Land Development literature the importance of strong leadership and strategic direction is outlined</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Navigation based on four platforms:  
  - Māori wisdom traditions  
  - Rangatira – to organise and discipline social groups into coherent and goal-focussed collective action  
  - Wānanga – to create inter-cultural platforms for collaborative and critical learning based on story-telling, mentoring and experiential learning.  
  - Pōtiki – to challenge social convention boundaries and explore new opportunities. |
CHAPTER SIX: Methodology

Introduction

In many regards the previous chapter already offers a methodological approach for undertaking the field research underpinning this thesis. In particular, the chapter highlighted the functions of participation, experience, mentoring, action, leadership, wānanga and narrative, as mechanisms for building rich, broad, and coherent understandings of particular contexts, or problems. This chapter continues this theme by arguing for a participatory action learning approach that embodies these functions as a means of building a rich comprehension of the subject area under investigation. However, this chapter also critically explores other methodologies that could either offer robust alternatives, or conversely strengthen the methodology adopted.

The chapter begins by providing a brief summary regarding the focus of this research outlining that its main function is to identify the key factors constraining Māori land development among Aspiring Owners. It is then outlined how the literature review in Chapters Two through Five has provided multiple insights into what the constraints on development might be. Consequently the research aims to test the validity of these hypotheses through action learning and praxis.
The Kaupapa Māori research approach is then reviewed which provides ethical guidelines, and considerations to researchers working in the Māori research field. Through this review it is concluded that the research should be contextualised, be owned by communities and produce positive outcomes. The research should also contribute toward a broader Māori political drive toward self-determination. However, it is argued that although Kaupapa Māori provides ethical guidelines it does not provide a prescribed process for engaging in the research based on praxis, action learning, and full participation/immersion in Māori community contexts.

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is then explored as a potential methodology for providing a prescribed process. PAR claims to transcend the power inherent within the relationship between the knowledge producer (researcher) and knowledge object, by treating human subjects not as objects but as co-researchers. In this manner it provides a mechanism for the research to be owned and contextualised by Māori. Furthermore, it is a research approach which places an emphasis on action to solve problematic issues. It is therefore squarely focused on generating practical and positive changes within a community of interest. PAR is rejected because like Freirean approaches to development, it is dependent upon the researcher.facilitator socialising co-researchers into intellectual rationality.

It is instead proposed that endogenous, or culturally internal methodologies of action inquiry, such as wānanga are likely to already exist within communities of Māori landowners, and as such can be used to undertake action learning. It is concluded that ethnographic narrative and propositional knowing will be the two primary means of communicating research results.

**Theoretical responses to the research questions**

In Chapter Three it was outlined that there has been very little research exploring why so many Aspiring Owners of Māori land are unable to build the development institutions and platforms they require for land development. It was mentioned that there were likely to be a combination of factors constraining development, and that in-depth research was necessary to identify these factors. In Chapters Two, Three Four and Five a number of theoretical perspectives were explored that identified possible factors constraining development in indigenous contexts, and offered possible solutions to overcome these constraints. These
theoretical perspectives were then synthesised and grouped under seven different themes in Figure 2.

Also developed in Chapter Three were research questions designed to guide the research process. The first question was designed to identify the development goals of Aspiring Owners as a means of establishing their intentionality. The second question was designed to focus attention on the constraints on Aspiring Owners fulfilling their intentions or development goals, while the third question sought to guide the research into exploring solutions to the problems identified – so as to avoid deficit thinking. However, answering these questions is not straightforward. As a result of the literature review multiple theoretical positions from different disciplines and fields have emerged to provide speculative answers to each research question.

When viewed through the first theoretical perspective from human-ends theory, our viewpoint is guided toward answering the research questions by looking at the values, or human-ends of Aspiring Owners, and whether there are constraints to these values being satisfied. The second theme, combating colonial oppression through exposing colonial narratives, orientates thinking toward the narratives internal and external to communities of Aspiring Owners that constrain their development. In particular, it focuses attention on internalised narratives that inhibit coherent action being taken toward goals, and external narratives that justify paternal relationships between the nation-state and Māori communities. Furthermore it identifies methods and techniques from different disciplines used to combat colonial narratives.

The third theme, expanding entitlements to resources to meet human-ends through political action, focuses attention on the political endeavours required by Aspiring Owners to overcome the constraints on development presented by resource deficits. Further, it centres awareness on the mechanisms required to overcome this constraint by supporting political action that encourages the nation-state and its agencies to increase the endowments or resources available to Aspiring Owners to meet their development goals. This relates closely to the fourth theme, which concerns assembling all of the endowments, or resources, required by Aspiring Owners to meet development goals or aspirations. This theme of course links to the theme two, given that resources are only likely to be accessed from the nation-state, which is not liable to listen to the needs of Aspiring Owners given colonial narratives that encourage paternalism.
When interpreted using theme five, the research questions can be viewed from a further angle. Theme five pinpoints the structures that enable indigenous peoples to identify their development goals, and articulates the platforms that enable goals to be met. In particular, it suggests that Aspiring Owners should establish culturally matched and accountable governing structures that enable the development goals of communal landowners to be determined, while expert-staffed culturally matched bureaucracies, or management, should be used to implement strategies to meet goals. Theme six introduces a Māori theological position, which argues that spirituality guides ethical human action. However, for guidance to occur humility is required to open space for the presence of the Gods among people which, when present, encourage openness, giving, sharing, collective action, and critical learning. This theme provides an additional perspective on the research questions by outlining the need for spirituality among Aspiring Owners to guide the formation of development goals, generate social cohesion and encourage critical learning to enable adequate planning.

Te Tai Hono, the final theme, approaches the research questions by providing a process for identifying development goals, and strategies for overcoming constraints. It is outlined that rangatira or leaders are needed to organise and discipline social groups into coherent and goal-focussed collective action. Further, the role of wānanga for collective critical learning is required in order to provide a basis for informed action and intercultural strategic planning between indigenous and nation-state institutions. Finally, the role of the Pōtiki is acknowledged to find unconventional development paths for meeting the development aspirations of Aspiring Owners.

The theoretical positions identified in the literature review provide different yet interrelated speculative responses to the research questions. Further, it is likely that when all are used simultaneously to interpret phenomena in the field, a rich and holistic perspective on the research subject will be generated. The goal of this thesis is therefore to test the validity of these different theoretical responses to the research questions. Table Fifteen (below) outlines each theoretical response to each research question.
However, at the same time I am interested in not becoming too rigid in my approach by only confining my interpretation of phenomena in the field to whether or not it validates the theoretical responses or hypotheses outlined above. I argued strongly within Chapter Five, that a real understanding of context can only come through experience, and it is through experience that true validation of theoretical knowledge occurs. As will be outlined, my primary emphasis is on experiential knowledge, and in particular engaging in an action learning process with Aspiring Owners to identify their development goals, identify constraints to reaching their goals, and taking action to overcome constraints.

The grounded experiential knowledge that is developed will then be critically juxtaposed with the theoretical responses outlined above. This process is illustrated in Figure Seven, below.
Through this praxis it is argued that cross-fertilisation between theory and practice will occur, that will contribute to a robust understanding of why Aspiring Owners of Māori land are unable to meet their development goals. Further, I consider that I may be able to avoid the common pitfall of framing ‘the ‘indigenous problem’’ and ‘apply solutions to it’ in a top-down and paternalistic manner (Banerjee and Linstead 2004, p. 221). Instead, I will have theory that is strongly grounded in practice and the day-to-day reality of Aspiring Owners.

**Kaupapa Māori**

Researching in indigenous contexts is potentially a fraught activity given colonial history. Using methodology developed for context is important. In the New Zealand context, Smith (1999) outlines the manner in which Māori have been categorised, classified and described through the ‘observation languages’ of the sciences. These languages have been infused with preconceptions and ideology from particular scientific and cultural traditions that have not, until recently, been critically evaluated from a Māori perspective. Historical analysis clearly demonstrates that Māori research has been covertly embedded within colonial stereotypes that have been fashionable within certain historical periods (Webster 1998; Smith 1999).

Smith (1999, p. 83) relies principally on Foucault to demonstrate the manner in which Western knowledge frameworks (or *episteme* in Foucault’s terms) delimit and define the scope of research (Howard-Bobiwash 2005). This is because the researcher coming out from a certain metaphysical or theoretical standpoint is inhibited from experiencing phenomena beyond, or outside, that standpoint (this will be discussed later in the present chapter when exploring the notion of *bounded rationality*). Consequently, Western knowledge places boundaries, or rules, on research by delimiting and confining what can be discovered to that which reflects existing knowledge frameworks.
Figure Seven: The Research Process: Engagement between development theory and indigenous development practice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theoretical responses to research questions critically developed in Chapters One to Five</th>
<th>The site of engagement between theory and practice</th>
<th>Answers provided through the field research experience of action learning with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Research Question One: What are the development goals of Aspiring Owners**

1. A range of strategic actions designed to fulfil Māori values, or human-ends

   ![](Juxtaposing development approaches)

   Provide answer to research question through participation and action learning with Aspiring Owners

**Research Question Two: What are the constraints to Aspiring Owners in fulfilling their development goals?**

1. Shortages in entitlements and therefore shortages in the quality and quantity of endowments available to Aspiring Owners

   ![](Juxtaposing development approaches)

   Provide answer to research question through participation and action learning with Aspiring Owners

2. The absence of adequate navigation frameworks within communities of Aspiring Owners that provide a platform for direction, critical planning and organisation

3. The absence of culturally matched governing and management institutions

4. The lack of intercultural planning and strategic thinking between indigenous and nation-state institutions required to support development

5. The existence of internalised colonial narratives within the communities of Aspiring Owners, which preclude coherent action being taken toward reaching development goals

**Research Question Three: What are the mechanisms for overcoming constraints?**

1. Expanding entitlements to endowments

   ![](Juxtaposing development approaches)

   Provide answer to research question through participation and action learning with Aspiring Owners

2. Building appropriate navigation frameworks within communities of Aspiring Owners that provide a platform for direction, critical planning, and organisation

3. Building culturally matched governing and management institutions

4. Building intercultural frameworks for planning and strategy between the nation-state and indigenous institutions

5. Overcoming internalised colonial narratives through critical learning
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These boundaries or rules inhibit Māori researchers who are inside the *academe* because, in order to gain legitimacy within the establishment, they are required to work within the existing theoretical traditions of particular science disciplines (Smith, 1999). In light of this, Māori researchers and academics became aware of the need to retake ownership of the manner in which their own culture and knowledge is interpreted through these scientific traditions. Out of this realisation Kaupapa Māori Theory was developed to centre research theory and practice within Māori knowledge, language and culture, rather than within the academe (Howard-Bobiwash 2005). Ka’aï (2004; in Eketone 2006) defines Kaupapa Māori as follows:

‘A philosophical doctrine incorporating the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values of Māori society, that have emanated from a Māori metaphysical base.’

However, Kaupapa Māori Theory is not intended to separate Māori scholars from the Western academe into a vacuum (Smith 1999). Its intention is to structure the assumptions, values and concepts underpinning Māori language and culture, with and for Māori communities (Smith 1999, p.183). Then the goal is to use this knowledge to engage critically with Western academia in a process of challenging and improving scientific theory and practice (Smith 1999).

Consequently, Kaupapa Māori theory attempts to provide a mechanism for critical analysis of Western science and practice that is driven by Māori understandings (Pihama, Cram et al. 2002). In addition, it is seen as a broader political tool for self-determination through promoting ‘the conscientisation of Māori through a process of critiquing and challenging Pākehā (European New Zealander) definitions and constructions of Māori people, and asserting explicitly the validation and legitimisation of te reo Māori (Māori language) and tikanga (Māori culture)’ (Pihama, Cram et al. 2002, p.35).

Also emerging from Kaupapa Māori scholarship are guiding research protocols to protect Māori communities from the power imbalance between researcher and researched (Banerjee and Linstead 2004). The idea of these protocols is to mediate the ‘*relationships of power that underlie the complex relationships between presenter and represented, the knowledge producer (researcher) and knowledge object, the cataloguer and the catalogued*’ (Banerjee
and Linsehle 2004, p. 281). Linda Tuhuiwai Smith’s (1999, p. 184-191) work Decolonising Methodologies provides a number of guidelines for undertaking research in Māori contexts, which include: The need for critical self-reflection of taken-for-granted assumptions when in a Māori cultural setting; operating according to an ethic of respect, humbleness, dignity and awareness; placing an emphasis on generating research outcomes; follow a process in which research participants own the research; design the research to produce direct benefits and positive transformations; localise the research into the specific social, historical, geographical and political contexts of research participants; and act under the guidance of Māori mentors.

Reactionary Traditionalism within Kaupapa Māori?

Linda Smith (1999: p. 186), in the guidelines outlined above, makes explicit the need for non-Māori researchers with little research experience in Māori communities to be guided in their research practice by Māori mentors. This is important to assist in avoiding cross-cultural misinterpretations (Smith, 1999: p. 186). Furthermore, Smith (1999) outlines the importance of researchers continually reflecting upon, and testing the factual basis of, their own taken-for-granted assumptions.

Some radical approaches to Kaupapa Māori research suggest that only Māori may undertake Māori research (Irwin 1994; Smith 1995). However, this approach can be criticised on multiple grounds. First, as outlined in Chapters Four and Five colonial mimeticism can occur within indigenous communities, which suggests that some Māori may hold a colonist’s view of their own communities, and express power in a very similar way. Consequently, just because an individual is of a particular cultural background does not mean that they will not exercise power over another person from the same cultural background within a research relationship. In other words, the same power relations between the knowledge producer (researcher) and knowledge object (research participant) may still exist.

Second, as outlined in Chapter Two, through mentorship, experience and immersion in the narratives and practices of another culture, misinterpretations can be greatly reduced (hence Smith’s (1999) encouragement of Māori mentorship for non-Māori researchers). Third, individuals from other cultures can see phenomena that someone from within a culture might not be able to see (because they are immersed in their culture like a fish in water). Although there is a risk that cross-cultural research can be prejudicial, it can also be very helpful because differences are made apparent.
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I consider that the fundamentalist approach to Kaupapa Māori (that only Māori can conduct Māori research) expressed by some Māori theorists is likely to be a form of *reactionary traditionalism*. This is characterised by the reversal of the developmentalist narrative, which elevates indigenous peoples into a position of moral purity and superiority over the settler. From this point of view the settler cannot research with, or for Māori, because they are morally inferior, or liable to harm the indigenous community. This position is further rationalised by the use of postmodern cognitive relativism utilised by Kaupapa Māori theorists. Cognitive relativism is used to demonstrate that cultures are bound by language rules into isolated pockets. From this perspective rationalities are relative to context, and therefore true only to that context. This results in a situation where any rationality is always true in its own right, and therefore cannot be subject to critical evaluation from the perspective of any other rationality. If this logic were followed to a conclusion then Kaupapa Māori would not be able to be critiqued by any tradition other than itself.

However, it has been outlined in detail, within Chapter Four, that cognitive relativism can also put Māori into a position where their rationality is always in a position of equality to others. I demonstrate that this is in fact crucial for Māori to combat the colonial narrative of developmentalism which positions Māori culture into either an inferior or superior category. Furthermore it is also argued that it is always necessary to come in from a position of equality to have critical research engagement in Fourth World contexts, given that if an inferior or superior position is adopted then two-way learning is precluded. I consider that it is a paradox that through continually starting from the assumption of equality, which presumes that one form of rationality will be as valuable as another, that mutual learning and engagement between cultures becomes possible.

The challenge for Kaupapa Māori theory is that the continued existence of Māori language, culture, and tradition is under threat – given the imperial and colonial impulse to eradicate difference. There is consequently a need to protect and maintain Māori knowledge and tradition through inhibiting the re-writing of this knowledge into categories determined by the settler. However, it appears that the challenge is to protect Māori knowledge and tradition, without following a *reactionary traditional* impulse to exclude all outside influence.
Applying theory in Māori contexts

It is worth emphasising that Kaupapa Māori is already engaged in cross-cultural approaches to research given that it is a field constructed on Western conceptual tools, which are being used to structure indigenous knowledge, and challenge forms of Western knowledge that stereotype and oppress. This may lead it, like postdevelopment and postcolonialism, to be accused of a double standard – seeking to free indigenous knowledge from outside Western influences, by adopting Western knowledge. The adoption of Western tools, as a means to think about Māori knowledge and tradition, amounts to acculturation.

Nonetheless, from the Kaupapa Māori perspective, Western knowledge in the form of critical theory and postmodern thought is not used because it is ‘believed in’, or fundamentally adhered to, but because it is considered useful for dismantling oppression. This is referred to as ‘using the master’s tools’ to ‘dismantle the master’s house’, or ‘disentangling the web’, without getting ‘ensnared by it’ (Howard-Bobiwash 2005). The concepts are viewed simply as intellectual tools (Pihama, Cram et al. 2002) in one part of a broad Māori-controlled strategy for self-determination.

16 Kaupapa Māori approaches rely upon critical theory (Eketone, 2006), and postmodern theorists (Smith, 1999) to structure Māori knowledge and critically examine science.

17 Based on Smith’s Foucauldian postmodern deconstruction of science in New Zealand.

18 There are some real questions as to whether conceptual tools adopted by Kaupapa Māori Research from postmodernism, and critical theory can be used for ‘disentangling the web’ without ‘getting ensnared by it.’ These traditions seek to objectify knowledge by using archaeological tools to uncover the factual assumptions underpinning social constructs, and subjecting them to critical examination to identify the presence of preconceptions that rationalise oppression. Kaupapa Māori Research has taken on this tradition, first in its critical examination of science in the New Zealand context, but also in its attempt to structure Māori knowledge (Smith, 1999).

The process of looking at traditional knowledge from the third person in order to structure it, essentially involves extracting oneself from tradition. Goncalves (2006, p.1155) quotes the medieval Muslim thinker al-Ghazali to describe the condition where one becomes extracted from their tradition, ‘there is no hope in returning to a traditional faith after it has once been abandoned, since the essential condition in the holder of a traditional faith is that he should not know he is traditionalist.’ Or in other words once you objectify your tradition you no longer hold the tradition. This perspective is reaffirmed by the Māori academic Charles Royal (1998; in Pihama, Cram et al. 2002: p.38) who quotes a young Māori reflecting on what matauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) is to his father; ‘To ask my father what matauranga Māori (Māori knowledge) is, would be like to asking a fish what water is.’
The concern that arises from this viewpoint is that Western knowledge could become cynically used by intellectuals simply as tools, without any corresponding critical scrutiny regarding the impulses underpinning their motives and drives for using the tools in the first place. This is because the motives for using the Western tools, is driven from an indigenous perspective, which cannot be questioned because it is indigenous. This issue is not specifically dealt with within the Kaupapa Māori literature.

However, it is apparent that Smith’s (1999) Kaupapa Māori approach is open to incorporating new ideas and knowledge that can provide a critical function, as long as they are not imposed, and are brought to complement and build indigenist projects. Howard-Bobiwash (2005) explains this in the following manner; it is not just about ‘using the Masters tools’ to ‘dismantle the master’s house’, but also ‘identifying loose bricks in the foundation’ which can be ‘used to build indigenist projects.’ In other words many ideas, technologies, and resources used in the construction of oppressive structures can also be used to build alternatives that are not oppressive. However, the tools used to undertake this reconstruction are the tools deemed appropriate by Māori.

In this way the Kaupapa Māori approach centrally pivots off a Māori cultural standpoint, which is used to select what knowledge, or theory, is suitable for achieving Māori aspirations.

The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that once one has adopted the epistemological approaches of critical theory and postmodernism, and one begins to look at tradition objectively and structure it in the third person, one has lost the tradition. Instead one is in a new tradition – the western subject disembodied from the life-world.

Consequently it might be suggested that one cannot untangle the web without being snared. The question is whether becoming disembodied is part of the cost of ‘dismantling the master’s house’ given the need to dismantle the master’s house using the master’s tools? However, it was described in Chapter Five to demonstrate that becoming disembodied through adopting Western intellectual rationality is not necessary for the development of a critical consciousness. Instead a critical consciousness can be developed through a process of story-telling, figurative thought, identifying with the other, and mentorship. Nevertheless to challenge structures of oppression objectifying one’s knowledge, to legitimise it and challenge the knowledge of the oppressor, may indeed be necessary. This is a topic for future debate within the Kaupapa Māori field.

19 This shows a slight change in Smith’s work given that in 1995 she asserted that Kaupapa Māori could only involve ‘research by Māori, for Māori and with Māori.’
This may include bringing in ‘outside’ knowledge that is critical of Māori ways of being and doing. However, from the Kaupapa Māori perspective it is up to Māori to perform this function and critique themselves. Consequently, Kaupapa Māori is motivated by the entitlement or right for Māori to choose what knowledge is appropriate or inappropriate.

However, the question among Māori, who decides what outside knowledge is appropriate or inappropriate, to interpret Māori ways of doing and being? Or in other words, what is the Māori cultural standpoint used to decide what theoretical perspectives are appropriate or inappropriate? According to Smith’s (1999) guiding principles for research in Māori communities, outlined previously, it is up to local Māori to determine this for themselves, according to their own specific social, historical, geographical and political context. Given that Māori are a diverse society with diverse communities, it might be concluded that judgements about the appropriateness, or otherwise, of knowledge will differ based upon the reasoning used by different communities within different contexts.

This suggests that Kaupapa Māori cannot provide a specific cultural standpoint that can be used to review the appropriateness of any particular theory. Instead the appropriateness or compatibility of a particular theoretical standpoint will be contested by communities, in partnership with researchers, within any given Māori context. In this manner Kaupapa Māori is always acknowledging the self-determination and rights of whānau (family), hapū (subtribe) and iwi (tribe) in their respective tribal rohe (areas), and their right to determine what is useful and appropriate for themselves.

Adhering to the principles of Kaupapa Māori research

There are a number of challenges presented by Kaupapa Māori research for a person in my position. I am of Māori descent, and a Māori land owner, yet during my life have only had limited contact and engagement with this part of my heritage. This limited involvement has included, for example, family reunions at the marae, or more recently visits with whānau active in the iwi rūnanga and in the management of our land. Essentially I have been raised in urban areas and largely disconnected from Māoritanga and the rural places where my tribe is located.

Nonetheless I am able to feel relatively at ease and comfortable in what might be termed the ‘Māori world,’ and generally ‘get’ social context I am within. However, given that I am of
Pākehā appearance I can initially be treated with some distrust and distance in Māori contexts until I am known and trusted. I also feel relatively comfortable in what might be termed the Pākehā, which suggests I live, to some extent, a hybridised existence. I consider that the simple Pākehā-Māori bifurcations that currently underpin much theorising of Fourth World contexts fails to capture the subtlety of syncretic existences.

I believe that this hybridised existence provides me with a background to navigate research with Māori, as an insider as well as an outsider. This claim needs to be qualified with awareness that my knowledge is far from robust or complete and as such critical mentoring and support from within the communities where my research will be based, and from supervisors at the University, will be key to avoiding problems that emerge from cross-cultural misinterpretation. In this way I aim to follow the principles of Kaupapa Māori for non-Māori researchers by having in place appropriate mentoring and support, given the potential for cross-cultural misinterpretation.

Research in a Māori context is a complex landscape. This is because, as outlined in Chapter Two, Māori society is diverse and made of many identities. Māori identity can be centred at one or more social scales including whānau, hapū, iwi, urban, and nation. As a consequence insider/outsider relationships can greatly vary given that a shared identity at one social scale does not guarantee that one is an insider at another social scale. Just because a person is Māori it does not mean, for example, that they will be an insider within a hapū or iwi that is not their own. In the same manner, just because one is from the same iwi, it does not mean that one will be considered an insider within another hapū. I consider that the differences between whānau, hapū and iwi need to be acknowledged, and that appropriate mentoring and support for the research may be required from within each community to avoid misinterpretation.

The Kaupapa Māori protocols for research provided by Smith (1999) also call for Māori research to be contextualised, owned by the communities researched, and to generate tangible benefits for the people concerned. The research should also contribute toward a broad Māori political drive toward self-determination. These general principles appear as reasonable and simply ethical research practice as they attempt to build a relationship between the Researcher and Researched based on mutual respect and equality.
This research will attempt to fulfil each of the above principles of Kaupapa Māori research. First, as outlined above, the research will be contextualised through praxis and by taking an action-learning approach. Second, the research will also focus on accurately articulating the development goals of Aspiring Owners. Once articulated, these self-determined goals will be used as reference points for ensuring that the research works to identify constraints to achieving these goals, rather than any externally imposed goals. Third, I aim to actively contribute to, and support Aspiring Owners in reaching their development goals by providing my own specialist skills in the fields of development, agriculture and forestry when requested. In this way the research may contribute to improvements in the lives of actual communities involved in the research, identify solutions to problems that might be shared with Aspiring Owners not involved in the research, or used to develop policy that better supports Māori land development generally.

**Developing the right methodology – is Participatory Action Research appropriate?**

The principles of Kaupapa Māori research only provide fairly loose ethical guidelines on how research in Māori contexts should be conducted. However, there is a methodology that offers a prescribed process for engaging in the style of development research that I am proposing to undertake – an approach based on praxis, action learning, and full participation/immersion in the goal-orientated activities of Aspiring Owners. This methodology is referred to as Participatory Action Research (PAR). I consider there are a number of shortcomings with the prescribed processes used in PAR, and as a result I have chosen not to use PAR. Nevertheless, it is still necessary to demonstrate why this methodology has not been adopted, given that practitioners and theorists in the development field will question why PAR has been abandoned.

Participatory Action Research (PAR) is defined as follows by Reason and Bradbury (2001, p. 1; in Williams and Cervin 2004, p. 2):

‘[Participatory Action Research] seeks to bring together action, reflection, theory and practice in participation with others in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities’
This description of PAR seems well suited to my desire, and the requirement of Kaupapa Māori, for research to be contextualised by placing the researcher and research participant into a collaborative working partnership to co-generate answers to the research questions. Further, PAR aims to generate direct benefits by identifying problems and taking action to address them in a community.

PAR also provides a structured process, involving action, reflection, theory and practice, for the researcher to undertake the research in collaboration with communities. The structured process offered by PAR for identifying problems and finding practical solutions to those problems is described in detail by Kemmis and McTaggart (2000; in Williams and Cervin 2004, p. 2) as follows:

“PAR is underpinned by a cyclic process of inquiry through which participants move through successive phases of action and reflection, with each phase informing the next. This method involves extensive collaboration among all participants (including those who may be traditionally defined as the “researcher” and “the researched”) from research planning to the dissemination of results, and the reciprocal education process between all those concerned.’

The nature of PAR is therefore episodic because it involves successive phases of action and reflection (Dash 1999, p. 475). In the reflection phase PAR is characterised by focus-group discussion, where problematic issues are identified, and the actions required address problems determined. The action phase involves, not surprisingly, taking the actions anticipated to address problems identified in the reflective phase.

Applying PAR in a Māori land-development context would involve the development of Aspiring Owner focus groups, each representing the interests of landowners in an area or block of land. The purpose of the focus-group, as outlined above, would be to identify problems, or barriers to achieving development goals, and determine actions to overcome problems identified. This reflection phase would be followed by an action phase, where the actions identified to address problems are implemented. This is again followed by a reflection phase, in which it is determined whether the actions have achieved the desired outcome. In this way PAR is a ‘project-based’ approach to development, in that it brings together a group with a particular concern, and focuses the group on addressing the concern (Dash 1999, p.
It is the role of the researcher/facilitator to guide the episodic process of action and reflection (Dash 1999).

The descriptions of PAR outlined above make it appear a fairly straight-forward methodology. However, it is complex because the process of collaborative learning and inquiry is fraught with challenges, particularly in regard to arriving at a consensus understanding within a group regarding the actions required to address problems, and even deciding what the problems are in the first place. This is because dominant social constructs are likely to subsume, or subordinate, minority social constructs within a focus-group situation.

When particular social constructs dominate social groups Gambetta (1999; in Jollands and Harmsworth 2006) suggests that they can lead to an ‘uneven distribution of information’, given that some social constructs are overrepresented or expressed. This in turn can lead to less well-informed actions, undermining one of the most important goals of participation – taking into account as many social constructs as possible, ‘so as to pool limited capabilities and so increase the odds of making a good decision’ (Fearon 1999, p. 49; in Jollands and Harmsworth 2006). Also undermined, in circumstances where particular social constructs dominate, is the likelihood of achieving ‘just outcomes’, in that particular individuals, or groups, will carry a sense of injustice at not being heard, or involved in decision-making. In this situation the legitimacy of decisions made is reduced (Jollands and Harmsworth 2006).

**Bounded rationality**

The constraint on achieving full, free and equal participation within the PAR focus group, according to Ulrich (1994), is due to the challenge presented by *bounded rationality*. To explain the concept of *bounded rationality* it is first necessary to introduce Kant’s *systems idea* (Ulrich 1994). The *systems idea* is based on the notion that in every definition of something human beings must make selections between phenomena considered relevant and phenomena that are considered irrelevant. For example, when determining the boundaries of this thesis it was necessary for me to make decisions regarding what theory would be included, or excluded, and what data would be included or excluded.

It requires a judgment to exclude phenomena that allows the entity to be defined and take on an independent existence. The decision to exclude certain phenomena from consideration
when defining an entity is based upon certain metaphysical, ethical, political and ideological judgments (Ulrich 1983, p.21). When drawing the boundaries for this thesis I attempted to include information that appeared to be most pertinent and relevant to the problems and challenges facing Māori landowners. This was based on the Kaupapa Māori values outlined previously – the desire to ensure that the research is contextualised, owned by Māori, and is useful in generating tangible solutions to pervasive problems.

The totality of phenomena, from which subjective value judgments permit the identification of concrete entities, is referred to as the systems idea (Ulrich 1983). The systems idea suggests that the totality is, in effect, infinite. Consequently, it is impossible to know the whole system. In response to this unavoidable incomprehensiveness a selection between phenomena considered relevant, and phenomena that are considered irrelevant, must take place (Ulrich 1983, p.21). The border between phenomena an individual, or social group, takes into consideration or excludes from consideration, when defining a particular problem, or planning particular actions, is referred to by Ulrich (1994) as the boundary judgement.

To provide an example of how the boundary judgement appears within a PAR group learning situation the following brief example is provided. A participatory development project might be initiated with Aspiring Owners with significant forestry resources. During a participatory planning focus group designed to formulate an action strategy, two interest groups emerge. One is looking for quick cash income through a clear-fell forestry partnership with a company. However, an alternative interest group is looking at the options for eco-tourism and selective harvest with value-added cottage industry. The first group is interested in a quick pay back to address subsistence poverty, and establish local industry with the financial capital. The second group has placed its emphasis on resource conservation, and looks toward less cash income in the short-term. Each group has different boundary judgements, which are based upon different values. The first group values reducing subsistence poverty more so than the second group. However, the second group values conservation of forest resources more so than the first group. It can be concluded from this example that different value-judgements give rise to different interpretations of what is an optimal course of action within a given circumstance.

Therefore the values that different individuals and groups possess place boundaries on their interpretations of phenomena, which creates different viewpoints or perspectives on the same
issue. This is why the process of collaborative learning and inquiry is fraught with challenges, particularly in regard to arriving at a consensus understanding within a group.

**Eliciting personal constructs**

To address the challenge of bounded rationality Ulrich (1993) considers that the value-judgements of different actors within focus-groups, which give rise to different rationalities, need to be made explicit. Ulrich provides a number of boundary questions, which can be used in focus groups to make value-judgements explicit. Once these have been made overt, argument or debate can be used to defend particular value-judgements. Ulrich refers to this as the *polemical employment of boundary judgements.*

Critical approaches to PAR provide techniques for eliciting personal constructs and identifying the source of differences between actors within a focus-group, brought about by *bounded rationality.* In addition they aim to move the group toward some sort of convergence of understanding between participants through negotiating meanings and arriving at consensus plans for action. These include (among others) Ulrich’s (1994) critical heuristics (outlined above), Flood and Romm’s (1996) critical systems, and Ison’s (2000) 2nd order systems approach to agricultural extension and rural development. Together these PAR approaches all attempt to establish a convergence of understanding through collaborative learning and inquiry that moves groups of people ‘from existing assumptions, values and mental models, through to new knowledge assumptions and guiding values’ (Allen 2001, p. 13).

Through making the boundary judgements of different social constructs explicit within a focus-group, the values that underpin the rationalities of different groups and individuals are also made overt. In this manner, majority and minority rationalities have their grounding assumptions equally exposed and placed side-by-side, to provide an ‘even distribution of information’. This counters the over-expression and overrepresentation of particular rationalities, and provides a mechanism to subject each social construct to critical examination, regardless of whether the social construct is that of a powerful social entity, or a less powerful one. The goal of PAR is to create a ‘level playing field’ upon which social hierarchies do not constrain participation (Dash 1999, p. 476).
In this way PAR (like Participatory Development) adopts an emancipatory approach, and attempts to liberate participants through a cooperative inquiry that increases consciousness of self-deception, coercion and the dictates of tradition, through the objectification of knowledge constructs (Zuber-Skerrit 1992, p. 12). In addition, deep PAR approaches demand that the researcher engage in their own hermeneutic reflection to elicit and articulate their own personal constructs (Smith 1997). This is to ensure self-awareness of their power role as facilitator within the PAR process. Furthermore, in the ideal situation, the communication and sharing of narratives between PA researchers or facilitators enables mutual learning to occur.

**Structuring issues in PAR**

However, the controlled process of eliciting personal constructs within a focus-group discussion does not address some broader structural issues that need to be taken into account when establishing a PAR project. Ulrich (1994) provides a number of questions which draw attention to factors that need to be taken into account prior to beginning a PAR project, in order to assist in facilitating full, free and equal participation. These factors are summarised below as:

- Who is the source of motivation for the PAR project in the first place, and is this in the interests of all those likely to be effected by the project?
- Are all those likely to be affected by decisions either invited, or able to attend focus-groups?
- What is the role of technical expertise, which can be used as an authority to expound or convincingly argue for a particular viewpoint?
- Who is present to represent children and future generations and others who cannot speak for themselves?

In asking these questions Ulrich is drawing attention to the need to ensure that a PAR project is initiated and owned by all those whom it is likely to effect. This means representative stakeholders of all interests need to be present within focus-group discussions, when both determining what problems are, and what actions are required to address problems. Furthermore, thought needs to be directed toward who has access to expertise, and what role that expertise will play in decision-making.
Criticisms of PAR

Like the Freirean approaches to Participatory Development, PAR is heavily influenced by the social constructivist and critical theory traditions (Williams and Cervin 2004). In this manner the criticisms that have been directed at Freirean conscientisation apply similarly to PAR.

Just like Freire’s process of conscientisation, critical PAR approaches attempt to objectify participant’s knowledge through eliciting personal constructs. This involves making explicit the value-based assumptions that underpin different rationalities. In effect, this involves a socialisation of participants into an intellectual rationality, through disembodying the subject from the knowledge they use to orientate and interpret phenomena in the world. In Chapter Five it was demonstrated that socialising participants into an intellectual rationality was not necessary, to move people beyond their rationality boundaries. Instead it was argued that a process of mentorship, experiential learning, and storytelling can enable closed and bounded rationalities to be transcended.

Also like the Freirean approach, PAR concentrates on formulating intellectual appreciation between different rationalities within focus-groups. This occurs through the eliciting and sharing of different rationalities. However, as outlined in Chapter Five for the rationality of a person to be actually understood by another individual, that individual must either experience what the other person has experienced, or be told a story that will enable empathy. In other words, a process of eliciting and sharing constructs does not move from information exchange to understanding unless it is accompanied by story-telling and/or experiential learning. In this way, the success of a PAR focus group would not be dependent upon its process of eliciting personal constructs, but on the story-telling within the focus group that enables constructs to be understood.

PAR, like the Freirean approach, also has no answers for situations where individuals characterised rigid and fundamentalist adherence to a particular social construct, refuse to move beyond their particular position. In a group learning situation, or focus group, an individual in this frame of mind would not be willing to openly engage, subverting the process. It was suggested in Chapter Five that this is due to an inherent fear of stepping beyond what one already knows. The actual process of demonstrating to participants the boundaries of their own knowledge may in fact be a reason not to participate. However, moving beyond knowledge boundaries, I argued in Chapter Five, can be facilitated by
wisdom traditions that provide the confidence to step into the unknown. PAR does not explore, or consider, the influence of wisdom traditions in facilitating learning.

A criticism of PAR that has not been directed at the Freirean approach is that PAR produces highly constrained, structured and controlled conditions, in which the process of learning and inquiry is placed into episodic cycles centred on focus-group discussion. This is contrary to the organic and implicit processes of learning, outlined in Chapter Five, whereby much of what is learned occurs through emulating others, and story telling. This knowledge is passed down in families and communities, through mimicry, and as shared stories within multiple sites, such as a yarn at the pub, a cup of tea with friends, or conversation around the dinner table.

In these sites of learning individuals may express themselves in ways they would be reluctant to in structured, focus-group situations. All of these sites provide places for planning action and reflecting on the outcomes of action through story-telling. It might well be suggested that the highly structured and controlled conditions of PAR are designed more to ensure that the entire process remains within the researcher’s locus of control, rather than for the benefit of those engaged.

**The rationality underpinning PAR versus a narrative learning approach**

Through this discussion it can be surmised that PAR is based upon a ‘construct’ metaphor. This metaphor causes PAR practitioners and theorists to view the knowledge human beings use to understand and orientate themselves in the world as a building, constructed on founding assumptions and values. In other words, knowledge is interpreted as existing in fixed or concrete bundles, which transform and change over time, through having the ‘wrong assumptions’ on which they are based uncovered and eliminated.

However, the narrative learning approach, outlined in Chapter Five, is underpinned by a different rationality. The knowledge a person holds is understood as a novel, which represents through stories and figurative thought, the embodied knowledge or experiences of an individual. This narrative is constantly changing as new experiences and stories bring about a constant refiguring and rewriting of the narrative. Certain beliefs are illustrated by the narrative, which indicate the presence of values and assumptions. These beliefs, nevertheless, are constantly changing as new experiences and stories constantly refigure the narrative. In
this manner values and assumptions are implicitly altered through exposure to new experiences and stories.

Nonetheless, in Chapter Five, it was contended that narratives can become fixated upon, which would cause the knowledge a person holds to become a construct, or ‘concrete bundle’. This occurs when openness to learn new narratives and experiences is not present. As a result the narrative an individual holds becomes truncated, or narrowed, giving rise to distorted interpretations of phenomenon. This suggests that the metaphor of the construct is an appropriate mechanism for interpreting the knowledge another individual holds only when that individual has become fixated on a particular narrative, or has ceased to learn.

**An endogenous approach to PAR**

A final criticism directed at PAR is that it fails to take into account that other cultures may already possess endogenous processes for overcoming bounded rationality, and for arriving at a convergence of understanding through group learning. For example, it has been outlined in Chapter Five how wānanga, rangatiratanga, pōtikitanga, and pūrākau combine to allow for the identification of problems and determining actions to address problems.

However, the notion of using existing social structures for conducting PAR is outlined by Orlando Fals Borda (1993, p. 83) who states that ‘people cannot be liberated by a consciousness and knowledge other than their own’, which should be built upon ‘endogenous processes of consciousness-raising and knowledge generation’. At the same time Fals Borda (1993, p. 80) demonstrates a strong adherence to Freirean development, which is demonstrated in the methods he suggests for creating a critical consciousness including the use of emancipators to ‘stimulate self-reflective awareness’. Stimulating self-reflective awareness involves the objectification of oneself and one’s knowledge. It is therefore another term for ‘intellectual rationality’.

I considered that it would be possible to use culturally internal processes of planning and action learning to undertake my research. In fact I considered that ‘bringing in’ a methodology might be considered paternalistic, given that such an action would be based on an implicit assumption in the superiority of an outside methodology. Furthermore the existence of Māori pedagogy, or ako, in group learning situations has been identified by
Hemara (2000; in Papuni and Bartlett 2006). Ako is used to raise awareness and consciousness through storytelling and figurative thought. Eketone (2006) similarly identified the use of story-telling, folklore and mentorship in consciousness-raising and addressing problem issues within Māori communities. Together with the insights from Māori wisdom tradition in Chapter Five, I consider that endogenous planning and learning methods will already exist within communities of Aspiring Owners. Furthermore, I would suggest that all cultures will have endogenous planning and learning methods, given that without such methods the ability of any community to exist is based on its ability to collectively plan, undertake actions and learn from the outcomes of action.

However, the decision to use a culturally internal methodology does raise the following question: Why is it hypothesised that a constraint on development might be the lack of planning and strategic thinking within an indigenous community, if there are already effective endogenous methodologies for participatory action learning already in place? There are at least three possible answers to this question. First, even if Māori landowners possess excellent planning processes for determining action, this does not mean that these processes will lead to good decisions. For example, Māori landowners may not be able to afford technical expertise to contribute into their decision-making, due to limited financial assets, which might lead to bad decisions being made. Second, no assumption can be made that endogenous processes of action inquiry will be any better, or worse, than current critical PAR approaches, given that no comparison has ever been made. Undertaking this research will permit a critical comparison to be made. Third, there may be no problem with endogenous action learning processes; instead constraints on development may come from factors external to the group. For example, the nation-state may have inadequate policies to assist development. Consequently, in the spirit of action learning, endogenous action learning methodologies will be sought and used if available.

**Being an insider and an outsider and the challenge of representing the research results**

As outlined above, the primary methodological approach adopted in this thesis is to participate within endogenous planning and action learning. This involves researching lived day-to-day experience. However, there is a need to communicate the results from the learning that occurs through this process. The methodology of reflecting on actions, or the knowledge that one has in practice, is referred to by the development anthropologist Jurich (2000) as *hermeneutic phenomenology*. The *hermeneutic* component involves the process of reflecting
on action and its outcomes, while the *phenomenological* component refers to the actual knowledge one has developed through practice. The primary method for communicating the knowledge learned through the *hermeneutic* process is ethnographic narrative, or story-telling which describes experience (Jurich, 2000). This entire process is outlined in Figure Eight, below.

Figure Eight: Methodological approach used in this thesis

However, ethnography is a methodology fraught with challenges principally related to the insider/outsider roles an ethnographer must negotiate when undertaking the research. There are a number of advantages seen to using ethnography, particularly within marginalised groups and communities. Kanuha (2000; in Labaree 2002, p. 107) outlines that an ethnographic approach has advantages for researching in marginalised communities where
narrative traditions, oral communication, and cooperative relationships are prevalent. Kanuha (2000) considers that ethnography provides a means of working through the barriers, or walls presented by marginalised communities, permitting the interpretation and understanding of phenomena in a way that cannot be achieved from the outside. Further Laberee (2002) identifies a variety of interrelated advantages to insiderness, which he categorises into four broad values: ‘the value of shared experiences; the value of greater access; the value of cultural interpretation; and the value of deeper understanding and clarity of thought for the researcher’ (Laberee 2002, p. 103).

However, there are also numerous disadvantages to an ethnographic approach. O’Connell-Davidson (2008) outlines the struggle involved within ethnographic research from being both an insider and an outsider. She articulates how the advantage of being an insider is that one is able to write up their research with confidence because they have been ‘there’. In the ‘writing up’ of the research, by contrast, the experience becomes presented ‘here’ which allows the experiences to be read, quoted, misunderstood and criticised. Being ‘here’ and ‘there’ leads to trouble. This is because not only must the ethnographer exist in two places at the same time, so too must the research subject (O’Connell-Davidson 2008, p. 56). In the process of representing the research subject ‘here’ the ethnographer ultimately ends up framing the research subject according to the academic and political concerns of the researcher, which may or may not align with the interests of the research subject. In essence writing up the research involves objectifying the research subject, and oneself, which reifies certain aspects of each experience and identity (O’Connell-Davidson 2008). The ethical danger in this situation is that engagement with the research subject ‘here’ cannot engage with the whole person, but only a fragmented and partial picture (O’Connell-Davidson 2008, p. 56).

The phenomenology of representing experience, and in particular depiction of fragmented or partial narratives, was explored in detail within the previous chapter. Specifically it was demonstrated how the representation of partial or distorted narratives can create universalising caricatures that are used to rationalise the expression of power over indigenous peoples. There is a real danger that ethnography can perpetuate this universalizing, which is outlined by Bhattacharya (2007, p. 15):

‘Seeing the participants’ negotiations and production of experiences through a lens of universalised understanding would be un-seeing them and silencing whatever is left of their
mitigated voices’...‘and would be an unethical, co-opted act violating the expectations of care and concern’

Ultimately, ethnographic research essentially provides the researcher with the ability to represent another, which is an act of power that fundamentally involves appropriation and objectification – that is the appropriation and representation of other people’s identities for the specific ends of the researcher. As stated by O’Connell-Davidson (2008, p. 57) no matter how ‘reflexive, non-hierarchical and ethically sensitive the researcher, ultimately’ the research subject will be ‘exposed to the gaze of, and consumed by, other people’. She considers that this ‘remains the case even for those researchers who state that their aim is merely to ‘give voice’ to their research subjects by collecting and presenting narratives’.

This throws a real challenge to the ethnographer who through their privileged insider status may develop close relationships and friendships with research subjects, but is then called upon to write about them in a manner which would fail to encapsulate the presence and wholeness of the person. The fact is that the research participant who agrees to engage in the research, through a consent contract for example, is in essence giving permission for their own objectification and consumption by other people. O’Connell-Davidson (2008, p. 62) asks whether it is actually possible for someone to agree to something which is, from her perspective, ultimately incompatible with caring.

However, O’Connell-Davidson argues that one way in which this ethical dilemma might be overcome is to look at the relationship as ‘gift-giving’, that is the research participant is providing their self to the research purpose, which has some sort of benefit on his, or her community and society. Nonetheless she also rejects this approach as it introduces a number of complications, as outlined below:

‘Gift-giving can take us into a symbolic domain that is non-contractual, where people are more permanently connected in a complex web of mutual dependency and obligation, that in normal life we are usually careful about whom we ask to help us. To conduct social research, however, it is often necessary to ask for help more indiscriminately, or indeed, to ask for help from those from whom we would not usually accept gifts – perhaps because we perceive them as too vulnerable, but also sometimes because we find them morally, politically or personally
objectionable and so would wish to avoid a sense of ongoing obligation to them’ (O’Connell-Davidson, p. 64).

Consequently Davidson rejects ethics of insider-outsider relationships based on reciprocal obligations given either the potential for vulnerable research subjects developing dependency on the researcher, or because the researcher ultimately finds some of their research participants objectionable. However, another option for avoiding the objectification and consumption of the research subject, or subjects, is to involve them in the actual writing and representation of themselves through the research. Nonetheless this opens-up another set of challenges, particular if the research is uncovering issues or problems within individuals, families and communities, which are not spoken about, or are avoided. In such circumstances individuals are not usually willing to have either adverse representations of themselves, or the desire to explore elements of their existence that might be painful.

Further challenges to collaborative approaches emerge through the friendships and bonds that develop during research. Bhattacharya (2007, p. 17) outlines how she came to build rapport and became accepted as part of the kinship group she was participating in, which actually acted against collaborative knowledge production and re-presentation. This was because her role in the kinship group was to assume a leadership and directing role as an ‘older sister’ rather than an ‘equal’ collaborator. Humphrey (2007) outlined similar problems in his own study where he was nominated to a leadership position within the group he was researching, but then found that part of the group had not been happy with his selection and subsequently rejected him as an outsider, holding him at ‘arms length’. In this manner a collaborative approach became difficult to negotiate within the real-life complexities of divisions within communities. Beoku-Betts (Beoku-Betts 1994) outlined that her African background was an advantage for working in the research context she was engaged in, particularly in developing rapport with other black women. However, this rapport also came with limitations, given that she was unmarried and was expected to avoid associating with the local black men.

Consequently, acceptance, and becoming an insider in one situation, can also create a position where one also becomes an outsider. This constrains the ability of a researcher to work collaboratively across families and communities in the representation of their disclosures. In fact it may be unethical to do this, if a high level of trust in one particular role or position leads to sensitive disclosures that cannot be revealed in others. These circumstances highlight
the complexity of positionality and disclosure within ethnography. Overall, it can be
summed up that the objectification and consumption of research subjects cannot be addressed
simply through involving the actual research subjects in the representation of themselves. No
doubt some level of sharing and collaboration would be helpful to ‘cross-check’ the
researchers experiences and interpretations of events. However, the extent to which this can
be done will be contextual and dependent upon the position of the researcher and the type of
disclosure they have been given.

O’Connell-Davidson (2007, p. 65) outlines that ethnographic research subjects are consenting
‘to an extremely intimate relationship within which they are to be used as objects’. Further,
O’Connell-Davidson (2007, p. 65) outlines, ‘that this cannot be described as a morally
principled request to make per se. Nor can the research process, which is fundamentally a
process of objectification and appropriation, be justified self-referentially (objectifying people
does not become ethical simply because it is done by researchers, following rules and
guidelines agreed among researchers). Perhaps the best that can be said is that, to the extent
that all of us – whether researchers or researched – have an interest in the kind of rational
and open debate that is made possible by empirical research, the ends sometimes justify the
means. If this is so, then another criterion by which to judge the ethicality of research is
whether or not it is relevant to the moral, political and policy debates that impact on people’s
lived experience.’

It is in this vein that I would argue that the research in this thesis is valuable and necessary. Its
focus is to influence the moral, political and policy debates concerning Māori development to
improve the lived experience for Māori landowners and indigenous people in general.
However, I also consider that ethnography can be assisted in improving the accuracy of
representation through the use of complementary methods. It is outlined, in the next chapter
that research participants involved in the research were involved in cross-checking the way in
which they are presented in situations where the information disclosed was not sensitive, or
did not lead to harm. Second, Lamberee (2002) outlines how triangulation can be used to
assist in the development of accurate representation through other methods such as interviews.
It is mentioned in the next chapter that semi-formal interviews were also conducted with
research participants concerning areas where further understanding and elaboration was
required. Third, as Lamberee (2002) points out, document analysis, such as the extensive
literature review in this thesis, can be used to build a rich portrait of the context under
investigation. Finally, as is outlined in the next chapter, there were also two oversight komitis established, with both research and personal experience in the communities being researched, which assisted and guided the manner of representation expressed in this thesis.

**The role of virtue in ethnography**

The literature outlined above is omits one of the key underpinning elements of good ethnographic research – the role of virtue. It was demonstrated in the previous chapter that much of the knowledge we hold is preontological, or embodied. This knowledge is developed through experience and cannot be gained in any other way. One cannot read an instruction manual on sailing and then get into a boat and sail. It instead requires experience. This same rule applies to a social researcher when going into a new social, or cultural, context. Until one gains experience of a social context, one will not be able to accurately anticipate what the social consequences of different actions will be, nor will one be able to know how to read and understand particular circumstances.

Experience, it was outlined in Chapter Five, emerges through trial and error. An individual can reduce their likelihood of making errors in a new social context. This can be achieved first, by participating in the practices and skills of others in that culture and, second, through following the guidance of those who already understand the cultural context that one is navigating. Through immersion in the skills, practices and language of a new social context, one is better able to understand the social dynamics at play, reducing the likelihood of misinterpretations.

It has also been argued, in Chapter Five, that narratives are a means of communicating experiences within different cultural settings (Carrithers, 1992). This transcultural nature of narrative is supported by a developing body of research, which suggests that story-telling as pedagogy works well in indigenous contexts – given that they can be adapted to indigenous story-telling traditions (Feldman 2000; Struthers and Peden-McAlpine 2005; Evans, Hole et al. 2009; Austin 2010; Burdick and Sandlin 2010; Wootton and Stonebanks 2010). I argue that this is because narratives follow sequences of action and consequence, and as such demonstrate experiential learning patterns. When learned, a narrative permits an individual to anticipate the likely consequences that different actions will produce.
However, it was also demonstrated in the previous chapter that narratives can become truncated and fixated upon, which leads to misinterpretation of phenomena, giving rise to delusional and paranoid experiences. Researchers therefore need to be self-reflexively aware of the narratives they hold, and whether or not these narratives are being fixated upon.

Consequently, it can be concluded that valid interpretations of a social context is dependent on an individual, carrying to the best of his or her ability, a critical consciousness. This consciousness is based first upon self-reflexive awareness, and second an openness to learn through new experiences, stories, emulation of practices, and instruction from mentors, within the cultural context that one is researching. However, this is a continual learning process, which means that the interpretation of a particular event, at one point in time, may be quite different at a later point in time, once more experience has developed.

Accuracy of interpretations is therefore dependent first upon a researcher’s openness to learn and self-awareness in a social context. This, as outlined in Chapter Five, is in turn dependent upon the integrity of a person’s character, in terms of humility and bravery to step out and learn new things. Second, the ability to represent the other is dependent upon the length of time that one is immersed within a cultural context, to gain experience, build friendships, and learn common narratives. It can therefore be concluded that the researcher needs to be committed to the following two principles:

- Personal transformations through openness to new experience; and
- Long-term experience in a particular context to formulate accurate representations of the social context under investigation.

**The paradigmatic mode**

Consequently, as an ethnographic researcher, I have attempted to embody the two principles above, and have attempted to communicate my research experiences through narrative within the results sections of this thesis. However, I have also supported this approach through another mode of representation, which I consider adds another, complementary, dimension. Carrithers (1992) refers to it as the paradigmatic mode, while Heron (1988), in the field of cooperative inquiry, refers to it as propositional knowing. The paradigmatic mode can be explained in the following manner. As outlined in Chapter Two, we learn through trial and error, where an action is taken to produce an anticipated outcome. When the action produces
the anticipated outcome then the assumption used to rationalise the action is substantiated or considered factual. This is the basis of substantive theory, or theory constructed on experiential learning.

Using paradigmatic, or propositional knowing, an individual will make a factual assumption explicit then use a narrative to illustrate the assumption. For example, an individual may make the proposition, or statement, that not wearing a sunhat gives you sunburn. To illustrate this factual assumption a story of getting sunburn from not wearing a sunhat could be provided. In terms of a more complex illustration, related to this thesis, the proposition or statement might be made; participatory processes do not work in highly stratified, classist societies. To illustrate this statement the narrative of Blanchett (2001) could be used, which illustrates his experience of attempting to undertake participatory process in contexts where elites were present that would not engage in process of a open discussion, or learn from others. This was because they consider themselves superior too, and having nothing to learn from subordinates.

**Reflexivity**

The methodological approach outlined so far has made it clear that I do not consider myself to be a passive bystander in this research. As outlined above I aim to work with Māori landowners to assist them in achieving their own development goals. It is therefore clear that I will have an impact on the very social processes that I am attempting to understand (Law 1994). Not only will I be growing and changing through my experiences of participating within the day-to-day skills and practices of Māori landowners, they too will be changing through their interactions and associations with me. It is likely the skills and practices that I bring to bear, and my knowledge, and mode of conduct, will change the people around me, in the same fashion as I am changed by them.

As outlined previously the only possible way to accurately interpret phenomenon within a social context is to have experience within it. Any attempt to stand as a neutral observer can only have the effect that one cannot come to understand the object of study. It is important that I am reflexively aware of my effects on the social contexts in which I am researching (as far as is possible), and that these effects are positive and fit within the ethical boundaries established by Kaupapa Māori research, which are clearly articulated in the conclusions section below.
Conclusions

I conclude that research in Māori contexts must produce research that is contextualised, be owned by communities, and produce positive outcomes, contributing overall toward Māori self-determination. Although PAR appears at first an appropriate methodology for performing this task, it was deemed inadequate because it attempts to socialise the Other into an intellectual rationality. Instead it is concluded that endogenous processes of action inquiry should be used.

These endogenous processes of action and reflection, it is proposed, will provide the necessary experiences to answer the research questions. It is concluded that two modes of communication are appropriate for communicating experiences, the narrative mode and propositional mode. The answers to the research questions, provided in the narrative and propositional modes of thinking, will be critically compared, juxtaposed and contrasted with the theoretical propositions designed to answer research questions. This will occur in the following results and discussion sections of this thesis.
CHAPTER SEVEN: Methods for Conducting Field Research

Introduction

The following chapter outlines the methods that were adopted for conducting field research, as well as the process used for interpreting data and presenting the research results. The chapter begins by describing why a case study approach was taken, and the process that was used to identify and adopt case-study groups. Second, the chapter depicts the nature of each case-study group participating within the research, and the level of contact and involvement that I have had with each of them. Following this section, the methods of recording data are illustrated, and the ethical concerns that were taken into consideration during the research are expressed. Finally, the chapter ends by explaining the methods used to construct, interpret, and communicate the research results.

Undertaking a case study approach

In the previous chapter it was outlined that my intention for this study was to undertake research that is owned by the communities involved and produces positive tangible outcomes. Furthermore I outlined in Chapter Five the importance of experience in validating theory, and consequently concluded that the research should be based on praxis, action learning, and my full participation/immersion in Māori community contexts over an extended period of time.
As a result, I decided to adopt a case study approach to this research, where I could work with specific groups of Aspiring Owners to answer the research questions of this thesis by identifying developments goals, taking action toward achieving goals, identifying constraints, and finding solutions to overcome constraints.

Further, as outlined in Chapter Three, my goal was to work alongside Aspiring Owners, or those that have strong development aspirations for either unutilised land, or underutilised land, but are constrained in their ability to unlock its potential. My first task in completing this study was, therefore, to find case-study groups of Aspiring Owners. I considered that a good starting point would be to participate in the annual hui of Te Waka Kai Ora, the Māori National Organic Farming representative body. In February 2002 I attended a three-day hui in Waitangi with approximately 150 other Māori landowners. The primary focus of the national body was to encourage Māori landowners to adopt organic production, given that it was considered a good development option for landowners, and given histories of low agrichemical use on Māori farms, but also due to the potential for producing high-value niche products. Te Waka Kai Ora referred to organic food as ‘hua parakore’, and possessed a mission statement to farm in a way that ‘maintains and enhances the mauri of ngā taonga katoa’. During the hui I was given a chance to give a mihi where I outlined my whakapapa and talked about my area of research interest. I made it apparent that I was looking for Māori landowners to participate in my research, who would let me work alongside them, in the pursuit of their goals. Further, I outlined the criteria for participating in the research, indicating that I needed case studies of Māori landowners that had strong development aspirations for either unutilised

---

20 In the hui (meeting) Hua Parakore was explained as a term emerging from the Māori translation of the bible which refers to the oil used to anoint Kings. This oil is considered the most pure substance possible. This term was adopted to refer to the food produced from Māori land, which has been farmed in an environmentally sustainable manner.

21 Maintaining and enhancing the mauri of ngā taonga katoa was the mission statement of the national Māori farming body. In the hui it was explained that maintaining and enhancing mauri refers to the life-force, or unfolding energy of beings. Nga taonga katoa refers to, all things of value, or all things sacred, and was used in the hui often interchangeably with the term resources. Consequently, the mission statement refers to maintaining and enhancing the unfolding life-force, vitality, and life supporting capacity of all things sacred, which includes for example, land, air, soil, water, people, plants and animals.
land, or underutilised land, but are constrained in their ability to unlock its potential. In addition I made it clear that I would be available to assist the case studies in pursuing their goals and that I could provide expertise in different areas to assist. I was a little disappointed with the outcome when only one whānau, of the 50 or so present, indicated to me that they would be interested in participating. However, I was still pleased to have my first case study.

From this hui I was given the contact details of another group of Māori landowners who had established another Māori organic farming organisation to achieve Māori land development in their region. I contacted the chair of this organisation and was invited to attend their next monthly hui. At this hui I outlined the intention of the research, and again outlined the criteria for participating within the research. I also pointed out in my mihi (speech) some skills that I could bring to contribute to their development, and gave them some examples of what I could do such as writing up strategic development plans. This sparked some interest as there was a desire within the group to articulate the actions required to achieve their moemoeā, or dreams into a document.  

This group agreed to become a case study and so became my second case-study group.

Later in 2002, I attended another Te Waka Kai Ora national hui of Māori landowners. At this hui approximately 60 Māori landowners attended. I was nominated and voted onto the committee of this national body. One of my roles in this body was to work with the other committee members to represent the interests, and articulate the needs of Māori landowners affiliated to the organisation, to the New Zealand Crown and its agencies. The underlying principle of the relationship between the Crown and the organisation was Te Tiriti o Waitangi, or the Treaty of Waitangi, which as outlined in Chapters One and Two, places on the Crown certain obligations and responsibilities to Māori. I consequently spent a lot of time writing reports with other committee members outlining the development goals of the Māori organic farmers within our organisation, and how the Crown and its agencies could assist in overcoming the constraints that were being faced.

Through my experience with the national Māori farming body, and my experience of working alongside case-study groups One and Two, I was offered a contract as a Research Leader with

---

22 There are numerous benefits to getting a plan written by an organisation such as this, as it assists with communicating to government agencies and other Māori groups what the organisation is all about.
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu to develop strategies for the sustainable development of Māori farmland in the Ngāi Tahu rohe, or tribal region. This placed me in a position where I could identify further case studies. Initial scoping for case-study groups occurred through contacting, via mail, all Ngāi Tahu descendants who described their occupation as farmer, on the Ngāi Tahu whakapapa (genealogical) database to find if there were any Aspiring Owners desiring to be part of my research. Further letters were written to all Papatipu Rūnanga outlining the project and the criteria for involvement.

However, this technique did not produce any case-study groups to participate in the project. Instead it was found that Ngāi Tahu living on ancestral communal tenure land were largely outside of the ‘common loops’ of tribal affairs. That is, they were not directly linked into tribal political and institutional life. Consequently, ‘word of mouth’ was used to locate communities of Ngāi Tahu Māori landowners living and working on Māori land. I travelled around Te Waipounamu meeting these groups, once again outlining the criteria for participating in the research. Through this process I picked up five more case studies of Aspiring Owners.

**Defining each case-study group**

There were challenges in precisely defining exactly what a case-study group constitutes. Case Studies One, Three, Four, Five, Six and Seven were all linked to specific blocks, or areas of land. Each block of land was owned communally, by perhaps as many as 200 owners, which made the number of participants within each case-study group potentially very large.

However, the management of land blocks was nearly always turned over by the landowners to a group of nominated Trustees, or Trustee. It was often typical for the Trustee, or Trustees, to lease the land back to a shareholder, or group of shareholders within the block of land to manage and develop the land. In Case Studies One, Three, Four, Five, Six and Seven, the participants within case-study groups consisted of either the Trustees of a block of land governing the land, or conversely a land shareholder that had been mandated the right to manage the land under lease from a Trust. In this manner, all participants within case-study groups had a mandate to manage the land, and make decisions on behalf of all the landowners.
Despite such arrangements, the mandate for decision-making is rarely clear cut. Trustees typically work with the land shareholders on decisions that might possibly be controversial. Similarly, lessees may consult with Trustees, and other land shareholders, on decisions they make when legally they are not obliged to do so. This is simply to avoid political problems among land block owners if the decisions do not have widespread agreement.

Case Study Two differed from the other case studies. It concerned a group of Māori landowners that came together to plan collectively and pool resources to achieve development goals in a whole region. This group was therefore not bound by interests in a particular block of land, but by mutual interests in the benefits brought about by collective action. Table 8 below outlines the structure of each case-study group studied in this thesis.

**Working alongside case-study groups**

The seven case studies were adopted over a four-and-a-half year period, from 2002 through to mid-2006. The Case Studies One and Two (identified in 2002), I worked alongside them for two years. I am still in regular contact with Case Study Two but am no longer in direct contact with Case Study One. Both case studies were located in Te Ika a Māui, or in the North Island of New Zealand.

In terms of engagement with Case Study Two, I moved with my family to the North Island to live in the community of this Case Study for seven months. I developed a close working relationship with this whānau, and developed a good working relationship and eventually strong friendships. I began my work with this whānau by editing and developing action plans that they had already begun drafting through a series of conversations I had with them both individually and as a group. Second, I provided technical assistance in regards to farm management and farm forestry. Third, I offered support by generating links and contacts to specialist expertise, which was required for the whānau to overcome development constraints.

---

23 The whanau (family) Kaumatua (elder) from Case Study One has provided significant support for this research and has been a close mentor throughout the entire research process.

24 Although on a tight budget I was able to move into this community due to some farming friends who were travelling overseas and needed a family to ‘farm-sit’ or look after their farm. We (my wife and children) did this so as to be in the local community.
Finally, I learned a great deal from this whānau on how to develop relationships with government agencies to assist in achieving their goals because they had significant experience in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Case Study Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>This Case Study is a community group consisting of approximately 20 groups of Aspiring Owners organised into a formal legal structure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>This Case Study Group is a Whānau Trust with two Trustees representing eight land shareholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>This Case Study is an Ahu Whenua Land Trust consisting of four Trustees nominated by communal land shareholders to administer land on their behalf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>This Case Study is a whānau (family) consisting of six members leasing a Māori land block from the Māori Trustee. All whānau members are shareholders in the land block.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>This Case Study is a whānau (family) consisting of nine members that are leasing a block of Māori land from an Ahu Whenua Trust consisting of five Trustees representing land shareholders. The whānau are majority shareholders in the block of land, and therefore have a controlling interest in the Ahu Whenua Trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>This Case Study is a Whānau Trust consisting of two Trustees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>This Case Study does not possess a trust structure but is managed by a whānau in what one participant referred to as ‘rūnaka style’ or ‘talking until consensus is reached’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although I did not live in the community of Case Study One, I made frequent visits to this community of landowners and developed excellent relationships. The remote location of this case study did limit the contact I could make, and the ‘drying-up’ of research funds meant that I could not maintain a face-to-face relationship. I worked alongside this group to undertake action plans, and further worked with many whānau, or organisation members to do actual farming work and provided some advice in regard to farming systems, ecological restoration and forestry in areas where I felt competent. As in Case Study One, I also assisted in building relationships with technical expertise, which was identified as needed to overcome constraints to development.

The five case studies that emerged through my research position with Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu, were located in Te Waipounamu, the South Island of New Zealand. Immersion in these communities occurred over a five-year period, and the relationships are still active. Once
again I worked with these case-study groups to plan their future direction for land development, provided hands-on work assistance around the farm, and offered technical advice where appropriate. Through my position with Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu I was also provided with funds that could be used to contract in specialist help to deal with particular problems, in situations where case-study groups considered it necessary.

**Data recording**

In all case-study groups I participated in hui designed to identify visions and goals. During these hui I took research notes of the discussion and also recorded discussion. In Case Studies One and Two tape recordings of hui were made, but later hui were digitally recorded. All case-study groups were keen for me to assist in drafting sustainable development plans from planning hui, which outlined the development goals determined by landowners, and actions required to achieve goals. Consequently seven development plans were produced – one for each case-study group.

Additionally, I worked alongside case-study groups to implement their development plans, which included doing ‘hands-on’ development work, such as constructing tunnel houses, digging potatoes and constructing wasabi gardens. Photos were taken of physical signs of movement toward development goals, and notes kept on my work experiences. In addition I continually reflected on experiences, sharing my reflections with research participants.  

Finally, many semi-formal interviews were undertaken to follow new lines of discovery and to get the perspectives and understanding of research participants on particular phenomenon – in an iterative process.

---

25 I travelled to Case Studies One, Five, Six and Seven to share the research results communicated in this thesis, and to get feedback from each group on whether these results provided a fair representation of the social phenomena under investigation. I was not able to share the results with Case Study Two due to the costs of travelling to the remote location where the case study is based. Case Study Three withdrew from the research after completing a sustainable development plan, and I was not able to re-establish contact. The landowners in Case Study Four were simply too busy to meet to discuss the research results.
Ethical Issues – Invisibility

Unfortunately it has not been possible to provide maps of case-study groups, and the many photos taken to show the movement of groups toward development goals. Additionally, names of research subjects have been altered, as well as the names of organisations and groups. These measures have been necessary to ensure confidentiality, and to disguise identity. As will be outlined in the following results chapter, there were many reasons to conceal identities given that commentary about and between whānau and community members was at times derogatory, while some case-study groups were engaged in illegal activities. Consequently, to avoid possible harm being directed toward research participants as a result of this research, identities have been concealed.

The need to conceal identities was not something that I intended on undertaking this study. Additionally, it is not something I have wanted to do, given that the people involved, and the experiences flowing from that involvement, is what has made this work enjoyable. Furthermore, from a postcolonial perspective concealing identities in itself can be seen as an unethical practice as it makes the research subject ‘invisible’ and does not provide a vehicle for the marginalised to be ‘present’ (Bhabha 1999, Khanna 2000). However, I have become aware that some key development challenges regarding Māori land development concern issues that can be very personal and central to Māori identity. As such these issues need to be dealt with sensitively, and protecting the research participants from being identified is pivotal to good research practice.

Method of presenting research results

I went through much deliberation concerning how the research results should be presented. It is clear from Chapter Six that I would use ethnographic narrative as the primary means of communicating research results. However, there are multiple ways in which narrative can be presented. One option was a case-study-by-case-study approach whereby the stories of each case study could be told in sequence. Nonetheless, I decided against taking this approach. The first reason regarded ethical concerns, given that presenting a complete story about a case study would make it much easier to be identified. My second reason for not taking this approach was that it did not allow for the direct synthesis of research results between case studies to demonstrate common themes, or critical comparisons to demonstrate differences. Third, I wanted to communicate what I considered to be the main themes emerging from the research, and use stories of the case studies to illustrate these themes.
Consequently, I opted for an approach that illustrated common themes with narrative. This approach is represented in the results chapters. Chapter Eight explores the experiences involved in the planning process with each case-study group, and in particular describes the methods of endogenous action learning and the processes and structures used by case-study groups to navigate development. Chapter Nine then articulates the development goals of case-study groups emerging from the planning phase. Both Chapters Ten and Eleven explore the constraints on achieving development goals, and the actions taken to overcome constraints – in the interests of finding solutions to problems. In this manner the chapters sequentially answer the three research questions.

However, I did consider presenting Chapters Ten and Eleven differently, whereby Chapter Ten would only present the constraints to development, while Chapter Eleven would only communicate the solutions to overcome constraints. This approach did not work because the constraints and actions to overcome constraints were entwined, and the threads between action and outcome became lost. Consequently, Chapters Ten and Eleven emerged to explore separate constraint themes, and methods for overcoming constraints.

**Constructing and interpreting narratives**

As it might be imagined, after nearly eight years of working with some of these case studies, there is an overwhelming amount of information and data. I have grown to know each situation intimately and can write about each from significant personal experience. Consequently, some explanation is required regarding the methods used to select, construct and interpret narratives presented in the results chapters of this thesis.

First, over a number years common narratives began to emerge across case studies from the data gathered, or in other words the experience I was having in one case-study context was being matched by experiences in others. The ethnographic narrative of my experiences was tracing similar plots, identifying similar themes, and expressing similar characters. However, I was concerned that this may have had something to do with either my influence over each situation, or it might have been due to cross-cultural, or general, misinterpretation.

In response to this concern I followed Kaupapa Māori Methodology and sought support from Māori, as well as non-Māori, specialists with experience in the contexts I was working. I
called this process ‘external validation’. My first ‘port of call’ for external validation came from members of the communities in which I was working to ensure that the narratives I was expressing accurately represented their own understanding of events. My ability to do this was often constrained as at times the narratives covered sensitive topics that were difficult to discuss openly (a phenomenon that will be discussed in detail below).

In response, I had two specialist groups that critically reviewed my narratives. The first group consisted of my supervisors at the University, and an external Māori advisor. This external advisor had a professional background in Māori development, and was experienced in the North Island case-study groups I was working with. The second group, an Oversight Komiti, was established by Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, which consisted of four Ngāi Tahu rangatira and one Ngāi Tahu researcher, all of whom were familiar with the case-study groups I was working with.

Through a series of critical discussions I found that the groups assisted me in interpreting and developing the narratives. Further, they provided me with alternative insights regarding why certain events may have unfolded as they did, which had the effect of broadening and deepening my understanding of the narratives. Through this rigorous process I got to a stage where there was a convergence of agreement between myself and the oversight groups, and as such I considered that the narratives I was producing provided a relatively accurate representation of the phenomenon under investigation.

Nonetheless, as outlined above, the real challenge came to me from having many experiences where validation became difficult from within families or communities. For example, there was one whānau managing Māori land where I continually witnessed a father belittling his son, and strongly inhibiting him from having an input into the management of the farm. When speaking with this young man he raised this issue with me, outlining that he was tired of being excluded, and that ‘he wished his father would die’, so that he could get on with his life and get the land working in the way it should. I found that I could certainly validate this young man’s experience, and knew that his father was definitely excluding him, and continually belittling him. Furthermore this experience was validated by the young man’s older siblings. The challenge for me was that getting validation of this type of narrative from all those participating in the research was not possible, and as such I could not achieve validation across all research participants. This was because for complete validation of this phenomenon
the father would need to agree that he was acting in an oppressive manner. I felt that undertaking this type of initiative required a skill-set that I did not possess, and that it fell more under the role of a family member, social worker or psychologist.

However, this type of situation illustrates the challenges in gaining validation regarding narratives that might be very sensitive exposing practices within a family or community that are unjust or abusive in some way. Given that these types of relationships between families and communities can be key constraints on development, actually talking about them and gaining some sort of validation was not possible. Instead, I needed to work primarily with my specialist oversight groups who were both familiar with the case studies, and the methodological process. This also illustrates why the identity of the characters in this thesis are hidden – a practice particularly necessary when a number of community members have something challenging or sensitive to say about other members.

Gaining external validation of narratives was only the first part of the process of selecting narratives to be presented in this thesis. The second part of the process involved selecting between different narratives based upon the insight they provided into unlocking the development potential of Aspiring Owner’s land. The mechanism used to decide the most important narratives was based on critical discussion with my oversight groups. Generally speaking those narratives which frequently presented themselves across case-study groups appeared. For example, there was a constant and consistent narrative across case studies that pōtiki, or as they were termed by some research participants, ‘likeable rogues’, were consistently in positions to intercept government funding for their own benefit, largely excluding benefits from reaching the communities. Given the frequency of this narrative identifying a constraint on development across case studies, and its universality, it became identified as a constraint to development. Consequently, the frequency and universality of a narrative was used as a mechanism to determine which narratives ‘stood out’ as exceptional, important and not relative only to context. In addition, the narratives chosen to be presented in the results sections were those that best illustrated a particular phenomenon, so despite a number of narratives describing the same phenomenon across case studies, only a narrative from one case study might be given. This was to avoid simply telling the same narrative repetitively, and also to reduce the size of the results section, which was eventually reduced by two thirds.
It also needs to be pointed out that this thesis concentrates primarily on telling narratives that describe practices and experiences rather than retelling the narratives, or statements, of research participants. Consequently, the number of quotations in the results section is limited. This is because many of the phenomena that constrain land development are not spoken about day-to-day because they may be too sensitive. For example, the situation between the father and son outlined above is not something that is going to be frequently discussed within the case-study context of the family; however, the family’s sense of frustration with the lack of assistance from government agencies might be mentioned frequently. Nonetheless each phenomenon may have equal importance in constraining development despite the differences in frequency that they are spoken about.

Finally, it also needs to be mentioned how the relationship between narrative and propositional thinking, as explored in Chapter Six, occurs within the results chapters. It will be recognised when reading the results chapters that the following process continually occurs:

1. Narratives are provided that articulate a phenomenon; and
2. Reflection on the narratives occurs to identify the common factual assumptions underpinning each narrative.

Through this process of narrative and reflection, propositional knowledge is created. A narrative might, for example, describe a situation where a land trust has followed some excellent advice from an agronomist, which has led to an excellent growing season. A proposition, or factual assumption, that can be made from this story is that ‘following good advice improves your chances of success’. It is through this process that narrative, as a description of practice, is developed into propositional knowing, which can be critically juxtaposed to theoretical knowledge (from the different science disciplines) in the process of praxis. The overall process used to construct and communicate narratives represented in the results chapters are provided in Figure Nine below.

Conclusions

It is concluded that a case-study approach is the most appropriate method for conducting field research given the requirement for in-depth immersion, action learning and praxis to adequately undertake this investigation. Further, it is concluded that the most appropriate method for presenting research results involves communicating narratives in a manner that
produces synthesis between case studies to demonstrate common themes, and to allow for critical comparisons to demonstrate differences. Finally, the process used to construct, interpret and communicate narratives concerned a process of external validation involving research participants and two specialist groups experienced in the research contexts within which I was working. This process is outlined in Figure Nine below.

**Figure Nine: Process used to construct, interpret and communicate narratives in the Results Chapters**
CHAPTER EIGHT: The Navigational Domain – Endogenous Planning

Introduction

The function of this chapter is to communicate my experiences of working with case-study groups to articulate development goals and establish strategies to achieve goals. In the methodology and methods chapters I have referred to this as endogenous planning, given that the methodologies used to determine plans and strategies have not been imposed externally. Furthermore, I have adopted the use of the term navigation, from Durie’s (2005) development theory, as a theme that encapsulated a process that involves setting direction.

In this chapter it is outlined that I participated in planning with all case-study groups. This involved meeting with different combinations of landowners, Trustees, delegated managers to create plans for action based upon critical deliberation and discussion. However, I found through these experiences that the development of critical awareness in planning was dependent upon the presence of conditions in which participants could freely express their narratives, or storylines of the past, present and future, in a manner which linked into, what is termed in this thesis a common learning narrative. Through such critical learning the robustness of development strategies was improved.

It is demonstrated that the common learning narrative is created, through the presence of common cultural practices, which are evident in the manner that particular individuals ‘carry themselves.’ I refer to these different modes of action as deportments. Each deportment is explored in detail within this chapter, through narrative descriptions of circumstances and
The chapter concludes by demonstrating how when these deportments are combined then the conditions for open and critical discussion are generated, to plan actions and deliberate critically on the consequences of action.

**The deportment of humility**

To illustrate the *deportment-of-humility* a number of experiences, emerging from planning hui with different case-study groups, are described. The first experience concerns a hui with a cluster of gardeners and farmers, from Case Study One (refer to Table Sixteen in Chapter Seven for a description). The cluster had been formed, or separated out from the broader community group, to pursue objectives that the individuals in the group felt they shared in common and consequently worked together in a supportive role to achieve. It must be noted, as outlined in the methodology chapter, that I was an active participant in hui, which meant that I had an influence in both shaping the nature of the hui, while my experiences of participating in the hui shaped my own knowledge and understanding. My primary influence in the hui was asking questions that would help me grasp what the goals of the group were and the actions they deemed necessary to achieve goals. However, I did not control the discussion within hui.

**The experience of the Māori woman’s cluster hui from Case Study One**

This first hui was ‘guided’ by a Māori woman in her fifties, whom I refer to as the *kaihautū* – a term that can refer to somebody who is a guide, or a navigator. The hui was held in the

---

26 This woman was higher education levels than other participants. She had recently returned to her ancestral land with the intention of providing opportunities back on the land for her children, grandchildren and generations to come.
local community hall, and began with the kaihautū expressing the kaupapa\textsuperscript{27} of the hui, which described the purpose, function and philosophy behind the hui. This created what might be thought of as the ‘terms and boundaries’ for the discussion. She also asked me what I needed to know to assist in writing-up an action plan for their group, so I articulated that I wanted to know where they were going and how they wanted to get there. A participant in the group described this as ‘the four Ws and the one how’ referring to the following questions:

1. What are we doing?
2. Where are we going?
3. Why are we going there?
4. When will things happen?
5. How are we going to get there?

A karakia (prayer) followed the defining of the kaupapa. The focus of the karakia was to request that our discussion be guided by God.

At first conversation was slow. To stimulate discussion development plans that two participants had written were passed around. This stimulated other individuals to begin sharing their plans including what they were currently doing with their land and the moemoeā or visions that they possessed. The conversation was free flowing with the stories told by one individual concerning what they were doing, and interested in doing, stimulating others also to provide stories about what they were doing and anticipated doing. Also discussed were the challenges that were being experienced in relation to achieving goals. The kaihautū took notes of the discussion on large pieces of paper, which was pinned to a whiteboard so all could see the discussion points as they were raised. She also asked me to take notes, which I did.\textsuperscript{28}

When discussion began to slow surrounding a particular topic the kaihautū would ‘pick-up’ and encourage those participants who had not participated to have their say. The group would be silent for this individual allowing their voice to be heard within the hui. Consequently, in situations where more retiring individuals were not being heard, an effort was made by the group to let their voice emerge. During the hui a couple of participants left, with the intention

\textsuperscript{27} The term kaupapa, as used by the kaihautū referred to the topic, or matter of discussion. However, the term kaupapa was also used very frequently among case studies to refer to the underpinning logic of a particular viewpoint. Consequently to talk about a kaupapa is to talk about a rationality, or ideological standpoint.

\textsuperscript{28} I wrote my reflections on the hui, outlined in this section, after the hui was conducted.
of bringing other individuals in the local community along to participate. These were young women, who others in the cluster knew were farming, or gardening Māori land, but were too whakamā, or shy, to attend the hui. Shortly, they came back with two new participants.

Throughout the hui the kaihautū and I compared the notes we had taken together with the group. These notes summarised the stories that had been told by participants, namely what they were currently doing on their land, what they anticipated doing on their land, and the constraints they were experiencing, and how the group might work together to make their dreams a reality. These notes were reiterated and discussed a number of times during the hui to arrive at a fairly robust consensus regarding actions that could be taken by the group to support one another in achieving the goals of each landowner.

The discussion lasted for three hours, an hour longer than what had been organised. At the end of the hui a karakia (prayer) was used to conclude the hui and thank God for the inspired discussion. The kaihautū emphasised how positive it was to see some of the younger women come along. The kaihautū made a statement that there ‘was always room for one more in the whānau’, referring to the need for openness and inclusion.

The experience of participating in a hui with all participants in Case Study One

After the hui with the previous Cluster Group, a second hui was organised for the next day, which involved all participants from Case Study One. Like the hui with the Cluster Group this meeting in a second community hall, and consisted of approximately 20 Māori landowners. Similarly, like the first hui, this meeting opened with a karakia, to ask God to inspire and guide the discussion, which was performed by a well-known and prominent man in his fifties. He assumed the position of kaihautū in the discussion. Also, as with the first hui, the kaupapa was outlined, which was described as the desire to arrive at a consensus plan for action among the community of landowners, for determining collective actions that would assist landowners in achieving their own goals. I was asked to take notes from the discussion within this hui, which I did.

---

29 The kaihautū discussed privately with me afterwards that she believed that these woman lacked confidence and needed ‘building-up’.
The dynamics within this second hui contrasted with the first hui. The kaihautū in the second hui had a dominant presence and strongly argued for particular development options that would see the entire community of landowners collectively and cohesively engaging in the same type of production. The kaihautū was articulate and presented ideas that were well thought out. Further, his arguments for pursuing a collective enterprise were well presented. The primary rationale underpinning his argument was that all the landowners should work together to increase the scale of production, generating the group, and local community, significant financial capital which could be used to create employment and benefit the community in general.

After the first hui with the Cluster Group, and having visited the farms of a number of the landowners from within the community group for various cups of tea I became aware that many of those within the community had quite different ideas about what they wanted to do. The Cluster Group, for example, had mostly expressed interest in gardening and subsistence growing, to provide families with a healthy diet and rongoā, or medicinal herbs. Further, they were interested in ecological restoration and saving heritage varieties of fruits and vegetables.

The argument put forward by the kaihautū, for large-scale, broad-acre production, was responded with awkward periods of silence, but with some stilted conversation among a small group of participants interested in going into broad-acre production. The reason for the silence, and stilted conversation, was revealed to me by a participant after the hui. She pointed out that she only had a small acreage, and going into the large-scale development option would not benefit her, because the return she would get from it would be very small. However, the kaihautū had a very large acreage and would benefit more than anyone else from the investment in infrastructure (e.g., machinery) necessary to establish the large-scale enterprise.

Despite it being clear that many participants had quite different plans for how the community could take collective actions to assist one another in achieving their development goals, no one participating in the hui expressed alternative viewpoints to the kaihautū. However, it appeared that the silence and stilted conversation caused the kaihautū to feel that he was ‘losing ground’ with his argument. This was evidenced in that in response to the silence he began to argue more vigorously for the development approach he had in mind.
The general experience of this hui was that the free-flowing discussion I had experienced with the first hui was not present. In addition, little progress was made during this second hui as discussion did not move past discussion regarding the plans of the kaihautū. As a result it was decided among participants to meet again for another hui at a later date. This caused me to reflect upon the differences in my experiences between the two hui, and I began to make some tentative propositions regarding why the differences existed.

**The difference between the two hui**

The significant difference between the two hui I considered could be attributed to the presence or suspension of judgement. This may be illustrated in the following manner. In the second hui one leading figure made a strong argument for a particular development option. Through making a proposition regarding what the development option should be for the community of landowners and defending that proposition through logical argument, other participants were immediately challenged to articulate their own positions and provide logical arguments to defend positions. This created a polemic situation, in which combatant stances emerged between viewpoints. The purpose of the combat is to demonstrate the inferiority, or superiority of different propositions through logical argument and reasoning. This polemic situation is based upon judgement, given that its goal is to demonstrate the superiority of a particular viewpoint, over alternative rationalities.

However, participants in the second hui did not engage the kaihautū in polemic debate, and instead met the arguments being made by this individual with silence, or self-withdrawal. I speculated that this was for at least three reasons. First, participants might be afraid of having their beliefs and intentions shown to be inferior through argument, to that of the kaihautū. Second, they may have lacked debating skills to combat arguments, even though they may know their perspective to be sound. Third, they did not want to get embroiled in an argumentative situation.\(^{30}\)

---

\(^{30}\) A fourth option was that participants may have considered challenging the Kaihautū directly as inappropriate, or contrary to social norms. However, my experience from participating in many hui is that making a challenge is not in any way considered inappropriate. Instead speaking and expressing a different point of view is respected.
I deduced that participants in the second hui did not want to engage in a situation where they were cornered, or forced into positions where they must defend their particular point of view, against the arguments made by the kaihautū. Conversely, in the first hui participants did not feel in a position where they needed to defend their particular viewpoint. The environment was therefore not combative, but was instead encouraging to those present to express themselves. Dialogue was conversational rather than polemic, built around the stories of different participants, which were linked via the themes of conversation.

I would argue that the open atmosphere experienced in the first hui is dependent upon an environment where judgement is suspended. In other words, it requires an environment where the goal of discussion is not to demonstrate the inferiority, or superiority, of a particular rationality, but to create a learning atmosphere, where the stories of different participants can be conveyed. In contrast to the open atmosphere, the defence-and-attack atmosphere emerges where propositions are made and forcefully defended, in the anticipation of an attack.

The conclusion that can be drawn from these experiences is that conversation tends to ‘free-flow’ when judgement is suspended, whereas it stagnates and stalls in the presence of judgement. Creating an environment where judgement is suspended is dependent on the presence of individuals within hui that do not convey, or argue, for a particular rationality as a template for others to follow, but open spaces for the free expression of other participants. To carry oneself in a manner where judgement is suspended I refer to as a deportment-of-humility. This is because the practice of suspending judgement involves abstaining from ranking the viewpoints of other individuals into superior or inferior categories.

Conversely an individual carrying the deportment-of-judgement tends to argue that her or his particular template, or understanding, is the standard to which other ideas or viewpoints should be measured against, placing oneself on a superior footing. This in turn gives rise to the defence-and-attack atmosphere.

I contend that these deportments are general orientations that can occur in any group planning situation. The presence of the deportment-of-judgement can be discerned when an atmosphere of tension pervades a discussion, due to the ‘retrenching’ and ‘defensive positioning’ of
participants in response to a challenge.\textsuperscript{31} The presence of the *deportment-of-humility* can be discerned when an atmosphere of openness and free-flowing discussion is present. This atmosphere emerges in an environment of non-judgement. The two deportments, of humility and judgement are outlined in Figure Ten below.

**The experience of a third hui with Case Study One**

The third focus-group session provided me with an opportunity to test the propositions or substantive theory made above. The situation and environment within this third focus group changed considerably. The kaihautū from the second hui was far more resigned and had ceased arguing strongly for the whole group to pursue his development option as a community enterprise. Instead a cluster of interested farmers had formed around him to pursue the broad-acre development option. Similarly, the cluster group from the first hui continued to concentrate on subsistence farming and restoration.

Consequently, at the third hui recognition emerged that development options being pursued by different landowners constituted a polyculture, and that landowners with similar interests should cluster into different groups.\textsuperscript{32} Once there was recognition of the legitimacy of different viewpoints, an open atmosphere emerged throughout the rest of the session – with discussion resembling the first hui. This experience reinforced to me that a *deportment of judgement*, whereby an individual assumes a dominant posture, and challenges others to ‘defend’ their viewpoint will actually stifle free expression of other participants who may feel reluctant to engage when the *defence-and-attack atmosphere* is present.

---

\textsuperscript{31} I consider that a *defence-and-attack atmosphere* is most likely to arise in planning situations in which strongly differing viewpoints are held (particularly on controversial issues) leading to strong defensive positioning, or *deportments-of-judgement*.

\textsuperscript{32} I consider that this recognition may have been the result of my influence on the planning hui. At the beginning of this hui I read out the notes that had been taken during the first hui with the cluster group, and the second hui with the whole group, in order to ‘recap’ on everything that had been discussed so far. It was possible that my reading out the many goals of participants was understood as a form of recognition and support for the development goals particularly of the cluster group from hui one. This may have had the effect of placing the viewpoints of these participants on an equal footing with that of the Kaihautū from hui two.
Despite the different cluster interests emerging, plans for collective action within the group did emerge, which were designed to benefit all clusters. This included planning a café/shop to provide an outlet for farm produce and packing and storage sheds for export. These were facilities that all landowners, and cluster groups, considered they could benefit from. In this manner the function of the community group had become to put in place mechanisms to facilitate the autonomy of whānau and individual landowners, to achieve their own development goals, rather than as a means to create a singular approach to development in which all participants undertook collective action rationalised from a particular viewpoint.

**The experience of hui with Case Study Three**

My experience that a *deportment of judgement* gives rise to a *defence-and-attack atmosphere*, which stifles the emergence of an open conversation stream, was further substantiated by my experiences in Case Study Three. Case Study Three, as outlined in the methods chapter, was an Ahu Whenua Trust, which was established to manage land on behalf of communal land shareholders. I participated in two hui with this land trust.
My experience of the *defence-and-attack atmosphere* within this case study occurred in both hui. However, the experience described here is in relation to the first hui only. As with Case Study One, the hui began with a karakia that was undertaken by a leading figure, or *kaihautū*, who was a prominent Māori tribal leader. Initially, an open environment was present within the hui with participants freely expressing their future visions for the land, and expressing through story their past experiences and relationship to the land. However, the *kaihautū*, after the lengthy conversation that had occurred between other participants stated: ‘I don’t feel comfortable with the ideas so far.’ He considered that the land had been left in ‘*benign neglect*’\(^{33}\) for a number of years, and that a few more years would not matter much. He considered that more time was needed, and more consultation with shareholders, and *kaumātua* (elders), before any big decisions could be made. He suggested that land development could still be fifty years off. Although he was interested in hearing the ideas that participants had, he refrained from any support or commitment to the ideas.

The expression of judgement by the dominant individual (that he was not comfortable with the ideas expressed so far) caused the other participants to become silent. In other words it appeared that the *defence-and-attack atmosphere* had become present within the forum, once judgement had been expressed. The authority figure had the ‘final say’ over the suitability of the development visions expressed by other participants. As a result there was no natural free expression in conversation.

This confirmed to me that when figures within a hui carry a *deportment-of-judgement*, they create a situation where a standard is created to which other ideas or viewpoints should be measured against.\(^{34}\) This in turn gives rise to a *defence-and-attack atmosphere*. Without the presence of dominant figures with a *deportment-of-equality* an ‘open stream of conversation’ will fail to emerge, and in turn the trusting personal relationships required for the open expression of personal beliefs and intentions does not develop. It might be considered that authority figures, through this process, might become confined to acting only as facilitators not able to make substantive contributions to discussions. However, I do not think that this is

---

\(^{33}\) The reason why the neglect of the land had been benign was because significant portions of it had reverted to native forest in a region otherwise devoid of natural vegetation.

\(^{34}\) A *deportment-of-judgement* should not be equated with holding a strong or well-argued point of view, if that point of view is recognising, respecting and based on a solid understanding of the viewpoints of others.
the case. Although not experienced in the case studies from this research, I think that authority figures can make substantive contributions by providing visions and ideas that integrate, or encompass, the diverging perspectives of others. Furthermore, in *defence-and-attack atmospheres*, it may actually become necessary for authority figures to push a particular idea or direction that better fulfils needs, or encompasses the will of an entire community, than other ideas or approaches.

**The deportment of autonomy**

Through my experiences it became apparent that when exhibiting a *deportment-of-equality* an individual does not position herself as superior to others through judgement, but instead permits others to express and put into action their own goals and ambitions. In other words, she facilitates, endorses and encourages others to express their autonomy.

This became very apparent at the second hui within Case Study One, when the kaihautū, with a *deportment-of-judgement*, attempted to persuasively reason with landowners to abandon their own visions, and participate in the development vision of the kaihautū. When this occurred conversation stagnated and periods of silence resulted. As outlined previously the silence, and lack of free-and-open expression, are characteristics of the *defence-and-attack atmosphere*.

I concluded that the action of silent withdrawal is a practice that makes explicit a deportment that I refer to as *autonomy*. This is because the practice of withdrawing from a situation in which power is expressed, is also withdrawing from a process in which self-determination is threatened. The practice of withdrawing represents a tacit rejection of the control being imposed by a dominant rationality.

The *deportment-of-autonomy* was also made evident in practice through the manner in which the organic free-flow of discussion increased once the expression of control ceased. The enthusiasm expressed by participants appeared to be directly related to discussion of development options that were related to participants meeting their own visions and goals. Consequently, I concluded that the *deportment-of-autonomy* is identifiable through the following actions of participants:
• Withdraw from situations in which control is expressed over autonomy; and,
• Open participation in situations where control is withdrawn and self-determination of focus-group members is made central to discussion.

Through this experience, I learned, that asserting autonomy through tacit withdrawal can be an effective means of dealing with circumstances in which an individual, or group, seeks to establish a position of control. However, I also learned that it was possible to have autonomy, and be interdependent. This was demonstrated in Case Study One, in which plans for collective action at the community level were established, which respected and contributed to the autonomy and self-determination of each community member.

This situation also brought me to reflect upon traditional tribal structures. Many of the participants involved in the hui were from different hapū and whānau. I considered that there was significant resistance to subordinating the independence and autonomy of whānau and hapū to that of the collective iwi. It was also clear to me at the time that traditionally Māori possessed political autonomy at micro scales and that this could simply be a continuation of this tradition. Nonetheless, plans for collective action were generated, which were based upon the development of enabling infrastructure, such as a shop, that each autonomous ‘unit’ could contribute into. In this manner organisation at the regional scale emerged naturally from autonomy being expressed at micro scales. Consequently, it became apparent, that organisation was forming at an iwi scale only to the extent that it contributed to autonomy and freedom at hapū and whānau scales. Further this appeared to occur when a kaihautū was in place who encouraged the expression of autonomy and independence, yet sought to develop organising structures at an iwi scale to assist in this process.

The common learning narrative
I did not experience any polemic engagement, or battle for ‘supremacy between rationalities’ in any case-study group hui I participated within while researching this thesis.35 I only

---

35 However, I have had experiences in hui, outside my case-study groups, where polemic engagement occurs between different Kaihautū, in what might be termed a defence-and-attack atmosphere. This occurs when the authority figure has to defend their knowledge, construct and demonstrate through logical argument the superiority of their rationality.
experienced the withdrawal of participants when a *defence-and-attack atmosphere* emerged due to the presence of a dominant participant carrying a *deportment-of-judgement*.

However, I learned that just because critical engagement between rationalities did not occur, this did not mean that a critical consciousness was not growing within case-study groups, to better inform action to address the problem situations case-study groups faced. Instead, the critical engagement occurred tacitly through what I term the *common learning narrative*. To describe the *common learning narrative* the metaphor of a rope might be helpful. When a conversation begins in a group, it usually starts with some ideas or stories being expressed. For example the first hui with the cluster group from Case Study Two began with two participants outlining their plans for the future. These initial ideas might be thought of as the first strands of a rope.

As one story is told it inspires another story that shares a similar theme to that of the first. These new ideas stimulate again further stories and ideas, which together build new strands into the rope. The ideas are held together by common themes, given that one story tends to stimulate similar stories, although over time themes change. Sometimes ideas, or stories are given that do not quite fit with the conversation, and as a result they fail to gain the interest of the group, or traction, and therefore fail to become part of the emerging rope. That is, the narrative does not stimulate the flow of conversation.

Rather than openly criticising the idea, the idea is usually ‘passed over’ by the group or met with silence,\(^{36}\) and soon other ideas are ‘thrown in’ that work in the flow of discussion. The ideas ‘passed over’ may well fit into the discussion at a later point when the theme changes, and there is better fit. Through the discussion, as more ideas are contributed, a whole rope begins to emerge made of multiple, diverse, and entwined stories that follow along certain themes. Consequently, through discussion a ‘rope’, or *common learning narrative* emerges, that encapsulates the complexity of a particular situation.

\(^{36}\) An act of silence could also be a form of judgement or rebuttal of a point of view, demonstrating a coercive form of power. An individual expressing silence in this manner would be carrying a *deportment-of-judgement*. However, the silence expressed in a common learning narrative needs to be understood as a response to an idea that does not fit with the flow of the narrative, much like a sentence or paragraph that does not fit within the plot of a story, or a note or chord that does not fit in with a piece of music.
To provide an example of this a short section of a common learning narrative is provided in Table Seventeen below. The excerpt, chosen at random from a transcript, shows the points of discussion in chronological order. Each participant is represented by a different colour. The points of discussion that do not fit within the conversation, and are followed by silence, are outlined in the right-hand column.

In the example below the discussion begins with talk about establishing a nursery, which evolves into discussion about using native seedlings to ecologically restore land through landscaping. This discussion in turn evolves into talk about how to propagate and the collection and storage of seed. It then moves into a conversation about conserving existing forest remnants on land and getting school children involved in conservation practices. Talk about school children stimulates concern about the well being of children and how to make them responsible by developing their personalities through art and craft.

At this stage of the common learning narrative an attempt is made by a participant to change the topic of discussion to making information booklets for landowners on propagating potatoes. However, this attempt to change the common learning narrative is rejected by the group, and the topic of discussion is not changed and returns to discussion of how to develop children through developing characteristics outlined in Māori knowledge and folklore. However, directly after this excerpt of the common learning narrative, the topic does evolve to the propagating and growing of potatoes which Participant Five had raised.

This brief example demonstrates how the common learning narrative changes from idea to idea, linked via common themes. Ideas which do not quite fit within the narrative at a particular point in time are passed over. The common learning narrative over time enables a whole picture, or story to be uncovered, which permits participants to see where their particular idea does or does not fit. For example, it became apparent to the kaihautū in Case Study One, hui two, that the development option he was attempting to persuade the whole community to pursue did not correspond with the ‘big picture’ that was created when all research participants began telling stories of their own development visions. This was because the ‘big picture’ demonstrated to him that the development pathway of the community was a polyculture that did not correspond with his idea of the community pursuing a single development goal collectively.
## Table Seventeen: The common learning narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The common learning narrative</th>
<th>Idea passed over</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starting a nursery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to grow plants from seed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use plants to landscape own land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our family is good at propagating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many potato seeds do we have?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight tonnes?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We want to conserve <em>ngahere</em> (forest)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the school kids involved in conservation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are becoming mothers and fathers too young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They need help in becoming responsible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach them art and craft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moments of silence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Provide information booklet to landowners on how to propagate potatoes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and craft to stimulate the children’s personalities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kia ora</em> (agreement all round)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Papatūānuku</em> and <em>Ranginui</em># pried apart and gave rise to the seven characteristics of Māori – develop these characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three gifts of knowledge provided – develop this knowledge in children</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacredness of women – that young women know this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Moments of silence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Talk about growing potatoes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>He Whakatauākī</em> (a proverb) to encapsulate discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Your basket and my basket will embrace and build our people</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognise differences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each person has their own way of walking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need to recognise <em>Papatūānuku</em> (Earth Mother)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish our own nurseries to grow plants for <em>Papatūānuku</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurseries act as seed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Discussion moves onto the pragmatic issues of developing a nursery</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant One</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Two</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Three</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All eight participants together</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant Four</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant five</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Papatūānuku – earth mother

# Ranginui – sky father
However, the *common learning narrative* need not be idealised and, at one level could be seen as inefficient or even ineffective. Some ideas expressed that have been ‘passed over’, might be relevant and important to the whole picture. For example an individual in the second hui of Case Study One stressed the need for building a database that matched land use to land type. In other words, he considered it would be useful to establish a database that identified the characteristics of different land areas, including for example soil type, rainfall, sunshine hours, frost risk and average temperatures, to what can grow in the different conditions. These suggestions, despite their apparent relevance, did not gain and were not retained in the evolving narrative. The theme of discussion at the time was centred on developing enterprises that different landowners were interested in pursuing.

It was not until the fourth hui within Case Study One that all of the participants were at a stage to be able to understand the importance of a database. This was because discussion moved to adopting novel crops, and participants wanted to know whether or not different sorts of crops would grow on their land. It was at this stage that the relevance of knowing detailed land characteristics became realised, and its importance recognised. The participant who had mentioned the need for a database had already ‘thought out’ the situation in a way that other participants had not yet come to. However, once the rest of the participants had also gone through a learning process to see the ‘bigger picture’ they too saw the relevance of the idea. While seemingly inefficient in the short term, the evolving *common learning narrative* ensured that the idea was incorporated at a time when participants were most receptive.

This idea of flowing past an idea that is blocking the flow of conversation then coming back to it, when a deeper understanding has developed through following the *narrative learning stream* is demonstrated in the following quote by the kaihautū from hui one, Case Study One:

> ‘I think at the moment we have hit a brick wall, leave the wall and go forward, and then if we have to, we can go back.’

Instances where there is lack of receptivity can be frustrating, particularly when I personally had an idea that I believed to be crucial to the success of planning and implementing a particular enterprise, but I could not express it. In one particular case-study group, for example, I could see the desperate need for specialist assistance in developing an enterprise.
However, participants were not really receptive to this at the time. Consequently, this group decided to grow a particular crop without technical help. I was worried because the soil looked spent, and I thought it unlikely that the nitrogen-demanding crop would grow well. Although I did not want to interfere I convinced the farmers to get soil tests. They did this, and I then got a specialist from the University to interpret and present the results to the farmers. He advised them to apply a fine lime and fertiliser before sowing the crop. Ideally he felt that they should leave it for a year and green manure it. However, the group went ahead and sowed the crop without applying the lime or fertilisers. The crops failed, costing farmers a year’s income from those fields.

From a number of such experiences I surmised that some ideas will not fit into the *common narrative stream* until sufficient learning through direct experience has occurred. Or, in other words, receptivity to some ideas depends upon the picture having ‘grown’ in a way that allows the idea to be incorporated into practice. This can occur in hui, where an idea that has been ‘passed over’ earlier, is picked up later on. Conversely, the relevance of an idea may only be discovered after a particular experience, such as discovering the need for good technical assistance to reduce risk of failure. Finally, some ideas will not fit in at all because they simply do not correspond to the developing narrative.

I therefore concluded that a critical discussion is primarily a learning process in which understanding is continually broadened and deepened through an ongoing *common learning narrative*. I considered that many ideas, or knowledge constructs, that individuals have will simply not be understood within a community of interest until the stream of conversation has created a meaningful context for the ideas to ‘take root’. For example, there was no point in either the database, or specialist knowledge ideas, outlined previously, being argued for at the wrong point in the learning process. The learning needs to be in place before ideas can be accommodated. However, it can still be useful to express ideas, even at the wrong point in the narrative, given that the idea once expressed, can be picked-up later.

**The practice of scribing and reiterating the common learning narrative**

The *common learning narrative* is not just committed to the memory of participants, it is also commonly committed to paper, or written down. During this research with case-study groups I was typically placed in the position of scribing or taking notes of the discussion within hui. The conversation points, or notes, were written down according to the manner in which
participants described their ideas and stories. At different stages during hui, or at the end of the hui, the ideas conveyed would be reiterated. Likewise at the beginning of a following hui, the notes taken in the former hui would be reiterated, to reposition the common learning narrative from where it had last finished.

I surmised that overall it is important for somebody within the group to be taking notes, in order to continually reiterate what has been discussed, and to describe the overall sequence and flow of conversation. This not only provides the role of ‘imprinting’ the common learning narrative but also creates a history that can be used to re-position future discussion.

**The deportment-of-pragmatism**

A third deportment that was central to building the critical nature and quality of the common learning narrative was the deportment-of-pragmatism. To illustrate this deportment it is necessary to make a distinction between those who performed ‘visionary functions’ within hui, and those who attempted to ground the common learning narrative in pragmatic experiences. The following narrative concerning experiences from all case-study groups is used to perform this function.

**Experience of the deportment of pragmatism**

Within Case Study Two, I attended four planning hui. In the third and fourth hui a large change occurred in the planning hui – the number of participants increased from 18 in the second hui, to around 60 in the third hui, and 80 in the fourth hui. The reason that these numbers grew so much was that three specialists were brought in to run farming workshops with the group, in conjunction with each hui. The decision to bring in the specialists was made by the case-study group – although I had made the suggestion. The combination of specialists included; one scientist from Lincoln University specialising in organic agriculture, one highly successful organic grower specialising in high-value, niche market crops, and one specialist in Māori land development (from Case Study One). I requested each of them run workshops that provided practical advice on sustainable farming. I also requested that they provide, from their own experience, success and failure stories, based on the knowledge they possessed.
The presence of these specialists brought out some individuals who I had not met, but who knew of me and had been kept abreast of the planning hui from a distance by others who had attended. It also brought out those individuals who had been more sporadically involved, and less committed to planning throughout the first hui. They wanted to talk to the specialists and get feedback and advice on problems and difficulties that they had been experiencing. The specialists provided them with pragmatic advice that could be applied in their day-to-day operations to solve problems.

It became clear to me that these individuals preferred to concentrate their efforts on problems that were at hand (such as dealing with a pest or soil fertility) rather than on development and planning. This was evidenced in the contribution they made to planning hui three and four. Rather than the broad, long-term visions and aspirations of the previous focus groups, the ‘at hand’ issues and problems came to the fore, such as how to obtain development capital and how to get hold of technical help. In other words there was an aversion toward the planning process of imagining new futures, scenarios and situations that remained ‘in the imagination’, or were too dependent upon significant obstacles being overcome (such as obtaining development capital) to be achieved with any certainty. Instead those issues that needed immediate attention, and could be easily solved, were focussed upon.

The focus on what is ‘at hand’ by these new participants within the third and fourth hui of Case Study Two may be referred to as the deportment-of-pragmatism. The pragmatists in this case study brought the focus of development planning onto the ‘nuts and bolts’, of development, bringing the ‘common learning narrative’ into the ‘immediate’. Pragmatism complemented the imagined new futures, and idealism, of earlier hui that were characterised by individuals attempting to create new futures to address deep and problematic social issues surrounding Māori identity, health and wellbeing.

In the same manner within Case Study One, the whānau (family) was being led by an individual that was not particularly concerned with the details, but was focussed on a broad, strategic development for the whānau. This individual was the prime driver behind the development – the kaihautū. Conversely, his two tēina (younger brothers) were very much pragmatically oriented concentrating on ‘hands-on’ issues and, in particular, development options that could be established given current resources. In Case Studies Four, Five, Six and Seven similar narratives describing the separation between pragmatists and visionaries also
existed. However, it would be repetitive to provide further narratives illustrating the same principle and phenomenon.

**Reflection on the experience of the deportment-of-pragmatism**

The *deportment-of-pragmatism* makes itself known in planning focus groups through a concentration on steering the *learning conversation stream* onto ‘at-hand’ issues faced by individuals and whānau. Its value is that it provides a ‘safety guard’ against the *common learning narrative* focussing only on ideals and visions, that cannot be realistically reached without first focussing on the ‘nuts and bolts’ of development. Or, in other words, it grounds the visions with the practical day-to-day realities of what is actually necessary to bring development goals into fruition.

Additionally, pragmatists showed relatively short time horizons and focussed on immediate constraints. Conversely, those with a vision-focus possessed long time horizons, but did not offer the practical stepping stones for reach the vision. Furthermore the visionaries had a future picture of how various parts should fit together. For example, the visionary might imagine the community working together to establish a common storage, loading, packaging and sales area for organic produce. However, the practicalities of completing such a project were not well understood. I concluded that planning required the synergy of both pragmatists and visionaries.

**The deportment-of-trust-building**

The focus of this section of the chapter is to outline the *deportment-of-trust-building*, which is used by case-study groups to develop a relationship with an ‘outsider’. This section is based on my own experiences as an ‘outsider’ working alongside Māori landowners in achieving their objectives. The initial focus of this section is on the point of first contact. That is when I first meet a case-study group and the resulting social dynamics at play between ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’.

When I first engaged in research within a Māori context, I experienced a combination of three phenomena. First, unsurprisingly as an outsider with a Pākehā appearance, I was subject to challenges. I considered this was because I was viewed as a potential threat, or an individual
who possessed the potential to exploit the community in question. Second, I was engaged with and worked with on the basis that I possessed skills or other resources that could be utilised by the community concerned. Third, I was treated with hospitality. This combination of challenge, hospitality and pragmatic engagement changed over time as trust was built, with fewer challenges occurring, and hospitality increasing. The combinations and changes in these three practices I consider constitute the deportment-of-trust-building – a knowledge-in-cultural-practice.

In the following section a selection of narratives is provided from throughout case studies to build and generate a picture of the social dynamics underpinning the deportment-of-trust-building. Following each narrative an account is given of the nature of the social dynamics at play within the narrative.

**The experience of meeting a case study**

In my first hui with Case Study One I entered the wharenui, or meeting house, on the marae with one of the trust members who had invited me along to their hui. I found that a number of members from the trust had already arrived. A number of tables had been brought together and organised into a line within the building. In an outbuilding the wharekai food was being prepared for after the meeting.

When the meeting began there were approximately 25 people seated around the tables. I sat down with the trust member who had invited me along. When the meeting started I was asked to stand and talk about my research and about what I wanted to do with the group. I outlined what my research involved. The response from the Trust members was mixed between those expressing interest, and those opposed.

After explaining what I wanted to do I was asked two related questions;

1. ‘What are you doing about intellectual property?’
2. ‘How do we know that the University is not going to get our knowledge and make money out of it?’

I replied that I did not think that this would happen, but that the most I could do was to ensure that all of the data I used, remained in their ownership. I was also asked another question:

3. ‘What do you want to find out from working with us?’
I said I did not quite know at this stage, but that generally I was attempting to find out what was involved in successful Māori land development. In response, a number of individuals rejected the notion of any outside interference and suggested that they would prefer to do everything themselves. The general consensus on my involvement was negative.

The trustee who brought me along to the hui tried to argue the benefits of having me participate, outlining that I possessed skills that could assist them in writing the action plan that they were intending to draft. Others in the group also stated that they thought such a plan was needed and would be a good idea. It was at this stage that the committee members were in a stalemate. The question of my involvement was then given to an Elder, a Kuia, in her 80s. She said in effect that she could see more benefit from my working with them. After this support a motion was soon passed that I would develop an action plan with the trust.

Following the meeting lunch had been prepared consisting of much of the produce that the trust members had grown. A number of trust members came and talked to me about what I was doing and wanted to know more about farming and horticulture. Simultaneously my plate was being continually topped-up with food. Two apologised to me for the challenge I got at my reception, explaining to me that that was the way ‘Māoris are.’ I explained that I was not offended and had anticipated as much.

**Reflection on experience**

The initial experience of meeting with Case Study One outlined above demonstrates the duality of my experience. On the one hand there was warmth and sincerity expressed toward me through the expression of manaaki. On the other hand there was a sense of hostility and mistrust of my motives and reason for entering into the group.

The duality resulted in me being placed in an ‘in-between world’ where pressure was generated from being both trusted and mistrusted, as well as being accepted and not accepted, at the same time. As outlined, these opposing pressures created an unsettled feeling. First, the manaaki or emotional warmth, gives rise to a desire to return the hospitality received and a sense of inclusion, while simultaneously the hostility gives rise to defensiveness and self-consciousness regarding my intentions.
At the time I could not see any good reason to be excluded, or treated with hostility. However, it became apparent that there are good reasons for mistrust and, in particular, the vulnerability Māori communities can feel from the involvement of outsiders. This is illustrated in the following narrative.

The experience of Māori community exploitation
After I had been working with the case study for approximately six months, which involved a number of extended visits and planning hui, the landowners decided that capacity building, in terms of increased skill in farming practice, was absolutely essential for assisting landowners in achieving their goals. It was determined that the optimal strategy would be to establish a relationship with an education institution, and set up horticulture and agriculture courses on the actual land of the different participating whānau. This would provide a hands-on learning experience within the comfort of the local environment. Further, we anticipated that the course would be tailored to meet the needs of the case-study group.

Through my assistance a relationship was established between an education institution and the case-study group. The idea was that an education course would be established and co-managed between the group and the institution. Unfortunately, the partnership was never established. This was because it was discovered that the primary contact within the institution had used the name of the group in a research funding application without permission. Of course this would not have been a problem if the application had been written with the group, and designed to access funds to assist them in achieving their goals. However, this was not the case with the research funding application being written in an area only marginally relevant to the needs of the group concerned. The individual from the institution who wrote the funding application did manage to secure the research funds and did arrive in the community to undertake research. A level of resentment from the event was evidenced when a research participant suggested that the researcher was ‘coming for his lolly scramble’.

The reason for incorporating the name of the community group into a research funding application was to meet government policy requirements that research money deliver benefits to Māori. Demonstrating good relationships, contacts and benefits to ‘end-user’ Māori

---

37 A lolly scramble is a game in New Zealand, usually played at birthday parties, where handfuls of lollies (candy) are thrown into the air, and children scramble to get the lollies.
communities greatly enhances the likelihood of success for a research bid. Consequently, the education institution had used the relationship I had developed with the group in an attempt to gain research funds. Because of this incident the group broke contact with the institution. Additionally, the trust I had developed with my case-study group was negatively impacted because I had established the relationship with the institution and encouraged them to trust the individual concerned.

Reflection on experience
Similar stories to that outlined above occurred to me on three different occasions during this research, and demonstrates that Māori communities are vulnerable to exploitation. Often this exploitation is subtle, such as the example above. However, the impact on Māori communities of being used to further the interests of individuals and institutions, without meeting the interests and needs of Māori communities, cannot be underestimated. The metaphor of the lolly scramble encapsulates the sense of paternalism when a ‘parent’, in this case an academic, arrives with research funds to invest, which in turn introduces a ‘scramble’ and competition among the community members to gain advantage. The obvious effect is to create divisiveness within the community. It became apparent to me that because of the prevalence of this type of phenomenon it was inevitable that I was going to be seen as someone with something to be taken advantage of. This is outlined in the narratives below.

Meeting with Case Study Five
I met with the kaihautū (Paul) of Case Study Five at the rūnanga (tribal authority) office. He did not say very much. His niece had organised the meeting with the intention of getting Paul some support for improving his farm. His daughters were also there. I explained the research to Paul and its focus on sustainability, planning, and development. After I had finished Paul said, ‘well what we really need is money, we know what we want to do.’ Consequently, it became apparent to me that what the meeting was about from Paul’s perspective was to get access to cash that could be used to develop their farm. After I had developed a good relationship with Paul and the whānau, he later explained to me that during this initial encounter he had ‘felt like a beggar’.

It was not long after this hui that Paul came with me on a trip to meet a new potential case study. I had already sent information to the kaumātua (elder) we were going to visit, regarding the nature of the research and what it intended to achieve. We arrived at the rūnaka (tribal
authority) office, where we needed to wait to meet with the kaumātua, because he was occupied with other business. After waiting for a short while he came into the wharekai or dining room, where we were waiting and said: ‘So, where’s the money?’ Consequently, once again, the kaumātua was primarily interested in obtaining cash to develop his farm.

A further example to illustrate the phenomenon occurred very early on in my research, when I was attending a hui in which a kaihautū from one of the case-study groups was speaking. During his mihi (speech) he pointed me out of the crowd and said, ‘that is John Reid, he has come to bring us money’. This example, along those outlined previously, all demonstrate how I was thought of as someone, coming from a government institution (in this case a University) and as such was likely to have financial assets under my control that I could dispense. Overall, this suggested to me that someone like me turning up in the community usually involved someone wanting something, and in turn the community leaders had learned to respond by asking what was going to be given? And if anything was going to be given then cash would be preferred.

**Reflection on the experiences**

I reflected on these experiences with my supervisory team, and in particular with Wade – the Māori development advisor in the team. He had attended the hui where I was picked out of the crowd and identified as an individual ‘that could bring money’. From his experience, he considered that the rationale underpinning the statement was the belief that the only thing holding back the community was lack of access to financial resources. In other words, the community did not require specialist skills or knowledge.

Wade’s prediction was that this attitude would lead to future failures in the community, given that specialist skills were not being adequately appreciated. His prediction unfortunately proved correct, when, as outlined previously, a group of farmers from the community sowed a crop despite the evidence presented that it was not fit to carry the crop. This project was led by the community kaihautū aforementioned.

**The experience of manaaki**

Despite some of my challenging experiences, I also experienced considerable hospitality. My experiences of being treated with hospitality, dignity and respect grew throughout the
research, as relationships developed and trust built. One of the first experiences of manaaki can be explained through my work with Case Study One. When I first met with this case study I was asked by Wade (the kaihautū – or individual leading the development) to assist his whānau in putting together a sustainable development plan. He insisted that I be paid to undertake work with his whānau, although the Whānau Trust did not have any funds of significance. The kaihautū said that I had a young family who needed support and that he did not expect something for nothing. He organised a meeting with agents from the Ministry of Māori Development, or Te Puni Kōkiri, who submitted a funding application to central office on our behalf. Through this application the whānau received funding to pay for me to articulate their development plans, and bring in outside specialists to assist on technical issues.

This payment was not the only manaaki I received from this whānau. I was also gifted many other things which are outlined in the table below, in the third row concerning Case Study Two. According to Wade the mana (standing and respect) of his whānau was dependent upon treating manuhiri with ‘due regard’. He considered that it was only through ‘the manaaki and tiaki’ of visitors that he considered that ‘his own mana’ and that of ‘his whānau’ could ‘be affirmed’.

Being treated in this manner was a common thread in six out of seven of my Case Studies. This was primarily represented in the gifting of mahinga kai, and ensuring that all my needs were met while staying or visiting. All of the experiences of manaaki would take too long to communicate, consequently the gifts I received from different Case Studies are outlined in Table Eighteen below as a demonstration.
Reflection on the duality of hospitality versus challenge

It became apparent that the different actions of challenge and hospitality formulate the *deportment-of-trust-building*. I found that the challenge and hostility I experienced when first entering may be considered a ‘defensive wall’ erected until the honesty and integrity of a character could be discerned through experience. Conversely, the hospitality (manaaki) component increased as friendships and relationships developed.

Metaphorically, the challenge and hospitality deportments correspond to the pōwhiri, which is formally practised when manuhiri are being welcomed onto a marae. The pōwhiri begins with challenging the guest’s intentions, which is followed by speeches and eventually a shared meal. I consider that these symbolic practices also run through the day-to-day practice of case-study groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Eighteen: Examples of <em>manaaki</em> received from Case-study groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Gifts Offered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Bed and breakfast at hotel on one occasion, and three occasions accommodated by landowners on marae. This involved being fed very well on local produce during each marae stay, which included crayfish, fish, kumara and riwai. Further food to take home was provided such as cakes and crayfish. Multiple invitations were provided for me to bring my family to stay on Māori land at local beaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Accommodation in local motel was provided as well as being accommodated in research participant homes. At meal time home grown and locally harvested cuisine was provided including <em>kahawai</em> snapper, <em>kumara</em> and <em>riwai</em>. A 4WD-trip combined with fishing trips was also organised. Further invitations were provided to me to bring my family to stay in the <em>whānau</em> bach when on holiday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>No gifts offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>I was accommodated in research participants home and provided with plenty of food, which included large quantities of delicacies such as whitebait, crayfish, mussels, fish, game (including wild deer, sheep and pig). Further, plenty of food to take home was provided including venison and whitebait.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Continually provided with plenty of food. Over a six month period I was gifted the following items: 3kg of home culled bacon, two legs of wild pork, 2kg of wild venison mince, mutton birds and two hogget legs. Further, an open invitation was provided to bring family to visit and stay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six</td>
<td>Large meals and hospitality were provided while visiting. A trip up to a local tourist site was provided and <em>riwai</em> were often provided as gifts to take home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven</td>
<td>Excellent hospitality while staying.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The challenge, exchange and hospitality deportments are clearly discernable within Table Nineteen below, which is an excerpt from the sustainable development plan I drafted articulating the development strategy of Case Study Two. Table Nineteen was developed with the assistance of Wade, and clarifies the manner in which a whānau determined they would engage with outsider institutions to assist in their development. Wade and his whānau had had significant experience in working with government agencies on behalf of their iwi and used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table Nineteen: Process of engagement with an institution (Case Study Two)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Prior to engaging with institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that the whānau knows its vision, its aims and objectives (where it is going and how it wants to get there)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure it knows exactly what it needs from the institution to assist in achieving its vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Engagement with the institution</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensure that a hui is conducted on the whenua (land) of the whānau (if at all possible) with dignity (i.e. institution representatives as manuwhiri (honoured guests))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify and work with individuals within institutions who are sensitive to the needs of the whānau, and who we can relate to well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Think of the institution as contracted to supply needs as a public service according to the terms and conditions of the whānau. In other words it is being contracted by the whānau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be explicit to the institution about what is needed to meet the aims and objectives of the whānau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• If the institution is not permitting the whānau to be in control of the process be prepared to walk away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Willingness of the institution to learn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Also be prepared to walk away if the institution or its representatives are not willing to learn and grow through their work with the whānau. The institutions and its agents should demonstrate modesty in this manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The institution should be willing to learn the Whānau Trust kaupapa (philosophy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The institution should know its own kaupapa and be willing to talk about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Work with the institution for an ongoing relationship</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build personal relationships with institution representatives whom you find to be modest and with whom you work well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be modest and willing to learn from technical expertise from within the institution to build a learning partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build a development team that can help the whānau meet its aims and objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The whānau must recognise its role to tuakana (nurture) and be tēina (responsible)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The whānau should ensure that it is tika (rightful) and pono (truthful) with the manner in which it deals with outsiders to ensure that its mana (respect) is maintained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
this as a chance to articulate the process they used for engagement. It is demonstrated in the table that the whānau saw institutions, such as government agencies, as useful assets that could be harnessed to provide the whānau with the skills, resources and knowledge they needed.

Clearly, the whānau saw it as their duty to treat the institutional representatives with manaaki. In addition they demonstrated the need for reciprocal learning and modesty to learn. Nevertheless, a cautious approach is indicated when developing relationships with outside institutions as they can potentially represent a threat. The threat is primarily seen as the whānau being dominated and controlled by the institution that may arrive with its own kaupapa (philosophy) and impose this upon the whānau.

Overall, Table Nineteen above outlines the themes of challenge and hospitality, which involve a cautious process of building the trust necessary to establish reciprocal learning relationships between Māori communities and ‘outsiders’. The practices of challenge and hospitality that characterise and constitute the deportment-of-trust-building.

Conclusion

Together the deportments, outlined within this chapter, provide the underlying conditions in which a critical inquiry process can be conducted to identify and take actions to solve problematic issues experienced by Māori landowners. First, the deportment-of-humility, when expressed by a kaihautū, and other central figures, creates conditions for open and critical discussion. In practice this is represented in a lively common learning narrative created by an environment where judgement is suspended, and individuals are supported and encouraged to express their selves.

The medium of expression is the narrative which permits participants to tell stories regarding their past actions, and consequence of actions. Further, it provides a mechanism to communicate proposed future actions, and the intended outcomes of those actions. The storytelling, much like a novel, follows the themes of the common learning narrative, which continually builds a richer and more complex story. This enables narrow perspectives and understandings to be continually transcended. However, group learning takes time, given that
the ideas (or proposed future actions expressed by some participants) cannot ‘take root’, until the common learning narrative has established a meaningful context for the ideas to be accommodated. Scribing provides the function of ‘imprinting’ the common learning narrative through reiteration, and also records the history of the narrative that can be used to re-position future discussion.

By contrast, in an environment where a deportment-of-judgement is expressed by a kaihautū or leading figure, participants become ‘cornered’ giving rise to a defence-and-attack atmosphere, in which withdrawal from the planning process occurs. In this circumstance the rationality of a leading figure can dominate discussions, and challenge other individuals to critically argue and defend their own rationality. Withdrawal from the planning process is a deportment-of-autonomy, in which an individual ceases to engage in an environment where power is being expressed.

When a common learning narrative flows through hui common themes emerge, as stories communicating the problems and actions to overcome problems, experienced by one participant, stimulate the expression of similar stories by other participants. Consequently, discussion themes regarding problems, and actions to overcome problems, organically emerge. For example, in Case Study One, hui one, all participants told stories about the loss of ngahere (native forest) on their land, and their desire to restore gully areas to improve the health of waterways. This generated discussion regarding how participants could take collective action, to overcome this challenge. It was determined that working together to gather native seeds, running workshops on propagating seedlings, and sharing the costs of establishing nurseries would assist each landowner to ecologically restore land.

It was identified that the presence of pragmatic participants was important to ensure that the visions and goals of participants remained grounded. The deportment-of-pragmatism provides the function of grounding the common learning narrative by binding participants to the ‘at-hand’ problems and issues in day-to-day reality. The pragmatic focus inhibits ‘fantastical idealism’ and assists in defining the practical step-by-step processes and mechanisms required to achieve lofty visions.

Finally, the deportment-of-trust-building provides a means for a community of interest to build relationships with outsiders who may contribute important knowledge into a common
learning narrative. The challenge component of this deportment brings ‘outsiders’ to question their own motivations and provides distance and space for community members to determine the trustworthiness of unknown characters. The hospitality component assists in developing close learning relationships with ‘outsiders’, by bringing them into relationships and personal ties with the community concerned.
CHAPTER NINE: The Development Goals of Aspiring Owners

Introduction

It was outlined in Chapter Seven that a development plan was completed for each case-study group that articulated development goals. This chapter begins by discussing how the development goals of case-study groups were remarkably similar, which permitted a straightforward coding process to occur that categorised the goals of case-study groups sequentially under three themes. The chapter then provides three sections to discuss and illustrate each theme in detail through case study examples.

In the first section examples are provided from different case studies to illustrate the need of landowners to establish a mandate for ongoing management decisions on communal tenure land. In the second section, the different strategies explored by case-study groups for enhancing the mauri of ngā taonga katoa (or increasing the life supporting capacity of the land) are outlined. The third section outlines the motivations of Māori landowners to provide the conditions necessary for whānau (families) to return to the land through the formation of nohoanga kāinga (a contemporary Māori village). Finally, the fourth section explores the Māori values underpinning and motivating the development strategies employed by landowners.
Coding the development plans

As outlined in Chapter Six, a development plan was completed for each case-study group participating in this research and was produced through a series of hui conducted by the case-study group. These development plans provided a platform for identifying the common passions, interests and intentions of landowners. Rather than providing the details of each plan within this thesis, I considered that the best approach would be to provide a summary table of development goals, so that aspirations and intentions of each case study could be viewed at a glance. Through undertaking this process I could answer my first research question by identifying the development goals of case-study groups.

The process for coding the plans, or grouping the goals, was fairly straightforward. Each plan articulated the primary interests and goals of the Trust, landowners, or delegated managers. I considered that the goals expressed clustered into five key categories. First, all case-study groups had a number of goals that came under the title of what I considered to be ecological restoration, whereby there was a strong interest to improve the health of the land, forests and waterways. Second, all case-study groups had a strong interest in exploring commercial development options on the land, which might include horticulture or pastoral farming. Third, all case-study groups were interested in what might be termed non-market production, or growing foods and fibres to feed and house whānau, build community, and provide material to maintain traditional cultural practices. Fourth, all case-study groups were interested in ensuring that a secure mandate was present for land management – to avoid the common conflicts associated with communal tenure. Fifth, all case-study groups wanted whānau connected to the land to return to it.

At first, when I viewed these five main goals, I did not see that they were sequential, or that some goals needed to be achieved before others. In order for case studies to implement commercial, restoration, and non-market development options on their land they would need to have in place stable decision-making structures. Without this structure in place it would be impossible for development on the land to be navigated, given that there would be no capacity or mandate for decisions to be made. Consequently, I coded the first ‘main category’, ‘establishing a mandate for ongoing management rights over communal tenure land’ – a goal that needed to be achieved before other goals could be achieved.
Second, case-study groups all outlined that the return of whānau to the land would require restoration, commercial and non-market development work, to meet the needs of families moving to remote rural areas, including for example housing and employment. Consequently it became apparent that putting the restoration, commercial and non-market development platforms in place would be required before the goal bringing whānau back to the land could be achieved. As a result I coded the three development platforms, which were aimed at increasing the productive capacity of the land in a general sense, under a second main category – ‘to enhance the mauri of ngā taonga katoa’. This category appeared to capture the essence of what case-study groups were trying to achieve, which was to increase the energy, vitality and life producing potential of the land – to provide for those who might want to return. Finally, I placed the aspirations of case-study groups to ‘encourage whānau to return to their ancestral land’ as the final main goal, which was dependent upon the two former goals being reached before it could be reached.

The goals of case-study groups were therefore coded under three main categories which are outlined below:

1. To build security of tenure and establish mandate to make ongoing management decisions;
2. To enhance the mauri of ngā taonga katoa; and
3. To encourage whānau to return to their ancestral land.

It also needs to be mentioned that the three development goals under the main goal of ‘to enhance the mauri of ngā taonga katoa’ were considered of equal importance by case-study groups. Commercial development, for example, was not placed in a superior position to ecological restoration. This suggested a strong emphasis on balanced and sustainable development. Nonetheless, as will be illustrated in the coming chapters, emphasis was placed on commercial development in some cases due to external circumstances.

It also needs to be outlined that the three development goals under the main goal of ‘to enhance the mauri of ngā taonga katoa’ also had multiple sub-goals under each. For example, under the sub goal of ‘maintaining and expanding cash income from the market economy’ case-study groups outlined multiple development options they wished to pursue including; pastoral farming, intensive horticultural in multiple forms, and value-added industry. Within summary Table Twenty these different development options under each sub-goal appear in the order of priority that case-study groups gave each option within their development plans.
So this gives a direct idea of where case-study groups wished to place their priorities. Detailed discussion regarding of the development goals pursued by case-study groups is provided in the rest of this chapter.

1. Establishing a mandate for ongoing management rights over communal tenure land

With all case-study groups the first, and probably most significant, development goal was establishing a mandate for ongoing management rights over communal tenure land. The need to establish a mandate is brought about through communal ownership arrangements in which a single mandate, or voice, regarding the management of land is difficult to establish due to conflicting interests. Without a consensus plan for action among landowners, Māori land is likely to be either left in ‘benign neglect’ as in Case Study Three, or over exploited as in Case Study Four. The ability of case-study groups to establish development goals and achieve sustainability on Māori land is dependent upon building security of tenure and establishing a mandate for the use and management of Māori land. Below, a number of examples are provided from case studies to illustrate the challenges experienced by case-study groups in regard to communal tenure and the strategies employed to overcome these challenges.

Case Study Three

Case Study Three consisted of four elected trustees of an Ahu Whenua Trust administering ninety-nine hectares of Māori communal tenure land split into two blocks. The land shareholders descend from a common ancestor that received individual title in the 19th century. The shareholders now number in the hundreds. There are two shareholders in the block with significant interests in the land, each possessing a number of hectares, one of which has over 20, or one fifth of the land shares. The land administered by the Trust on behalf of shareholders is currently leased to a local farmer who is neither a land shareholder, nor related to the whānau. The money from the lease is used to pay rates and a small dividend to land shareholders.

The Trustees outlined the difficulties that they had had over the years in getting any sort of consensus to develop the land from their shareholders during their annual meetings, giving rise to a degree of fatalism. As one shareholder said ‘little development has occurred on the
land in 150 years, and another few years won’t make much difference’. The positive side to the inaction of the Trust was pointed out by one of the Trustees in that minimal land development in the last 30 years had created a lone forest area and wildlife sanctuary, in a place otherwise devoid of original and natural vegetative cover. This was referred to as ‘benign neglect’. It became a clear goal of the trust to protect this wildlife sanctuary by establishing it as a Reservation to be conserved for its natural values.

The Trust was acutely aware during planning hui that any development options that they decided upon for the land must adequately deal with the competing interests among shareholders regarding the distribution of benefits from development. The Trust anticipated difficulties in obtaining agreement on any form of land use in which one shareholder would be seen to obtain more benefits than others. For example, a young Māori man (a land shareholder) approached the Trust after finishing a course in horticulture to use a small section of the land for a commercial venture in edible fungi. The development option was small scale and low impact, using the natural resources existing on the land. The Trust could not make a decision on whether the enterprise should be promoted with the land shareholders. Difficulties could be seen in one individual gaining benefit from a limited resource shared by a number of others.

**Case Study Four**

Case Study Four concerns a large area of highly marginal Māori land in a number of blocks that are a mixture of partially developed pasture, used for dairy run-off over the winter, and highly disturbed (through clear fell harvesting) indigenous forest. The land is administered on behalf of Māori land shareholders by the Māori Trustee. The blocks are currently leased by a whānau with significant shares in the block, although they do not possess a shareholder majority. The whānau are the last of the Tangata Whenua living in the local rohe (tribal area), with other tribal members having moved away over the last fifty years in search of employment to towns and cities. The whānau has liaised with the Māori Trustee communicating the development work they are doing on the land.

Like other case-study groups, this whānau desired to increase their security of tenure. Because the whānau is not a majority shareholder within the block they lease, they do not have control over decision-making among land shareholders. However, they do possess a degree of mana (respect) for having maintained a presence in the area, and on the land, for a number of
generations. This whānau felt that they have little security of tenure. This is because their land lease comes up for revision and renewal by the Māori Trustee every five years. The Māori Trustee has the option of opening the lease to tender at this time, which is a disincentive for long-term planning.

The whānau suggested that insecurity of tenure had so far discouraged capital investment in the land. The was because any capital investment, such as investing in fencing and pasture renewal, would increase the value of the land, and in turn lead to an increase in lease payments, when the lease came up for renewal. This is because the Māori Trustee is obliged, by law, to gain market rentals for Māori land at the renewal of a lease. The whānau was afraid that if the land value increased, the lease for the land would become subject to an open tendering process. If, for example, the whānau invested heavily in fencing and pasture development then it would be likely that the lease, when opened for tender, would be lost to an individual, such as a local dairy farmer, who could afford to pay more for the lease than the whānau.

The other problem, expressed by the whānau, with their tenure arrangements, was that many of the land shareholders (that they were required to report back to at annual meetings chaired by the Māori Trustee) were not familiar with farming or running a business. Misunderstandings often emerged between the whānau and land shareholders regarding the costs and expertise involved in undertaking a farming enterprise. Shareholders only tended to look at turnover of the operations rather than seeing how marginal the enterprises actually were when costs were fully taken into account. Furthermore, the whānau felt continual pressure from the Māori Trustee to extract as much dividend from the land as possible, without considering the requirement to invest development capital back into the land blocks.

As a result, the whānau suggested that they needed to secure longer-term leases, say 20 to 25 years, which would provide an incentive to significantly invest in, and develop the whenua. However, this was considered difficult by the whānau because of the challenges of getting landowners and the Māori Trustee to agree to this. A strategy that developed, during a whānau hui, for improving tenure security, was to provide the Māori Trustee and land shareholders with a 25-year development plan for the whenua at the annual general meeting. The plan would articulate a vision of how the land might be developed, and how the development might benefit all land shareholders. By establishing a set of milestones into the future the
shareholders and Māori Trustee could then monitor how the plan was being implemented and whether the desired outcomes were being achieved. The whānau would then be viewed as leading the development in which all shareholders could participate. It was suggested by the whānau that it would be a balancing act to ensure the whānau met their goals, while the land shareholders would also have their own goals met. The other strategy thought of by the whānau was to buy out other land shareholders to obtain a majority. In the short term, at least, this was considered financially unfeasible.

The whānau members suggested that rivalry and jealousy tended to crop up among shareholders. Some shareholders were considered by the whānau to be envious that they were making livelihoods out of using the land, whereas they were not. In practical terms the whānau are the only land shareholders capable of working the land, because they are the only ones left in the locality. Consequently, if the leases for the land blocks were not given to the whānau, then the development of the land would be the responsibility of local individuals who were not Tangata Whenua (people of the land), which would mean that individuals without a relationship to the land as Tangata Whenua would be making livelihoods out of the land rather than the whānau. However, the whānau suggested that many land shareholders would prefer to see this happen, so that the whānau would not benefit from the land more than any other land shareholder.

A side issue affecting the tenure security of the whānau, concerned a local Pākehā tradition of grazing Māori land blocks without permission. The whānau suggested that the local community considered Māori land blocks to essentially represent public commons, which could be used to graze cattle. Community members with this rationality were found by the whānau to be constantly utilising the land for grazing. This led the whānau to erect fences to keep out free-ranging cattle. However, the whānau said that they had to deal with constant fence cutting by locals still wanting to retain their access to Māori land for grazing. Nonetheless this practice of cutting fences, the whānau suggested, had now reduced because the local community became aware that the lands were not commons.

One whānau member suggested that the whole land tenure arrangement, in their terms, was forcing them to ‘rape the land’, because there was no incentive to invest resources back into the whenua, which they would like to do. The strategy decided upon by the whānau to maintain and increase their land tenure security was to continue doing what they had been
doing for the last 20 years of leasing the land. This strategy involved developing the land only to the extent that the land value would not increase to the level that they could no longer afford to lease it. The plan was to continue making use of the resources of the land to provide livelihoods, but not invest so much capital back into the land so as to lose the lease.

Unfortunately, the whānau failed to keep to their strategy and invested slightly too much in a land block. The whānau invested approximately $30,000 in roads and fences in one area of land, to run dry dairy cows during the winter. This raised the land value to such an extent that the Māori Trustee did not automatically renew their lease at the end of their five-year tenure period, but instead put in place an open tendering process. A local dairy farmer, with more resources than the whānau, secured a five-year lease for the land. Ironically, if they had not developed the land the dairy farmer would not be interested in leasing.

**Case Study Five**

This case study concerns a 360-hectare block of Māori land administered by an Ahu Whenua Trust. The Ahu Whenua Trust was established in 2002 to improve governance, provide a representative structure for the land shareholders and remove the influence of the Māori Trustee – which was deemed to be negative by landowners. The distinguishing feature of this block of land is that one whānau (extended family) possesses a controlling shareholding within the trust, with approximately 60% of the land shares. After the establishment of the Ahu Whenua Trust, the Trust chose to lease the land block to Paul, a significant shareholder in the land, and the oldest member of the aforementioned whānau. The lease provided was for 20-years, and was given on the proviso that Paul would maintain, improve and develop the land on behalf of all shareholders. Paul lives on the property and farms it full time, with the assistance of his youngest son (in his early 20s) and two daughters.

Given the solid governance structure over the land, in the form of an Ahu Whenua Trust, and a secure long-term lease to one whānau that possesses a majority shareholding in the land block, I considered that there was a fairly strong tenure security and management control in this case study. However, there was still some anxiety concerning on-going tenure security. The security of tenure is considered by Paul and the Chair of the Ahu Whenua Trust (Mark) to be dependent on the continuing presence of goodwill between all land shareholders. A number of strategies have been employed by the whānau to maintain goodwill and these are outlined below.
1. Selfless Action – Paul, the driving force behind land development, emphasised that any development strategy employed on the land must not alienate other land shareholders, or Tangata Whenua (people of the land). To ensure that this alienation did not occur, he considered that as leader he should demonstrate to Tangata Whenua that he is not acting solely in his own interests, but in the interests of the Tangata Whenua in general. This is outlined in the following statement:

‘One is there, one is there for all, I am a unionist. If I have something everyone else should have it too.’

In this statement the solidarity and goodwill of Tangata Whenua is considered the outcome of leadership acting in the interests of others. Through acting in the interests of others, concerns among Tangata Whenua over unfair distribution of benefits from land development are avoided. This notion is further elaborated upon by Paul where he suggests that an individual needs to ‘earn the right’ to lead the land development, by not showing personal gain. He also outlines the ‘need to stand alone, and follow a narrow path. Evil stands on either side of this path.’ Further Paul suggests that ‘you can’t show personal gain when you ask in the name of others’.

2. Disseminating a positive narrative – I consider that a strategy for developing goodwill among shareholders within this block of communal tenure land is also developed through ensuring that a positive narrative regarding the land development is distributed through the various landholder interests. This is outlined in the following statement by Paul:

‘You need to give the right story, into the right ears, and be part of the gossip – as long as it is good gossip’

In this statement, I deem that Paul is suggesting that an important element in maintaining positive relationships with land shareholders is disseminating a narrative, about land development that is positive and which communicates the intentions of those leading land development to act in the interests of the landholders in general. Paul disseminated his narratives through various means including Annual General Meetings, where he reported back
to the Trustees and shareholders, as well as through informal catch-ups with hapū members, and at community events.

3. Symbolic inclusion to avoid alienation – There was some concern expressed by Paul and whānau that through their efforts to develop the land, minority shareholders might feel alienated from the land. To avoid alienating this group of Tangata Whenua, and maintaining goodwill from the representatives of this group on the Ahu Whenua Trust, it was determined by Paul that a symbolic gesture was necessary to generate a sense of inclusion in the land development. Consequently, Paul obtained a totara log for every whānau with bloodlines to the land. Each log was carved into a pou, or totem, to be placed in a future wharenui, or meeting house, to which all whānau who have links to the land can come and stay. The logs symbolically represent the bloodlines that each whānau has to the land. Furthermore Paul and whānau had developed an ‘open-door’ policy to other land shareholders coming and working the land, and had established a strategy to create as many livelihoods as possible on whenua. Furthermore, a Reservation site designated for dwellings is also being developed, so that other land shareholders could find a place to live, work, and occupy the land.

The intention of the strategies
I believe that the overall intention of the above strategies is to create secure tenure through maintaining and developing goodwill and positive interactions between landowners. This is necessary to maintain and establish a common unified approach for land development. I consider that this is what Paul refers to when he talks about creating ‘a single voice from the land’. The statements and actions of Paul, outlined above, I think demonstrate an attempt to establish a unified voice through strong leadership, which acts in the interests of all landholders.

However, there are of course challenges to the approach outlined above. Even in the best-case scenario, where leadership does act in the best interests of all land shareholders, false or distorted narratives might still appear among Tangata Whenua. For example, Paul reported that among some land shareholders rumours developed that Paul and whānau were beginning to make large sums of money out of the land development, at the expense of Tangata Whenua – a narrative which, according to Paul, was not correct. As a result Paul suggests that there will always be those who will imagine that they are being exploited, when the opposite may
be the case. Therefore, simply acting in a way to develop land for the benefit of shareholders may not necessarily keep what he considered ‘destructive characters’ from generating ill will among Tangata Whenua.

Paul refers to the emergence of what he saw as the destructive element as the ‘horde’ and describes the need to ‘control the horde’ through ‘a power game’. In practice, he considered this involved meeting face-to-face those who are disgruntled with the land development and challenging the false or distorted narrative. However, Paul refers to the ‘need to be tactical’ and not to ‘offend people’. Because he suggests ‘at the end of the day it is about mana, it’s about getting them to believe in you’. Furthermore, Paul has had hui, in which all land shareholders have been invited to share in a hangi to experience, participate and contribute to the land development. These actions of Paul highlight the need for accountability, transparency and consistent communication from leadership that alleviates and manages high levels of distrust.

Case Study Six
This case study concerns 40 hectares of sheep farm administered by an Ahu Whenua Trust. The land is leased from the Trust by a married couple, Mark and Rachael. Both are shareholders in the block, with Mark possessing approximately 30% of the shares. Mark is a respected local kaumatua (elder), and Rachael is likewise a respected leader in the community. The couple make-up two out of the three trustee positions on the Ahu Whenua Trust, elected into the positions by the land shareholders. Mark and Rachael have secured a 20-year lease for the land and they are currently in year five of the lease. The couple suggests that their relationship with land shareholders is constructive, and that commonalities exist regarding the general development goals for the land and its management and administration.

The tenure arrangements outlined above demonstrate that this case study possesses reasonably high levels of tenure security. However, the tenure arrangements do lead to some problems with decision-making, decreasing the ability of Mark and Rachael to reach development goals. In particular, concern was expressed by Mark and Rachael about the ability of the Trust to actually ‘get things done’. Currently, Mark and Rachael consider that they put a lot of energy into land development but they perceive that it is difficult to find the same level of enthusiasm and drive from other shareholders. A particular constraint they expressed concerned difficulties with locating their third trustee to support and action tasks. They noted
that they found the trustee difficult to locate for long periods of time due to the nature of his work.

Given these difficulties, Mark and Rachael suggested that achieving development goals is largely dependent upon them leading and driving the development as lessees, with the third Trustee, and landowners, being consulted on major decisions regarding land development when necessary. According to Mark and Rachael this arrangement appears to work well, given that good will generally exists between land shareholders, the Trustees and lessees. In particular, significant trust is placed in Mark and Rachael by the land shareholders, which supports their belief that the development kaupapa (philosophy) reflects that of the shareholders. Mark and Rachael both pointed out that good turnout to biannual trust meetings of between 20 and 30 land holders plus proxy representation, out of 100 also outlines the strength of shareholder support they receive. The couple outlined their intention to act as kaitiaki (guardians) and to develop the land for future generations, both to protect it environmentally, and to provide a basis for establishing livelihoods.

Based on the statements of Mark and Rachael regarding good will within the trust, and the length of lease they have secured, it can be concluded that they possess a relatively high level of tenure security. However, there is a desire expressed by Mark and Rachael to increase the efficiency of decision-making by incorporating the Trust. They expected that by incorporating the trust, an extension of powers will be enabled to a committee of management, thereby increasing the efficiency of decision-making in day-to-day management. Consequently, a change in tenure arrangements is being sought, to increase the mandate of Mark and Rachael to make decisions regarding the land management.

**Reflection on above examples**

The need for establishing a clear mandate for decision-making is clear, given that before any changes for bringing about a sustainable development future can occur, landowners need the mandate, or right, to make changes. The above examples demonstrate that some case-study groups had a clear mandate for management rights over communal tenure land, whereas others did not. In the first two examples, where a clear mandate was not present, over exploitation and ‘benign neglect’ were identified as the result. However, even in situations where case-study groups did have a clear mandate for decision-making established, each case study still worked to increase and secure that mandate. In Case Study Five this involved
employing various strategies to maintain a ‘single voice from the land’. In Case Study Six Mark and Rachael were looking at incorporating the Trust to increase the efficiency of decision-making due to the unreliability of another Trustee.

2. Enhancing the mauri of ngā taonga katoa

With all case-study groups (excluding one) a number of development goals concerned within increasing the productive capacity of the land were outlined. These desired changes fall under the category of enhancing the mauri of ngā taonga katoa. This category describes the intention of case-study groups to manage the land in a manner that will increase its health and vigour. It is through ‘generating life’ on the land that landowners consider that their development goals can be met.

To bring about this desired change case-study groups envisioned a number of development strategies. The development strategies of case-study groups fell into three categories (2A, 2B and 2C) and six sub categories (2A(a), 2A(b), 2B(a), 2B(b), 2C(a) and 2C(b)). Each category and sub category is demonstrated in Table Twenty below, and discussed sequentially within this section.

2A. Maintaining and increasing the health of the whenua

All case-study groups expressed a desire in their plans to maintain and increase the health of their land. There were two main mechanisms identified by all groups for achieving this, which are outlined below:

2A(a) Intention to ecologically restore ecologically, or maintain, wild areas

In case studies where land was predominantly devoid of indigenous vegetation there was a desire to let wild areas such as remnant forest, or other areas of high ecological value (such as wetlands and streams), be restored to a natural ecological state, either through reversion, or through active restoration work. In case studies where wild areas of indigenous vegetation were dominant there was a desire expressed to make use of the resource in a sustainable manner. In one case study, it was suggested by participants that they were unable to achieve this goal due to communal tenure arrangements that forced them into thinking short-term and over-exploiting available resources rather than engaging in sustainable management.
### The development strategies of Case-study groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Study</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>2A</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>2C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2Aa</td>
<td>Maintaining and increasing the health of the whenua (land) and water bodies</td>
<td>Managing land resources to provide for landholders in perpetuity through the following mechanisms:</td>
<td>Procuring and offering the following food and other resources for partial subsistence living and gifting (manaaki)</td>
<td>Providing cash to purchase goods and services from market economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ab</td>
<td>Ecological Restoration</td>
<td>Converting natural resources (e.g. soil) and making available traditional ecological restoration materials to maintain customs</td>
<td>Opening land to settlement and making available traditional ecological restoration materials to maintain customs</td>
<td>Improving existing enterprises in relevant sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ba</td>
<td>Conserving health of natural resources (e.g. soil)</td>
<td>Propagating &amp; distributing local garden varieties of Kumara (sweet potato), Kamo kamo (squash), and other vegetables</td>
<td>Fibre for Taonga Raaranga (weaving)</td>
<td>Developing new enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Bb</td>
<td>Ecologically restore degraded landscapes through propagating native flora</td>
<td>Propagating &amp; distributing local garden varieties of Kumara (sweet potato), Kamo kamo (squash), and other vegetables</td>
<td>Trees for carving, Tulip poppy, and other flowers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>Ecologically restored landscapes to increase water health</td>
<td>Propagating &amp; distributing local garden varieties of Kumara (sweet potato), Kamo kamo (squash), and other vegetables</td>
<td>Cultivation and harvest of Rongoa Maori (herbal medicine)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ca</td>
<td>Value-added Industry</td>
<td>Organic popcorn production</td>
<td>Beef and Sheep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cb</td>
<td>Nursery</td>
<td>Organic tomatoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cc</td>
<td>Organic cooperative retail outlet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cd</td>
<td>Open air markets &amp; Box Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ce</td>
<td>Certified Kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>Ti Kouka (Cabbage tree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Aa</td>
<td>Ecological restore degraded areas to provide for wildlife and re-create ponds for waterfowl</td>
<td>Building soil fertility and structure through appropriate fertilizer regimes (composting, worm farming, crop rotation)</td>
<td>Producing the following livestock for whanau and community consumption: Ducks, geese, sheep, chickens, pigs</td>
<td>Dairy runoff for local beef farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ab</td>
<td>Weed control</td>
<td>Organic weed control</td>
<td>Produce the following tree and vine crops for home and community consumption: Tamarillo, passionfruit, lemons, limes, bananas, figs</td>
<td>Commercial hothouse production of organic: Capsicums, Chillies, Cougettes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ba</td>
<td>Pest control</td>
<td>Past control</td>
<td>Grow and distribute kumara, potatoes and other vegetables</td>
<td>Commercial production of organic: Watermelon, Ginger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Bb</td>
<td>Bee hives - honey for home consumption</td>
<td>Bee hives - honey for home consumption</td>
<td>Bee hives - honey for home consumption</td>
<td>Bee hives - honey for home consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ca</td>
<td>Production of goods for whanau consumption and sharing in community (e.g. to marae)</td>
<td>Production of goods for whanau consumption and sharing in community (e.g. to marae)</td>
<td>Production of goods for whanau consumption and sharing in community (e.g. to marae)</td>
<td>Production of goods for whanau consumption and sharing in community (e.g. to marae)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cb</td>
<td>Value-added Industry</td>
<td>Certified Kitchen (assist local marae in gaining certification) for canning</td>
<td>Dryer - for drying fruits and vegetables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Aa</td>
<td>Remove stock access to remnant forest and streams</td>
<td>Maintain adequate grazing regime</td>
<td>Possible reservation for: *House sites *Camp ground / cabins for land shareholders</td>
<td>Lease sections for sheep grazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ab</td>
<td>Establish succession planting</td>
<td>Avoiding nutrient pollution through appropriate fertilizer regime</td>
<td>Possible gathering from remnant forest once recovered</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>2Ba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Bb</td>
<td>Value-added Industry</td>
<td>Certified Kitchen (assist local marae in gaining certification) for canning</td>
<td>Dryer - for drying fruits and vegetables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>2Aa</td>
<td>Developing strategies for sustainable use of indigenous forest areas and grazing of forest margins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ab</td>
<td>Improved grazing management Appropriate drainage design Improved pasture management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ba</td>
<td>Wild harvest for home and gifting of the following: Pigs Cattle Deer Watercress Eels Whitebait</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Bb</td>
<td>Timber for home construction House sites for whananga to return to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ca</td>
<td>Sphagnum Dairy runoff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Cb</td>
<td>Wasabi Watercress Cranberries Edible Fungi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value-added Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certified kitchen for undertaking the following: Producing wasabi paste, watercress pesto and cranberry juice Plant for processing sphagnum into compostable nappies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Five</th>
<th>2Aa</th>
<th>Sustainable management of indigenous forest areas Leaving vulnerable areas to regenerate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ab</td>
<td>Achieve holistic grazing managed Appropriate fertilizer regimes Appropriate crop rotations Pest and weed management Shelterbelt design (to increase biodiversity Green manures Crop and pasture choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ba</td>
<td>Community gardens for all landshareholders Heritage gardens: conserving traditional crops and growing techniques propagating the following: Kumara riwai, hue, yam, taro, okra and yam Wild harvest of pigs and deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Bb</td>
<td>Timber and Reservation site for wharenui (meeting house) construction Reservation for house sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ca</td>
<td>Beef</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Cb</td>
<td>Production in portable tunnel houses of: Chillies, capsicums and tomato Edible fungi: shitake, oyster &amp; agricybes Apiary Linseed Buckwheat Hemp seed Heritage gardens for tourism Organic market gardens growing: Kumara, riwai, yams, sweetcorn pumpkin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value-added Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerical dryer for drying mushrooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Six</th>
<th>2Aa</th>
<th>Fencing of forest remnants Control of possums and rabbits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ab</td>
<td>Holistic grazing management Improved fertilizer regimes Improved pasture mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ba</td>
<td>Community gardens (Kai (food) in the garden project Maori woman’s welfare league)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Bb</td>
<td>House sites Gathering from restored areas Scenic walkways over land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ca</td>
<td>Sheep farming: Lamb and wool Develop high value breeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Cb</td>
<td>Market asparagus Tunnel houses (high value organic crops) Berry production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Added Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Café to sell produce</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seven</th>
<th>2Aa</th>
<th>Restoring wetland areas Significant plantings of indigenous plants species on marginal areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ab</td>
<td>Sustainable grazing regime Resowing pastures with appropriate pasture mixes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ba</td>
<td>Orchards Vegetable gardens for whanau and gifting to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Bb</td>
<td>House Sites Construction of homes from woodlots Construction of whareau for whanau accommodation and tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Ca</td>
<td>Sheep breeding: self-shedding wiltshires High value timber woodlots Leasing of land that can’t be managed on a small scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2Cb</td>
<td>Tunnel houses - high value crops - flowers in 2008-2009 Organic crops</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value-Added Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottling goods to sell at farmers market</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table Twenty: Sustainable development strategies of Case-study groups
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2A(b) Intention to conserve the health of land that is farmed
In all case studies there was a desire to conserve the health of farmed land. A number of farm management practices for achieving this in each case study were identified and were illustrated in Table 12, previously. The general intention of the farm management practices is to conserve stream, soil and pasture health.

2B. Maintaining and expanding non-market production and exchange
All case studies outlined their intention to procure resources for subsistence living and gifting. The distinguishing feature of this category is that the resources to be procured are not at any point in the production or exchange turned into commodities – or transformed into a monetary value. The basis of this economic exchange was referred to as manaaki, or unqualified acts of gifting understood as central to maintaining tikanga Māori, or a Māori way of life.

2B(a) – Mahinga kai
All case studies (apart from Case Study Three) outlined their intention to either harvest, or cultivate food on their land for household use and gifting to whānau and community. This included, for example, establishing, or maintaining, whānau and community gardens, as well as wild harvests of game and fish.

2B(c) – Opening land to housing and settlement
All case-study groups wished to seek avenues by which they could open land to housing and settlement, providing homes to whānau wishing to return to ancestral land. The predominant means understood to achieve this goal involved gaining reservation status on land. Reservation status is given by the Māori Land Court and provides an avenue by which land can be used to construct villages, or in the terms of southern Māori research participants nohoanga kāika or northern Māori research participants nohoanga kāinga. Furthermore, there was also a desire to provide camping grounds, or other accommodation for landholders to stay on the land, when
visiting. Case Studies Two and Five were also interested in constructing wharenui\textsuperscript{38} and wharerau\textsuperscript{39}, respectively, as central meeting points for contact between Tangata Whenua.

2C. Maintain and increase cash income from the market economy
All case-study groups wanted to increase the cash income they received from the land to sustain and increase their ability to purchase goods and services from the market economy. They wished to achieve this through pursuing two goals:

2C(a) Improving existing land-based enterprises
All case-study groups wanted to improve their income from their current land use. The type of land use varies between case-study groups, but the primary categories of land use include: sheep, beef, dairy, forestry and horticulture.

2C(b) Developing new enterprises with distinctive characteristics
All case-study groups were interested in considering the development of new enterprises and were keen to explore multiple enterprise development options. The types of enterprises explored and chosen as potential development avenues possessed distinct characteristics. These characteristics were linked to the specific challenges associated with developing enterprises on Māori land. Generally, the challenge is that Māori land blocks are small in scale and are significantly underdeveloped in terms of infrastructure (e.g. fencing, machinery and buildings) due to fragmentation. This means that generally Māori land is not of a sufficient scale, or efficiency, to compete in the production of agricultural commodities.

Low-capital development options that focus on novel crops and livestock that target high-value niche markets were development options that appeared to case-study groups as most feasible. In particular, the development options needed to be small-scale intensive development initiatives, which did not require expensive investment in the modification of the existing environment. Therefore matching crop or livestock type to farm type was necessary to lower development

\textsuperscript{38} A wharenui is a large meeting house, which is used for hui and sleeping.

\textsuperscript{39} A wharerau, as explained to me by a member of Case Study Seven, is a type of building or structure designed by Southern Māori to cope with the cool temperate climates in the far South. It is igloo shaped, constructed from living branches which are criss-crossed and patched with clod.
costs. For example, seeking edible fungi as a development option was considered appropriate if a certain tree species was abundant at a location that was a suitable medium for mushroom production. In other words rather than adapting the environment to fit the crop, it would make more sense to select the crop to fit the environment. The types of development options sought by case-study groups are demonstrated in detail within the Table 12 above.

Stretching beyond farming as land use, several case studies identified tourism related uses of land and capital. These ventures are potentially a high value use of land; for example a marginal piece of land could be turned into a campsite that could generate revenue for a reasonably small investment.

**Value-added processing**

Small-scale, value-added processing of goods from the farm was seen as a means of increasing income at the farm gate. Some case studies, for example, looked at canning goods, others at cafes, and shops, in which farm produce could be sold. The scale of the value-added processing considered was primarily cottage industry targeting high-value organic markets. The purpose of the cottage industry was to increase income to the farm gate, by adding value on-site, rather than simply producing goods, which would need to be processed outside of the local area. In general it was considered that this would be a way of creating more local employment in businesses owned and managed by Māori.

**3. Encouraging the return of whānau**

The goal of creating abundance through transforming the land is to provide all of the resources required to encourage the return of whānau. This is outlined in the following conversation from Case Study One, hui one:

Participant One:

> They were shipping our people away in the 1960s, the late 60s, went from the land to the cities, and I think that a lot of them are turning around from being in the serfdom, a lot of them are focusing on coming back to the land, therefore we must care for that.'

Participant Two:
‘We need to be prepared with opportunities for them to come home for – the expertise.’

Participant One:

‘That’s the one.’

Further, Aroha from Case Study Seven reiterates the statements made above: ‘We are preparing the ground for a return...to provide a home to go to...and resources to house and feed a lot of people.’ Consequently the development strategies outlined above were motivated by the desire to make resources available, so that those with bloodlines to the land could return. These resources include:

- The opportunity of self-employment;
- Reservation sites for home construction;
- Resources for a partial subsistence existence based on mahinga kai and other traditional cultural practices such as raranga (weaving);
- Land under best-practice management ensuring the maintenance and enhancement of communal resources in perpetuity; and
- Providing a place, as summarised by Paul from Case Study Five, where land descendants ‘can learn the stories of the land and the people from it’.

Overall, the goal of case-study groups was to provide those returning with the opportunities for a contemporary Māori existence through livelihood options, while also providing the basis for a traditional Māori existence based upon customary practice.

**Māori values underpinning the development strategies**

Underpinning the development strategies of case-study groups outlined above was the motivation to fulfil Māori values. Within Case Studies One and Two explicit awareness of the motivation to fulfil Māori values was present when discussing development strategies. These values were referred to by some research participants as ‘the tangas’. This refers to the manner in which the terms used to describe Māori values often end with the term ‘tanga’.
However, in Case Studies Three through Seven, where less te reo Māori was spoken, Māori values were only occasionally made explicit. Instead, metaphors (using English) were used to describe values. For example, in Case Study One and Two, the term manawhenua was used to describe an individual’s mandate to control land resources. By contrast I considered that Paul from Case Study Four was referring to securing a mandate when he referred to getting a ‘single voice from the land’, which he termed a ‘mana thing.’ Overall, I considered that the similarity of planned development strategies between all Case-study groups demonstrated a common set of values between Māori landowners, whether they possessed Māori language or not.

In Table Twenty One below, examples are provided to illustrate the manner in which planning was explicitly guided by a need to fulfil a number of human-ends, or Māori values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Examples of context where applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Manawhenua</td>
<td>Control over resources</td>
<td>The term manawhenua was an everyday word used to refer to the legitimacy to own or control resources. Among landowners the term was often used to demonstrate whether one had a mandate or right to speak regarding a particular land block. The frequent use of the term demonstrates the need for the landowners to possess a sense of control and right to manage a resource, before development strategies can be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Whanaungatanga</td>
<td>Togetherness</td>
<td>Whanaungatanga is also a common term in everyday usage to describe the experience of togetherness. Typically within planning hui the term whanaungatanga was used to describe the ‘togetherness’ that participants wished to create through bringing whānau back to the land. Consequently the desire to bring whānau home was to fulfil a need for ‘togetherness’.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Arohatanga</td>
<td>Care, Love, Respect</td>
<td>Arohatanga, like whanaungatanga is a term in common usage. The term was used frequently to express the human need for care, love and respect from other human beings. For example, the development strategies, designed for ‘preparing the ground for a return’ were described in the development plan of Case Study Two as being based on arohatanga.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Manaakitanga</td>
<td>Hospitality, Kindness</td>
<td>With the previous chapter manaakitanga has already been explored in detail. It refers to the duty and responsibility that many research participants felt to fulfil the need of those around them with warmth, hospitality and kindness. Development strategies designed to provide places for those returning to the land, to stay, or simply holiday was seen as manaaki. Further, as also outlined in the previous chapter, providing manaaki to outsiders was important to the mana and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **5. Wairuatanga** | The spiritual dimension | The wairua, or spiritual elements was continually acknowledged, in all Case Studies apart from Case Study Four. This was represented primarily in prayers before hui, in which Io Mātua (God) was asked to guide the discussion. The incorporation of wairuatanga in the formulation of development strategies was made in the action plan created by Case Study One. This is outlined in the following statement in the introduction of their plan:\(^{40}\); ‘the development begins with wairuatanga or ensuring that the underlying motivations for development are inspired by creative energies that are wholesome’. This outlines an underpinning need to ensure that any development strategy is ‘in sync’ with the wairua or spirit, for it to feel tika (right) and pono (truthful).
| **6. Kaitiakitanga** | Guardianship | The role, or sense of duty to perform the role, of Kaitiaki, or guardian over resources (taonga katoa) ran through all case-study groups. All landowners referred to themselves as kaitiaki (guardians). Creating development strategies for maintaining and enhancing the health of land resources, while providing and protecting those who may wish to return to the land was understood as fulfilling the role of kaitiaki. This is illustrated in the following excerpt, from Case Study One’s sustainable development plan,\(^{41}\) which illustrates this phenomenon: ‘There is an expectation that the Trust assumes its rights and responsibilities’, and in particular ‘performs their duty as Kaitiaki over taonga katoa (all treasures).’ The notion of kaitiakitanga is explored in more detail later in Chapter Nine.
| **7. Tino Rangatiratanga** | Self-determination | Tino Rangatiratanga, or the ability to act in a self-determining manner underpinned all planning hui. The purpose of generating more livelihoods off the land, increasing subsistence capacity, and managing resources in a sustainable manner, were all goals designed to increase self-reliance, and freedom from oppressive structures. The need for self-determination is outlined in the mission statement of the action plan drafted for Case Study Two, it is outlined that the focus of the development is on strengthening people to become self-determining. The mission statement of this community group is as follows: ‘To bring about a healthy environment that provides opportunity and well being through a refocusing and strengthening connection of the people ki tona rangatiratanga’
| **8. Taonga Tuku Iho** | Holding and passing down protected treasures – may include knowledge, | The notion of holding and passing on protected treasures was expressed frequently and was a guiding principle in the action plans of Case Studies One and Two. It was seen as a principle to guide actions in a manner that ensured that future generations would be provided with the resources required to meet their needs. Within the South Island Case Studies (Three to Seven)

---

\(^{40}\) I wrote this development plan with the whanau.

\(^{41}\) I wrote this development plan with the group.
| 9. Whakapapa | Genealogy, lineage, descent | Whakapapa is seen by research participants as central to identity, as stated by a participant in Case Study One, hui one, ‘we hold onto our whakapapa so we know who we are.’ Whakapapa is explored in more detail within Chapter Nine, however it is worth noting that whakapapa links human beings to the landscape through genealogical descent. This creates a strong identity and place in the world, given that, according to the kaihautū from one Case Study, ‘one’s bloodlines come from the land’. Consequently bringing people home to the land, to experience and hear their whakapapa, is important for knowledge of who they are, and having a secure identity. | objects or natural resources | the following whakatauākī was used to describe the holding and passing on protected treasures – ‘Ma tātou, a, mo ka uri, a muri āke nei’ – ‘for us and our children after us’ |
Conclusions
This chapter provided a detailed outline of the development goals expressed by case-study groups, and the underpinning values that determine these development goals. I consider that what is particularly unique about the development goals indicated by all case studies is that the land is principally seen as a vehicle for social, environmental and economic development. Commonly, Māori land development is viewed as a problem related to agribusiness, or the failure of landowners to establish productive and commercial uses for land. However, the results in this chapter clearly demonstrate that the land is not seen as only a springboard for business but also as a platform for cultural revitalisation, environmental restoration, and community development.

It was nevertheless clear that case-study groups were presented with significant challenges concerning decision-making. In particular, many found it difficult to get collective support for their initiatives, and could only work within relatively short time horizons concerning decision-making. This reduced their incentive to invest time and resources in development. Some solutions to this problem were suggested, which included; leadership maintaining goodwill and unity by not showing personal gain from land development, continual discussion and open communication, and incorporating the land governing structure to establish a management committee. However, there was some concern and cynicism expressed regarding the presence of characters and personalities within Land Trusts who became jealous of any other landowner working the land to obtain personal benefit – even if this benefit concerned wages. This was seen as a problem to be continually managed within a number of case studies.

Despite these challenges all case-study groups were clear on the path that they needed to take, and that it involved pursuing a strategy of restoration, commercial development, and community development. Restoration was considered important for improving the health of soils, remnant forests and streams. Commercial development was valued for its contribution of cash income to the land owners, and for the employment opportunities it could provide. It is fascinating to see the highly innovative and entrepreneurial ideas that case-study groups came-up with for business development, from breeding self-shedding sheep through to edible fungi production. Furthermore, a number of options were also imagined for value-added processing and sale of produce, principally to increase income to the farm gate, but also to create local economic development through employment. Also of high importance was the desire for
cultural revitalisation and community development through building non-market production and exchange, principally via increasing the capacity for mahinga kai harvesting and fibre production.

However, these development goals cannot be understood as ends in themselves, but as platforms for the wider social and economic development project of bringing whānau back to the land. Furthermore, it is clear that the commonality between goals also indicates a common set of values guiding behaviour and strategic thinking. Although only two case studies articulated these values directly in te reo Māori, the common visioning suggests strong alignment of values. The development goals and values underpinning development are articulated within Figure Eleven below.
## Development strategies of Case-study groups to bring about desirable change

### 1. Establishing a mandate for ongoing management rights over communal tenure land

### 2. Enhancing the *mauri of nga taonga katoa*

#### Development options to transform land fall into three categories and six sub-categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2A</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Replanting and allowing marginal land areas to revert to natural state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Engagement in appropriate farm management practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Maintaining or building non-market production and exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Conserving soil, forest, stream and pasture health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Improving existing enterprises in the following sectors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Developing new enterprises with the following characteristic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Enhancing the <em>mauri of nga taonga katoa</em> and maintain existence on land (Nohoanga Kaingi - dwelling place centred around food production)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Values Underpinning Development Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3A</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Employment opportunities to procure cash income to maintain contemporary Maori existence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Resources necessary for partial subsistence existence and to engage in traditional cultural practices (e.g. gardening, hunting, gathering, carving and weaving)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>MAHINGA KAI</td>
<td>Knowledge of land management practices to maintain resource base</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure Eleven: Development goals of Case-study groups**
CHAPTER TEN: Human, Financial, and Physical Resources – Identifying Constraints on Development Goals and Solutions to Overcome Constraints

Introduction

In the previous chapter the development goals of case-study groups were clearly identified. The function of this second results chapter is to identify the constraints on case-study groups achieving each of their development goals, and to suggest solutions for overcoming constraints. However, this chapter does not explore all constraints on development, but instead focuses on the theme of resources. In particular it looks at areas where case-study groups experienced resource gaps that constrained their ability to achieve development goals.

The chapter begins by outlining the constraints on decision-making experienced by leaders. It is illustrated that the prevalence of distrust and suspicion constrains leadership gaining support for decisions from their communities. To overcome this constraint, it is determined that leadership needs first to support the collective interest, rather than using collective resource to pursue personal interest and, second, possess good communication methods to maintain support. Following this discussion, the chapter moves on to explore the constraints on developing commercial enterprises, ecological restoration and non-market exchange. It is argued that the primary constraints on achieving these goals concerns inexperience, technical skill deficits, and fear of debt. It is argued that strong institutional support is required to overcome these
Constraints on decision-making

In the previous chapter it was outlined how a main goal of case-study groups was to establish a clear and concise mandate for decision-making. It is worth revisiting and exploring the themes related to this topic in more detail, given that realising all other development goals is dependent upon case-study groups possessing effective decision-making. The first theme concerns the issue of rivalry and jealousy that can emerge when benefits to communal landowners are thought to accrue to some landowners and not with others. Within Case Study Three, the Trust anticipated difficulties in obtaining agreement on any form of land use in which one shareholder would be seen to obtain more benefit than others. This generated within Trustees a high level of risk aversion, whereby anything seen as slightly contentious, such as a young shareholder working and leasing an area of the land, was avoided. The general effect of this fear and apprehension was, in the words on one Trustee, ‘benign neglect’, which meant that the land was not used for anything at all, leaving it to revert to forest.

Within Case Study Four the same theme of rivalry and jealousy was also present. The whānau farming the land suggested that some shareholders were envious that they were making livelihoods out of using the land, whereas they were not. They further argued that they were under continual pressure from the Māori Trustee to extract as much dividend from the land as possible (to pay land shareholders) without considering the requirement to invest development capital back into the land blocks. To overcome the constraint of rivalry and jealousy, Case Study Four adopted the tactic of ensuring the land remained undeveloped, so that its value would not rise to the extent that local dairy farmers would be enticed to lease the land at a higher price than the whānau could afford.

Conversely, Case Study Five attempted to follow three different tactics: selfless action; disseminating a positive narrative; and symbolic inclusion to avoid alienation. A similar approach was taken by Mark and Rachael in Case Study Six who suggested that generating and maintaining goodwill between land shareholders, the Trustees, and lessees, was important. It
was clear to me that Mark and Rachael, as kaumātua, had developed a high level of trust and social cohesion in this Case Study. This is evidenced by the fact that both were made Trustees by the landowners, and both had been given long-term leases, effectively providing a mandate to govern and manage the land over the long term.

The second constraint theme concerns misunderstandings and misconceptions regarding the amount of income being generated from farming Māori land. In Case Study Four, the whānau suggested that misunderstandings often emerged regarding the costs and expertise involved in undertaking a farming enterprise. They considered that shareholders only tended to look at turnover of the operations rather than seeing how marginal the enterprises actually were when costs were fully taken into account. In Case Study Five Paul talked about how rumours could at times be spread that he and whānau were beginning to make large sums of money. He considered that this led to land shareholders imagining that they are being exploited, when he felt that the opposite was the case.

During the study, Mark and Rachael increasingly experienced growing issues of land shareholders thinking that they were being exploited for financial gain, which began to undermine the high levels of trust they had built with other owners. Both Mark and Rachael had moved to increase leases for some houses found on their land block. The lease was at a ‘peppercorn’ rate, approximately thirty dollars per week, and had not been increased in over 40 years. The income from the leases no longer covered the costs of rates or maintenance on the homes. Consequently Mark did much of the maintenance without pay. As a result Mark and Rachael moved to increase the lease levels. However, out of the ten tenants there were three who were also land shareholders. These land shareholders protested the marginal increase in the rates and attempted to organise the removal of Mark and Rachael as Trustees by encouraging a narrative among the community of owners that Mark and Rachael were motivated by greed. However, their challenge failed.

Mark and Rachael endeavoured to counter the narratives of the tenant-shareholders by presenting the argument that land shareholders were currently subsidising the rent of

---

42 It needs to be noted than within the Ngāi Tahu rohe it is common for both men and women to be referred to as Kaumātua.
tenant/shareholders, and that if any profit was received by the Trust from the rental increases then the tenant-shareholders would receive their money back in a dividend. This argument was not accepted by the shareholder/tenants, which has led to ongoing angst within the community of landowners.

To overcome the constraint presented by what were considered by research participants as distorted narratives, Paul referred to the need to be part of the ‘good gossip’. However, when rumours appeared that Paul considered were distorted, Paul felt it necessary to meet those who were disgruntled face-to-face and challenge the rumours. Paul referred to this process of influencing the gossip as ‘controlling the horde’.

The final theme, expressed within Case Study Six involved the challenge of actually ‘getting things done’. Trustees were often difficult to locate for long periods of time. This was due to the busy lives of Trustees that often could not make Trustee meetings. To overcome this constraint Mark and Rachael were considering making an attempt to incorporate the Trust. It was expected that by incorporating the Trust, an extension of powers would enable establishment of a committee of management, thereby increasing the efficiency of decision-making in day-to-day management.

Out of the examples provided above, Case Study Five, and Case Study Six had fairly secure tenure arrangements. Case Study Three was not able to manage competing interests successfully, whereas Case Study Four felt forced to ‘rape the land’ and invest nothing back into it. This raises the question of whether or not the techniques adopted by Paul in Case Study Five worked to manage shareholders better than the techniques adopted by Case Studies Three and Four. Further it raises questions as to whether the kaupapa (philosophy) adopted by Mark and Rachael, and their eldership role, enabled them to manage shareholders well. Without talking extensively with land shareholders that question could not be answered. However, there is also the possibility that the land shareholders in Case Studies Three and Four were simply much more difficult and challenging characters to deal with than those in case Study Five and Six.

These research results lead to some interesting inferences in regards to the management of Māori land. First, it is commonly suggested that having in place governance structures is a key
component to successful Māori land development. However, the results of this thesis do not fully support this conclusion. Case Study Three had an Ahu Whenua Trust structure to delegate decision-making to five governors yet these governors were to a large extent frozen in their ability to make decisions due to risk aversion and concerns with upsetting shareholder factions. Conversely, Case Study Seven had no governing structure, yet had no problems making decisions, based on what was referred to in the whānau as ‘rūnaka-style’ decision making – or talking until a decision was reached. However, this case study did benefit from the fact that all the shareholders were siblings, limiting the decision-making to six individuals.

The ‘worst-case’ scenario was Case Study Four, where decisions regarding land management were made by the Māori Trustee with the support of shareholders based purely on level of lease income. As a consequence, the land had become exploited with no investment into land development. Conversely case studies five and six both had Ahu Whenua Trusts, which established boards of land governors. Further both Trusts put in place leases with shareholding whānau over a long time periods, effectively establishing delegated management. However, the tenure was not completely stable in either case study and constant engagement with shareholders and Trustees was required to maintain trust and support.

Of central importance were leaders maintaining the trust and support of land shareholders through demonstrating inclusiveness and, in particular, that no personal gain was being received at the expense of other shareholders. Leadership driven by collective interest, and not personal interest, therefore seems important for maintaining social cohesiveness and effective decision-making. This suggests that although governance structures may indeed be important for empowering governors to make decisions on behalf of landowners, it must also be complemented by leadership that can maintain social cohesion. Consequently, the human resource element is very important, and in particular leadership that works for the collective. However, even if leadership is acting only in the collective interest, it does not guarantee that factions will not emerge to undermine this leadership based on false or distorted assumptions.
Constraints on developing new and existing commercial enterprises

Accessing ‘seed’ development capital
A second often cited constraint on Māori land development is lack of access to development capital. This lack of access is often attributed to the inability of landowners to raise finance because communal land cannot be used as collateral. However, it will be demonstrated below that financing can be obtained if well constructed business plans and technical feasibility plans for a particular enterprise are developed. The issue is not, therefore, that seed development capital is unavailable. Instead, the issue is that technical business and farm production skills for gaining development capital were not present within case-study groups.

Within Case Study Five, for example, the skills to construct a business plan were not present, nor were the technical skills to pursue their enterprise – organic hothouse production of chilies, capsicums and eggplants. In response to this constraint the whānau met with a business development officer from the Ministry of Māori Development, or Te Puni Kōkiri (TPK). Through this meeting a rapport developed with the TPK officer.

Working with the TPK officer an application for $5,000 to gain funding for a business plan was written. This funding was received and a business facilitation company was contracted to construct the plan. Further, as outlined in the methods chapter, I received a contract from the tribal authority of Ngāi Tahu to lead a sustainable land development research project. Some of these funds were allocated for aid and provided case-study groups with technical expertise. A technical specialist was contracted to provide the whānau with a horticultural production plan for the enterprise, and to provide ongoing technical support.

The business plan, horticultural production plan, and on-going technical support were looked upon favorably by a finance company. The combination of good business planning, technical planning, and ongoing support convinced the finance company that the investment was sufficiently low risk. The Case Study received $12,000 in loans. The funds were used to construct three portable and irrigated tunnel houses, at a price of $10,000. One of these tunnel houses, and crops, can be viewed in Plate 1 and Plate 2 below:

43 The finance company used was a tribal finance company. Without collateral it charges an interest rate of 14%.
Lack of technical skill in developing and growing novel specialist crops
Growing these crops (or any farm-based commercial enterprise for that matter) requires specialist technical skills that were lacking in case-study groups. Case Study Five had chosen to grow high-value specialist crops (for high return off small areas) and thus specialist knowledge in the commercial development of the crop was required. Consequently, in the first season the crop was grown primarily on a trial basis, under specialist guidance, until the skills and experience of one whānau member had developed. Through funding provided by Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu, an organic farming specialist in horticulture and agriculture was contracted to
provide specialist advice to Case Study Five. Although the trials demonstrated potentially high levels of commercial success from this enterprise the whānau member driving and leading this initiative fell-out with another whānau member and as a result moved from the land. This left a successful pilot without anyone to drive it through to a full-scale commercial enterprise.

In Case Study Four, below, small-scale development options that could produce a potentially high return were also identified and explored, through a partnership between an organic farming specialist and a whānau member keen and interested in driving the initiative. Two high-value, niche market crops were piloted with the intention of pursuing commercial production if the trials were a success. The crops needed to be suited to the local environment because the Case Study did not have the necessary development capital to extensively modify the existing environment to suit the crop. In particular, the environment received significant quantities of rainfall. As a consequence we sought development options adapted to this natural advantage. We therefore established a trial growing wasabi (Japanese Horseradish) within a slightly modified stream environment. We intended to market the wasabi to restaurateurs in New Zealand and also had access to Japanese markets for this high-value crop.

The first two pilots failed, but through trial and error, the whānau are now at a stage where optimal growing conditions have been determined. A photo of establishing the second trial site can be viewed in Plate Three below.

The second novel crop piloted comprised of three types of edible fungi; shitake mushrooms, oyster mushrooms, and agrocybes. This crop was chosen to take advantage of the naturally high levels of humidity and rainfall, and the existence of a possible growing medium found in abundance on the property. The medium was a tree found in forest margins, which we hypothesised might be useful for growing these mushroom types. After inoculating logs (by nailing a dowling into the wood containing innoculum and sealing the hole with wax) they were left in the forest margins for six months. We found the trial to be a success when an oyster mushroom fruited on the logs. Following the first initial success we have piloted the mushroom enterprise further and have found it to be commercially viable. The success of this venture is built upon a unique set of circumstances:

- Finding a high-value crop for which there is demand in New Zealand;
- A suitable growing medium found in abundance; and
• The right atmospheric conditions for the growing of fungi.

Plate 3 Digging wasabi gardens

This development option is incredibly low cost, with potentially very high returns. All the whānau needed to make it happen was a chain saw, the growing medium, and inoculum. Connections to restaurant markets in Christchurch and Queenstown were established for the mushrooms. The success of this pilot can be directly attributed to the input of technical expertise that could identify an interesting high-value product with significant development potential on the land, and who could provide ongoing training into production techniques. However, following the pilot initiative the young whānau member driving the enterprise decided to move to Australia on an Overseas Experience (OE). This occurrence, combined with the occurrence in Case Study Five, where a whānau member left the project after falling out with whānau members, demonstrated the vulnerability of land development initiatives to the presence of passionate whānau members to drive development. A photo of the first oyster mushroom that fruited can be seen below:
Plate 4 Oyster mushrooms fruiting on log

Pilot trials were also conducted within Case Study Six regarding berry production targeting high-value health markets, as well as growing traditional Māori gourds for carving. It was expected that carved gourds could be sold to tourists. It turned out that the climate was too cold for the gourds, and like the former edible fungi pilot outlined above, the whānau member supporting the berry production trial decided on a change of life course.

In need of appropriate plant and machinery
The lack of technical skills for piloting and growing specialised crops within case-study groups was compensated for through funds to employ a part-time technical specialist through the project funding I received from Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. Case-study groups also required reliable and suitable plant and machinery for conducting their enterprises, but lacked the necessary access to machinery due to prohibitive costs. For example, participants in Case Study One were embarking upon large-scale production of Māori organic potatoes, which are valued for their culinary qualities. To harvest the potatoes a second-hand potato harvester was given to the group. Unfortunately the harvester required significant repairs and suffered from frequent breakdown, which meant that a significant amount of time was spent repairing machinery.

Similarly in Case Study Five the farm tractor had been constructed out of three separate tractors, and was liable to breakdown. The tractor was out of commission at a crucial time – when the land needed turning over for the tunnel houses. This led to the situation where the
tunnel houses were planted out a month late resulting in the overall harvest being halved. Nevertheless the harvest was still lucrative and commercially viable.

**Bridging income while establishing an enterprise**

The most serious constraint on expanding an existing enterprise (for example developing pasture or re-fencing), or developing a new enterprise, is that whānau members have difficulty in finding time to drive land development. This is because the business does not initially provide a wage. Consequently, off-farm work commitments must be met first, to meet living costs. In three case-study groups it was common to be on an unemployment benefit while developing an enterprise. Nonetheless, it is illegal to receive the benefit while doing voluntary work – because the unemployed individual must be seeking paid employment.

In Case Study One most research participants were living on social welfare while developing their land. This required them to attend courses and show that they were actively seeking employment. In Case Study Two, the kaihautū driving development was on the unemployment benefit. However, he told me that the local Work and Income New Zealand (WINZ) office was aware that he was working on the land but ‘turned a blind eye’ and did not require him to report. This was because they knew that he was attempting to create a livelihood from his work, and therefore decided to ignore their own policy in this circumstance. As it turned out this individual became employed, established a horticultural course in his community through the assistance of a tertiary institution, and received two significant contracts to provide native plants for ecological restoration purposes. His business now has a turnover of $370,000 per annum. This contract in turn allowed this individual to employ others.

The lack of income, while establishing an enterprise on Māori land, also affected Case Study Five. All whānau members were employed off-farm and with family responsibilities there was no way that different whānau members could concentrate on farm-based land development, for no pay, while well-paid work was available to them. In Case Study Five, the kaihautū was employed by the farm business, but on a very low income. He also suffered from an illness, which meant that he only ‘operated at 50%’ (in his words). His son was nevertheless keen to develop the land, but had a growing family commitment and could not afford to work on the land for no pay.
A similar scenario was present in Case Study Six. The kaihautū, Rachael, who was leading development was also attempting to work full time to provide a family income and dedicate time to establishing an enterprise. Ironically, this individual possessed business administration skills, but had little time to apply these skills to land development. However, she could apply for funding to the Ministry of Māori Development to have ‘outside’ expertise provided to assist with business administration.

**Skills for administering a business**

Three Case-study groups identified a weakness in their operations of not keeping adequate financial records. The importance of keeping good financial records is evident in terms of adequately managing finances and monitoring income and expenditure. Further, fiscal responsibility also allows Trustees to report back to the landowners, reducing the likelihood for landowners to become concerned that they might be being exploited. It also reduces the risk of financial audits from the Inland Revenue Department, which could potentially lead to the end of farming operations if problems were found.

Another constraint on achieving the development goal of establishing an enterprise concerns compliance costs. A plethora of government regulations need to be met which are incredibly demanding for small businesses attempting to grow. Employer obligations need to be met, such as employment contracts, paying accident compensation, student loans, and tax. Further policies on workplace safety and health need to be developed and met (to avoid prosecution in the case of an on-farm accident). Up-to-date insurance is also important as well as vehicle and plant maintenance (for example vehicle warrants of fitness).

Three Case-study groups mostly ignored the need to be compliant. I considered that this was simply because the demands of compliance were too high. Furthermore, these groups were typically in financial positions that meant that they could not be affected by fines (that is, they could not pay them). However, this concerned me in that I considered as an enterprise grew they might get to a stage whereby a tax audit, or workplace accident, might cause the enterprise to fail.

The importance of meeting these requirements can be illustrated in an example from Case Study Five. The farm suffered from a one in fifty-year snowstorm, which collapsed the portable
tunnel houses outlined previously (Plate Five below). Unfortunately insurance had not been taken. Nevertheless the whānau were able to repair the tunnel houses. They subsequently found out though that insurance companies had ceased insuring portable tunnel houses shortly before they were constructed. Insurance had therefore not been an option for the tunnel houses at any rate. I felt responsible for the failure of the tunnel houses because the tunnel houses were, according to the specialist, supposed to shed snow and I therefore recommended them to the whānau. Nonetheless it was a lesson in managing risk and having in place the necessary safeguards for operating a commercial enterprise. In addition many barns, buildings and tunnel houses also collapsed during the storm due to the type of snow that fell.

Plate 5 Snow-damaged tunnel house

Working to obtain resources for technical help
The Ministry of Māori Development (TPK) does not fund for capital items, but will pay only for technical assistance. This assistance usually comes in the form of a contractor who works with a particular group of landowners to write business plans, development plans, or obtain legal assistance to put in place more efficient governance structures. The role of the TPK development officer is to write applications for these funds on behalf of particular groups of landowners. Senior bureaucrats make the final decisions regarding which applications will be funded. The development officer has a role in nursing the applications through the decision-making process. It was through these mechanisms that two $5000 grants, one $6000 grant, and
one $10,000 grant, were made available to case-study groups to obtain assistance with business and development planning.

The process of gaining funding for technical help, from my experience, was fraught. The funding can take a lot of time and energy to secure, and there is no guarantee of success. Further, the funding is made in bulk one-off payments to private contractors selected by government agencies. The work experience of these contractors is in the business world and, in particular, working inside corporate institutions. Consequently, their knowledge of Māori contexts and the needs of the communities can often be limited. My experience is that these contractors are poorly prepared for work in Māori contexts. For example, on one occasion I had to counsel a contractor who did not understand why he had come under a hostile attack during a hui. In other words, he did not understand the complex divisions and political nature of land ownership.

In addition, I have found that these contractors tend to write and plan for the group using business planning templates derived from a corporate setting. These plans use an alien language, particularly to those who might be partially literate. However, because these plans communicate in the language of financial institutions, they are useful for obtaining financing. This is demonstrated in Case Study Five, who obtained finance from a business plan.

The small one-off contracts of $5000 do not provide for much of the contractor’s time, when there are charge-out rates of $175 per hour, or more. This amount of funding usually only provides enough time for one visit (due to the cost of getting to remote locations), and the rapid drafting of a plan according to an established template. I considered that long-term frequent contact was necessary so that relationships with case studies could be built, and skills transferred as experience develops.

This is certainly recognised by one development practitioner in TPK whom I have discussed this issue with, although he suggested that short one-off contracts are far more politically palatable. The reason for this, he stated, is that large investments are risky, because if no outcomes can be discerned from the investment then senior bureaucrats and politicians might be placed under media, or political, scrutiny for misuse of public money. Instead, small investments are less controversial. He suggested that what are most sought are relatively small
investments in projects that already exhibit a reasonable likelihood of success. By investing in such projects significant outcomes can be quickly publicised providing kudos. This politicised approach may disadvantage valid cases that require significant levels of capacity building.

The fear of taking on debt

It has been described how, in Case Study Five, finance of $10,000 was obtained to establish a tunnel house enterprise. This case study also wished to invest heavily in other land development initiatives, including re-fencing and increasing stocking rates. Paul and whānau were reluctant to take on any debt to do this. They instead sought to establish a partnership with the tribal corporate arm of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (TRONT), to partner them, by investing and slowly withdrawing their interest as the whānau gained experience in how to manage the operation. The whānau felt that they were owners in this corporate body, and felt that this institution could support them best because it could be trusted and would understand their needs and customs.

Similarly, Case Study Six looked to TRONT to invest in their proposed enterprises, citing the need for development capital, but fear of taking on debt, and inexperience thwarted them from moving forward. The reluctance of the whānau to take on anymore debt meant that the planned large-scale enterprises of Case Studies Five and Six would not be developed further until TRONT, or some other institution, was ready to form a partnership. Both Case Studies Five and Six exhibited a degree of despondence and cynicism, at not being able to form the partnerships they required to access financial assets, and develop the skills, experience and knowledge required to achieve their development goals.

A second, and clear example of the fear of taking on debt involves an experience I had meeting with a group of landowners, to see if they could become another one of my case studies. This group of landowners had leased their farmland to a local Pākehā (European New Zealand) dairy farmer. The land consisted of 1000 acres of flat arable land. The lease that the dairy farmer paid to the landowners covered their rates (approximately $5000 per year). In return the dairy farmer would have been making, in the current prosperous dairy industry, a significant income from this land. Despite this inequality the landowners did not want to take over the management of

---

44 TRONT is now the largest corporation in the South Island of New Zealand.
the land. This is because thirty years ago the landowners had not been able to meet their rates obligations and so accumulated debt. They could not repay their debt and so portions of their land were sold to meet this debt.

I concluded that the fear of debt still haunted the landowners. It appeared much safer to them just to continue leasing the land rather than risking debt by managing their land for themselves. This type of narrative was very common throughout all case-study groups – namely land being lost through debt. Māori landowners, I concluded, showed a lack of confidence in their ability to manage ‘their land’. This outlined the need for Māori landowners to have good support, which was recognised by Case Study Five in their desire to have TRONT partner their land development.

**Land development in the post-settlement treaty era**

Five of the case studies explored in this thesis were whānau and hapū within the Ngāi Tahu iwi. Case Studies Three, Four, Five and Six, all spoke about their desire to form some sort of commercial partnership with TRONT – given that TRONT possessed approximately NZ$500 million worth of assets at the time of this research. All land blocks possessed a number of assets which potentially made them good investment options for the post-settlement iwi. Given that I was working for TRONT, I acted as the ‘go between’ between TRONT and case studies in an attempt to negotiate some sort of joint partnership.

However, there were constraints on TRONT’s development corporation becoming involved. It became apparent that this was because the corporation had not yet devised any policies on how joint partnerships, or co-investments, could occur. For example, TRONT is regularly approached by many of its 40,000 members to establish joint ventures, or co-invest in different businesses. Decisions regarding which members of the iwi can access commercial opportunities, and who cannot, is politically fraught. It was clear that some sort of policy regarding investment, based on a combination of equity and merit would be necessary before any investments could take place.

I also approached the Ngāi Tahu Holdings companies, which hold the iwi assets, to determine whether or not they could assist by co-investing with case studies. The feedback from Ngāi Tahu Holdings was that they did not have a large rural portfolio, and that this type of
investment did not align with their current strategic direction. Furthermore, it was unlikely that they would invest in any initiative so small, given that it was below their threshold for investment of $5 million dollars. Additionally, they considered that this type of investment would require development work that was beyond their area of expertise. Despite this feedback the Chief Executive of the property company used his networks to organise a rural investment company to visit Case Study Five. From this meeting the company offered to finance the development of Case Study Five. However, Case Study Five rejected the offer on the basis that they really wanted a partnership with the iwi not a rural investment company that might not understand their needs.

These events illustrate the challenges of post-settlement iwi. Policies are required to define who will obtain benefit from collectively owned assets. This policy is fairly straightforward in situations where equal dividends might just be paid to members of the tribe. Further, the policy is fairly straightforward if what is being provided is simply a loan, given that whoever takes the loan is required to pay the loan back under conditions that all others within the tribe are required to meet. It becomes far more complex when it is joint partnerships or co-investment, given that this may be seen as unfair advantage accruing to some members of the tribe at the expense of others. Nonetheless a number of case studies expressed their annoyance at the Treaty settlement, and the manner in which the settlement assets had not been decentralised and held at hapū level. There was a feeling that they had been ‘ripped off’ through the process, and that the iwi should offer them something.

The other complicating factor concerns the issue of tribal structure. TRONT is made of up 18 marae-based communities, each of which is represented by a Papatipu Rūnanga. Each Papatipu Rūnanga has resources that it can draw upon for making investments. Within TRONT’s strategic plan, referred to as 2025, there is the intention for development to be driven not by the iwi centre, but by its constituent Papatipu Rūnanga. Consequently, from TRONT’s perspective, the most appropriate avenue for the case-study groups to organise co-investment for their initiatives would be to work through their local Papatipu Rūnanga, as opposed to the iwi organisation. However, most case-study groups were generally cynical about their Papatipu Rūnanga expressing concern regarding the local politics.
Overall, case-study groups were disappointed in the level of support that they could receive from the iwi. Of course the iwi was providing technical help but they also required back-up mentoring and significant financial investments to bring their aspirations into reality. The result was that the whānau and hapū in the research tended not to identify strongly with their iwi, but more with their whānau and hapū.

The importance of institutional support
Out of all of the case-study groups, Case Study Two was the only group that was able to gain strong institutional support for its development, which enabled this group to move rapidly toward its development goals. This group was able to form a partnership with an education institution to provide horticultural training courses on Māori land. As part of the course a commercial scale nursery was constructed, and after the first year of the training course, graduates in horticulture were being generated in the local community. Through the assets provided by the education institution, Case Study Two had the infrastructure in terms of human and physical assets to take on two large commercial contracts to produce native plant seedlings for ecological restoration. This enabled the group to move rapidly toward its enterprise development goals, establishing a company, which grew to a turnover of $370,000 per annum. It is doubtful whether Wade, the kaihautū from Case Study Two, would have been able to gain the opportunities he did without the support of the education institution, given that in 2005 he was on the unemployment benefit. The assets provided by the institution were pivotal to success.

Reluctance to engage in institutional training
It may have been noticed that in this section there has been an emphasis on bringing professional individuals into case-study groups, to perform various specialised tasks, and transfer skills, where there is a skills deficit within the community. The alternative approach to bringing outsiders into communities to build skills and offer professional services is for community members to build skills through institutional training outside of the community, for

45 The courses were run by Wade, the kaihautū from Case Study Two.
46 Although this case study had planned to grow native seedlings for ecological restoration on its land, it had not planned to turn this into a commercial venture. However, when the opportunity arose for the commercial production of native seedlings, the development goals of this case study changed to take on this new opportunity.
example, through undertaking a course in horticulture. From my experience, there was generally within case-study groups considerable reluctance to leave the land to undergo outside training. The exception in regard to this was Rachael from Case Study Six who embarked upon a small-business course. However, she failed to continue this course due to heavy home and work commitments.

The model established with Case Study One, where a partnership was anticipated with an education institution to build necessary skills locally and on the land, according to local custom, appeared to be the approach that research participants found most comfortable. There was, in other words, a desire to develop skills while working the land, and to build skills relevant and specific to particular tangible problems. In Case Study One the extreme popularity of the organic workshops on marae that shared success and failure stories, combined with field tours of farms to deal with specific problems (e.g. pest invasion) proved a very effective way of transferring skills. No doubt these workshops could have been formalised and courses built around them. However, as outlined the attempts to build this type of course with a tertiary institution failed after it was found that a researcher was using the case study to gain research funds.

The success of this approach I considered was because it complemented the highly pragmatic focus of Māori landowners, which was outlined as the deportment-of-pragmatism. However, mostly it permits learning to occur in an environment within which Māori are at home and comfortable. Further, it provides a means to build trusting relationships based upon the deportment-of-trust-building. Through developing a trusting relationship, challenges to learning such as illiteracy (which occurred particularly in Case Study Five), or lack of confidence, due to poor past performance in educational institutions, can be discussed and overcome. Such issues are far more difficult to cope with in a large institution, where personal, open and trusting relationships, are less likely to develop.

There are also quite pragmatic constraints on engaging in institutional training. Concern was expressed in Case Study One and Seven regarding the cost of course fees, the distance from remote rural areas to institutions, and the requirement to meet full-time work and family commitments. Given these concerns, bringing courses from institutions, and adapting those courses to meet the pragmatic needs of Māori would appear to be an appropriate approach. Any
course could be modeled on the method developed within Case Study One, where a combination of workshops held on marae, and on-farm extension focusing on particular problematic issues faced by landowners, took place simultaneously. The success of the course, in particular, would pivot off the tutor or extension officer, being free of a patronising or authoritarian deportment-of-judgment, which would impede the development of openness and trusting personal relationships.

Constraints on maintaining and increasing the health of the whenua
The primary constraint on achieving the development goal of maintaining and increasing the health of the whenua was a lack of knowledge of best practice land management. Through feedback from case-study groups, it was apparent that their blocks of Māori land had had very little in the way of agrichemicals applied to them in the past – unless the land had been leased. This was positive in some regards, in that land was unlikely to be contaminated with pesticide or herbicide residues (although land on two farms in Case Study One had DDT residue). However, it was also negative in that often soil had been mined of essential elements and nitrogen. This is clear from the example of Case Study One where a nutrient demanding crop was grown in spent soil.

After soil testing with case-study groups it was found that most required significant lime applications because they had become acidic. Further, land was not often adequately fenced meaning that livestock often ‘free ranged’ over the land. This led to soil and pasture damage, as recovery from compaction and excessive grazing could not occur. Animals could also selectively graze pasture meaning that weed species became more prevalent within the herbage mix.

Case Study Two was the only exception in terms of having good soil, pasture and livestock management. The relatively poor state of the land in other case studies was primarily the outcome of lack of development capital, to purchase external inputs (e.g., lime and fertiliser), invest in land infrastructure (such as fences) and employ technical expertise to provide advice on addressing some more problematic issues. Consequently, the need once again, for good specialist assistance to access development capital and provide for farm production planning is highlighted.
However, it would not be fair to portray case-study groups as ignorant of techniques for improving land health. It was clear within development plans that a number of strategies for improving soil health were mentioned by case-study groups in the previous chapter including: composting regimes, worm farming, crop/livestock rotation techniques, organic pest and weed control, improved drainage, shelter-belt design, fertiliser regimes and pasture mixes. Nevertheless, to implement these plans development capital was necessary. Further it was clear that case-study groups sought good technical assessments of current soil health – in order to assess what methods of land restoration should be employed.

All case-study groups also mentioned the goal of restoring degraded landscapes (as outlined in Table Twelve, Chapter Seven) that were not essential for commercial production (for example gullies and wetland areas). Again, technical knowledge was sought regarding techniques for restoring land. Case Study Three, in particular, was keen on advice regarding ecological restoration options including; restoration through natural reversion from gorse and broom to native forest through to the direct planting of climax indigenous forest species. Further, Case Studies One, Three, Six and Seven expressed their need to learn ecological restoration techniques and mentioned the requirement for planting plans to guide the restoration of degraded areas within sustainable development plans.

**Constraints on maintaining and expanding non-market production and exchange**

There were no constraints present on achieving the goal of maintaining and expanding non-market production, apart from the lack of time available to be spent working the land, as outlined above. This is because the skills and resources required to achieve this goal were in place, including home gardening skills, hunting, fishing, rongoa (herbal medicine), and taonga raranga (weaving).

**Constraints on the return of whānau**

As explained in the introduction to this chapter, the sustainable development goals expressed by case-study groups are to be understood procedurally. Consequently, the first goal of
establishing a mandate for ongoing decision-making, and the second goal of creating abundance through transforming the land, are both essential for meeting the third goal of case-study groups – providing a place for returning whānau. Therefore, the constraints on achieving goals one and two are likewise constraints on achieving the return of whānau. However, there was a constraint on creating a place for whānui to return beyond the constraints identified for achieving goals one and two.

This constraint concerns the restrictions placed upon the use of Māori land for housing. Rural land is often zoned in a manner that restricts land development. For example, in a rural-one zone land cannot be subdivided to less than 10 hectares. This means that there is only one title for the land and a restriction on building more than one home on the title. Māori land zoned in a rural-one area is subject to this rule, which means that it is not possible to construct multiple homes on fragmented blocks of Māori land. However, this was changed under Te Ture Whenua Māori Act, which gave Māori landowners the right to gain reservation status for the construction of villages, or a collection of homes, outside of the rural zoning restrictions.

However, the challenge was that case-study groups were typically unaware of their ability to gain reservation status. Case Studies Five and Seven, in particular, were two groups that were keen to gain reservation status for their land as soon as possible once aware of the opportunity. This led me to investigate the process and guidelines required for gaining reservation status. I found the process fairly straightforward. It primarily involves providing a good argument regarding why reservation status is required. If the argument is considered satisfactory to the Māori Land Court then reservation status is given. Although straightforward, I consider that some assistance for case-study groups to assist with the process would be helpful – in particular, developing strong arguments for reservation status.

The Root Solutions

As outlined in the introduction, the function of this chapter has been to identify the constraints on case-study groups achieving each of their development goals, and to suggest solutions for overcoming constraints. The focus in this chapter has been on resource gaps that constrain development, with particular emphasis on gaps in financial assets, physical assets (in terms of
machinery), and human resource gaps (in terms of leadership and technical expertise). The following Table Twenty Two summarises the constraints covered in this chapter and offers potential solutions to the constraints identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>Cause</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a1. Challenges to establishing a mandate for decision-making</td>
<td>a2. Rivalry and jealousy emerging when benefits to communal landowners are thought to accrue within some landowners and not with others. Misunderstandings and misconceptions regarding the distribution of benefits.</td>
<td>a3. Leadership that acts to further collective interest rather than personal interest. However, there are limits to leaders acting in the collective interest being able to perform this function if lines of communication and accountability with land shareholders are poor or inadequate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b1. Insufficient farm scale</td>
<td>b2. Fragmentation of land blocks brought about through communal tenure</td>
<td>b3. Look to develop high-value niche and novel products that are more profitable per unit of land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b4. Shortage of technical skills in piloting and growing niche, high value crops</td>
<td>b5. Inexperience and requirement for formal training</td>
<td>b6i. Contract appropriate technical skills in planning and developing enterprise – go to c4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b7ii. Participants enroll in course offering necessary technical training – go to g1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| c1. Shortage of development capital or financial assets | c2. Shortage of technical skills in:  
- Business Planning  
- Technical Planning | c3i. Contract technical expertise to assist with business and technical planning – go to c4 |
<p>| | | 3ci. Participants enroll in course offering necessary training (e.g. night classes in small business planning and development) – go to g1 |
| c4. No resources to contract technical expertise | c5. Lack of development capital | c6. Write funding application to Te Puni Kōkiri, or other relevant government agency for resources to contract technical expertise |
| c7. Lack of experience in, and knowledge of, how to write a funding application | c8. Inexperience and lack of formal education | c9. Develop relationship and rapport with TPK development officer who has bureaucratic language writing and networking skills to either advise on, or write application, and support application through process |
| c10. Decision-making on applications takes time and with no guarantee of success. Contracts for technical | c11. Fear of hefty investment in projects that might fail, which would be politically unpalatable | c12. Meet this need for technical capacity building not through the Ministry of Māori Development, but through education institutions. However, there is reluctance to engage in institutional training, see g1. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>help are typically short-</td>
<td>term in nature not permitting long-term capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. d1. 'Bridging income' while establishing enterprise</td>
<td>d2. Need to provide whānau income</td>
<td>d3. Significant investment of development capital into enterprise to provide bridging income needed—go to d4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. e1. Need for adequate plant and machinery</td>
<td>e2. Lack of capital</td>
<td>e3. Significant investment of development capital into enterprise required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. f1. Obtaining significant investment of development through investment</td>
<td>f2. Communal tenure land cannot be used as collateral for taking loans</td>
<td>f3. Need for joint partnership with institutions that understand needs, and invest and support the development. For example Case Study Five’s attempt to build a relationship with the corporate arm of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, in order to get support from an institution that understands their needs, and which they feel they can trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. g1. Lack of business administration skills</td>
<td>g2. Inexperience, time constraints and shortage of administration skills</td>
<td>g3i. Contract individual to develop business administration skills – Go to c4 g3ii. Participants enrol in course offering necessary training – go to h1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. h1. Reluctance to engage in institutional training</td>
<td>h2. Distance to facility, illiteracy, desire for 'hands on' training on-site, fear of failure, lack of time</td>
<td>h3. Need for professional and culturally matched on-site extension and formal training from education provider based upon open and trusting relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. i1. Fear of taking on debt</td>
<td>i2. Anticipated personal and financial consequences of business failure</td>
<td>i3. The need for a business partner and investor who can understand needs and partner development – see f3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. j1. Process for gaining reservation status</td>
<td>j2. Lack of experience and knowledge of legislation and bureaucratic process</td>
<td>j3. Contract specialist skill in legislation and bureaucratic process, or use skills of TPK development officer to work through process – go to c4 and c9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. k1. Shortage of technical knowledge in land development</td>
<td>k2. Lack of experience and specialist knowledge of land management practice</td>
<td>k3. Contract specialist skills in land management, and/or engage in institutional training to gain necessary skills – go to c4 and h1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. L1. Whānau members leading and driving development initiatives leave</td>
<td>L2. Whānau members decide to change their life course, or ‘fall-out’ with other whānau members</td>
<td>L3. A particular initiative needs to be supported collectively, so that, if one member leaves, there are others to take on the initiative. This is primarily an issue of identifying the right initiatives that get broad support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table was developed through a straightforward coding process, whereby each constraint I experienced to development outlined in this chapter, is identified. Then next to each constraint is outlined the solution that was sought to overcome the constraint. However, it can be seen in the Table, that there were constraints in implementing solutions, which required another solution. For example, b1 in Table Twenty Two identifies that insufficient farm scale was a constraint on development. To overcome this constraint it was found that growing and processing high-value niche and novel products was a solution, which was coded in Table Twenty Two as b3. However, another constraint emerged to undertaking this type of initiative, namely shortages in technical skills to undertake such an enterprise, which was coded as b4. Through following the table through all of the constraints and solutions it can be seen that constraints and solutions are interconnected. The main purpose of the table is to enable the reader to trace all of the sequences of constraint and solution, back to four core solutions, or root solutions, that provide a means to solve all constraints. These four root solutions are highlighted in Table Twenty Two (below) in blue.

The first root solution suggests that Māori land development for Aspiring Owners requires leadership that acts to further collective interest rather than self-interest. Leaders who act in self-interest are unlikely to get on-going support, or generate cohesion among groups of landowners. However, there are limits to leaders who do act in the collective interest being able to perform this function if distorting narratives are present that portray leadership as self-interested.

Those leaders from case-study groups that worked hard on communication and accountability tended to have more stable tenure arrangements. This highlights the importance of leaders possessing the necessary communication skills to accurately portray their intentions. Regular and quality communication between leaders and land shareholders is crucial for leaders to retain support, and also for land shareholders to feel that their interests are being adequately represented. In this way communication establishes good lines of accountability between leadership and shareholders.
The second root solution concerns a mechanism for overcoming the constraints of lack of development capital, fear of taking on debt, and inexperience. These constraints led Case Study Two to look toward a tertiary institution to partner their development, while Case Studies Five and Six looked toward their tribal corporate body to assist, invest and partner them into establishing enterprises. This was because they expected the tribal body to anticipate their needs and respect their way of life. They envisaged the corporate body partnering them, by investing and slowly withdrawing their interest as the whānau gained experience in how to manage their own operations. Mentoring joint ventures between capable institutions and case-study groups is therefore considered the second root solution to the challenges of inexperience, lack of development capital and fear of debt. However, it is clear from the research results in this chapter that only Case Study Two was able to successfully establish a partnership which led to rapid development. The attempts of Case Studies Five and Six were unsuccessful, as their iwi did not have the policy instruments in place to support their initiatives.

The third root solution outlines the need for professional on-site extension and formal training from an education provider based upon open and trusting relationships (according to local custom) to overcome the constraints that exist to engaging in institutional training. This education/training is essential to gain the technical knowledge, expertise and specialist assistance case-study groups require to undertake the changes they desire to see occur on their land.

Conclusions

From the research results outlined in this chapter it is clear that strong institutional support from either the agencies of the nation-state, or from post settlement iwi, is required to achieve successful Māori land development with Aspiring Owners. I consider that this support needs to come in a number of forms. First, it is outlined in this chapter that Māori land development should be led by individuals who lean more toward acting in the collective interest rather than using common resources to pursue self-interest. However, even when acting in what they considered the collective interest, leaders from case studies stressed the challenge they faced in
communicating their actions and intentions in communities where suspicion and distrust was prevalent.

It might be suggested that addressing this situation simply requires the presence of governance structures that clearly define reporting processes and procedures between manager, governors and landowners, so that the landowners can clearly and regularly determine that leaders are representing their interests. Nonetheless, addressing this issue is not that simple. As outlined in the previous chapter, five of the case studies in this thesis possessed governance structures, such as Whānau or Ahu Whenua Trusts that, under law, placed on Trustees and Managers strong requirements for reporting back to landowners. Furthermore, Case Study Four had strong reporting requirements back to the Māori Trustee, who in turn was responsible for reporting back to shareholders. Despite these accountability requirements a number of leaders still stressed the challenges they had in combating the high levels of suspicion and distrust regarding their intentions.

Consequently, I consider that support is required to assist land development leaders in situations where existing communication skills are unable to adequately inform land shareholders of actions and intentions. I would suggest that institutional support to develop communication plans that establish good lines of communication and accountability back to landowners would be of assistance. In particular, I would argue that existing land development leaders, with good communication skills, be used to train other leaders driving Māori land development but who may not possess such skills. Furthermore, there is the potential to build the requirement for communication strategies that meet the needs of landowners within the constitutions of Land Trusts and Incorporations.

Second, it is concluded from this chapter that strong institutional support is required for Aspiring Owners to overcome constraints on development including: lack of development capital; fear of taking on debt; inexperience; and deficits in technical skills. However, this institutional support would need to be culturally matched and offer a suite of support mechanisms including: social loans or venture capital; on-site extension and formal training; and strong mentoring to build experience. Over time this strong support could be withdrawn. Preferably this type of support would be offered through post-settlement iwi structures that possess an understanding of context, and can nestle the development within tribal networks.
However, it is noted that in the context of this research the post-settlement iwi did not possess the policy instruments to provide this type of support. Nonetheless nation-state government agencies can provide this type of institutional support, which is clearly demonstrated from Case Study Two – the only case study of Aspiring Owners to make significant progress toward their goals through partnering an accommodating tertiary education institution. Furthermore government development agencies such as Te Puni Kōkiri could work toward providing holistic and coordinated institutional support for Māori landowners – whereby culturally matched mentoring, communication planning, training, and financial investment is simultaneously provided. This is to remedy the rather piecemeal approach of Te Puni Kōkiri experienced in the case studies outlined above, where support could be obtained in fragmented areas, such as business planning, after lengthy and time-consuming processes.

It is also concluded that any development options pursued on Māori land should not be built around the passion and interests of individuals. Three promising business ventures were developed with three case studies. However, in each case key whānau members driving the ventures left to pursue changing interests. Consequently, any development option should have broad support among any team driving development to ensure that it is continued should one member leave. Nonetheless, the development options created with the case studies are readily transferable to other contexts.

Overall it can be concluded that a comprehensive and multi-faceted programme is required to support the development of Aspiring Owners. A multi-faceted approach is required to deal with the diverse constraints experienced on development. If each constraint identified is simultaneously addressed through culturally matched mentoring, communication planning, training, and financial investment, I would argue that Aspiring Owners could rapidly move toward their development goals. It needs to be noted that for Aspiring Owners the development of their land is not just a business initiative, but a springboard for cultural revitalisation, environmental restoration, and community development generally. Thus any tribal or government investment in this type of development initiative would likely generate multiple social and environmental benefits that extend well beyond simple financial rewards.
CHAPTER ELEVEN: Tuna and ‘Likeable Rogues’

Introduction

In this chapter, two constraints on Māori landowners achieving the development goals are identified. The first constraint is identified as the *tuna* (*eel*) *phenomenon*. It is demonstrated that the *eel phenomenon* creates an environment within Māori communities which encourages the *status quo*. This is due to first a fear of ‘stepping out’ or trying new development trajectories that might end in failure. Second, it is due to a fear of highlighting the sense of failure experienced by other community members, if a new development trajectory is successful. It is shown that case-study groups attempted to overcome this constraint through two mechanisms. The first is reducing fear of failure by establishing mentoring relationships with institutions that can guide case-study groups into the experiences and skills required to make necessary changes. The second involves overcoming low self-perceptions through ‘reclaiming history’ and building images of Māori that are free from colonial stereotyping.

The second constraint identified on Māori achieving their development goals is the presence of leadership that fails to represent the interests of communities when engaging with institutions. Instead this leadership can support the interests of the institution over the interests of the community. The impact of this phenomenon is that Māori landowners cannot take advantage of legislation which compels many institutions to consult, and collaboratively engage with Māori in a manner which aligns Māori community interest with that of the institution. It is proposed that overcoming this phenomenon requires that mechanisms be developed for promoting representation that is accountable.
The fable of the eels

One afternoon, during my visits to my North Island case studies, I was sitting outside the wharekai of a marae situated near a remote rural town. I had been working through the planning process, outlined in Chapter Seven, with Case Study One. While standing outside I was approached and spoken to by a kaumātua in his late 70s, with whom I had begun to develop a good relationship. He told me a fable, which was in some ways humorous, but also raised some very important issues.

Later that day I journeyed north to another small town. I was meeting a Māori woman, a mother of four, who was currently hosting ten nephews and nieces from the city on her farm. They could be seen riding bareback on the beach from the verandah we were sitting on. She had written a business proposal to a tour bus company and had asked me to come and give her my opinion on whether the proposal was adequate. I read through the proposal and could see that it had been professionally constructed.

She wanted to provide the overseas visitors travelling past her home on tour buses with a traditional cultural performance and hangi. However, she was apprehensive in actually sending the business proposal. Interestingly, the woman retold the fable that had been told to me by the kaumātua. The fable differed slightly but the essence was the same.

The next day, back at the marae, I again had the fable told to me by another individual. The fable went like this:

*Once there were two Māori men fishing for tuna (eels), and a Pākehā fishing for tuna, next to each other. Every time the Māori men caught an eel they put it in their bucket, but it quickly proceeded to jump out and wriggle back into the stream. However, every time the Pākehā caught an eel it stayed in the bucket. After a while the Pākehā’s bucket was full and he went home. One Māori turned to the other and said, ‘He is catching Māori eels.’*

The fable as explained to me by the kaumātua is as follows:
‘Every time a Māori starts to get ahead, to raise their head out of the bucket, he will get pulled down.’

Dependency, vulnerability and the siege mentality

The purpose of this section of the chapter is to explore this fable. It has been demonstrated in previous chapters that I received both manaaki combined with reasonable suspicion and mistrust, while working alongside Māori landowners. It has also been outlined that this mistrust had a good basis, in that Māori communities can be opened to exploitation.

I was frequently told stories of exploitation that case-study groups had experienced through being involved in development and research. This included a lack of tangible benefits, and theft of intellectual property. It was pointed out to me regularly that researchers turn up, study Māori, then move away to pursue their careers, leaving the communities they worked with behind.

It was clear that Māori were vulnerable to exploitation, which I considered made many individuals defensive. In addition, after attending many hui, it was clear that the historical narratives of colonial injustice were raw in the minds of community members. A sense of injustice was pervasive. Distrust of the government, or Crown, was rooted in the discrimination of colonial rule, including dubious land acquisition, and a plethora of policies and practices designed to assimilate Māori.

After reflecting on the vulnerability to exploitation experienced, I asked a kuia how this vulnerability might be addressed. She said to me: ‘In the past power came from a sword, then it came from a pistol, now it comes from a pen, we need to learn how to defend ourselves with pens.’ When reflecting on this statement I consider that the kuia was outlining, from her understanding, how power expressed over Māori has changed. This change has entailed a movement from brute physical military force being used by those in power to fulfil their imperial ambitions, through to the emergence of specialised discourse that groups in power possess. Conversely, those outside of the ‘power loops’ do not possess these discourses, giving rise to exclusion.

This phenomenon can be clearly illustrated in the previous chapter in which specialist experts were required to assist Māori landowners in obtaining the financial assets required to overcome
development constraints. For example, specialists were required to write funding applications on behalf of Māori communities, to obtain financial support from New Zealand government development agencies. In turn these funds were used to contract specialists to write business development plans, and in turn obtain loan financing from corporate financial institutions. In this manner, the Māori land owners were largely excluded from institutional support due to a ‘discourse barrier’ that could only be overcome by a specialist who could act on their behalf.

Understanding the discourse of powerful institutions is important for generating opportunities. However, it is equally important for self-defence against exploitation. For example, there are many laws, policies and procedures that institutions must follow. When institutions contravene these standards, they can be brought to account for inappropriate conduct, through the legal system for example. If knowledge regarding the laws, policies and procedures is not present within communities, to which an institution must adhere, the community will not be able to bring the institution to account. In addition, if a community does not have the resources (e.g., time) to challenge the institution, then they will not be able to bring it to account. For example, Case Study One did not have the time, energy, or expertise to bring the institution to account that had used its name in research funding applications.

However, it was clear that the institution in question would not have claimed a research partnership with a large and prestigious corporate institution to gain kudos for a research proposal, unless approval had been gained from the institution in question. This is because the legal ramifications of claiming a partnership that does not exist would be potentially catastrophic for the institution. However, Māori communities do not possess the ability to defend themselves in the way that other powerful institutions do, consequently they are easy targets for exploitation.

Without knowledge of specialist discourse and the resources to pursue opportunities or challenge the expression of power, Māori neither take advantage of opportunities nor can they be adequately defended against exploitation. I consider that this leads to what Wade the kaihautū, from Case Study Two referred to as the ‘siege mentality’. Wade explained that the metaphor of the siege refers to the walls around the community as a self-defence mechanism against potential exploitation. This distrust precludes relationships forming with ‘outsiders’ or those individuals beyond the defensive walls of the community.
A common motto expressed in Māori communities that reject the participation of ‘outsiders’ is ‘by Māori for Māori’. These communities can reject the technical assistance or expertise of any individual who is not Māori. None of the case studies I worked alongside, in general, had the ‘by-Māori-for-Māori’ approach to development. However, I did have close working relationships with a number of groups that did take ‘by-Māori-for-Māori’ approach. Over the course of my research (five years) these groups experienced a number of set-backs due to errors that could have been addressed through having access to appropriate expertise.

I consider that the ‘by-Māori-for-Māori’ approach would, nonetheless work, if contained within Māori communities were individuals with the specialist discourse required to meet development goals and defend communities against exploitation. Furthermore, it would work if all of the skills, knowledge and financial assets needed to achieve development goals were present. As outlined in the previous chapter, skill shortages in a number of areas are a constraint on Māori landowners bringing about desired changes.

In contrast to the ‘by-Māori-for-Māori’ approach, case-study groups I worked alongside did not possess a siege mentality. Instead, as outlined in Chapter Six, I was subject to a deportment-of-trust-building, which entailed a process of hostility and challenge, slowly giving way to manaaki and whanaungatanga. Through this method-in-practice trust was built over time. Once trust was established, then relationships could develop, permitting the skills, knowledge and resources from outside the community to assist groups in achieving their own self-determined goals. Thus, although there may be a level of dependency on an individual from the outside to achieve development goals, the vulnerability associated with dependency is much less likely to lead to exploitation, if the individual is a trusted character.

The deportment-of-trust-building also brings an outsider into a social web of obligation and reciprocity. As outlined in Chapter Six, due to the manaaki I received from case-study groups, I felt a strong desire to work in their interests. In this manner, being brought into the community brings with it responsibilities to act in the interests of the community concerned. This is an empowering process for the group in that the group obtains a measure of influence and social pressure on the outsider.
Vulnerability, shame and the ‘hero complex’

The vulnerability that Māori experience from dependency is combined with a sense of shame that emerges from requiring assistance. This has been illustrated previously where the kaihautū from Case Study Five described his experience of feeling like a beggar, given his reliance upon the ‘charitable’ assistance of outsiders. However, another experience, that had ‘put off’ research participants from working with outsiders was expressed within Case Study Four. The whānau referred to their aversion of working with outsiders as a dislike of the ‘hero complex’.

The *hero complex* emerges when development practitioners, or researchers, view themselves as heroes coming to ‘save’ Māori who are victims. Research participants in a number of case studies frequently mentioned their dislike of outsiders assuming the posture of ‘hero’ or ‘saviour’. An outsider believing that they could come in and ‘save’ Māori was considered patronising and paternalistic. This may be explained using a metaphor from Case Study Four.

In Case Study Four a research participant referred to outsiders with a ‘hero complex’ as ‘Captain Planets’ – after a cartoon. This was a strong metaphor, which might be interpreted in the following manner. The superhero *Captain Planet* has powers that ordinary humans do not, which enable him to save the planet from evil forces. However, it may be imagined that if the writers of the cartoon gave all human beings the same superpowers as *Captain Planet*, he would become irrelevant – this is because they could defend themselves. Consequently, Captain Planet can only maintain hero status through having powers that others do not.

Through this interpretation of the metaphor, an outsider with a *hero complex* can only gain hero status through being around those who are disempowered. This explains the aversion that research participants feel toward those with a *hero complex* – the disempowerment of research participants is being used to feed an individual with the power they need to feel like a hero. In this way the vulnerability and disempowerment Māori feel is a source of power, superiority and satisfaction for the individual with the ‘*hero complex*’.

Negative internal narratives

Engagement with ‘outside’ specialists and institutions is also precluded within Māori communities by self-deprecating narratives that Māori are intellectually inferior. Frequently those research participants who were particularly shy (whakamā) suggested verbally to me that
they were ‘dumb’, ‘stupid’, ‘not learned’ or ‘just Māori’. Fear of formal learning institutions was also present, given that landowners expressed not having done well within State schools and having suffered from unpleasant learning experiences. This was represented in the common story of Māori being disciplined (usually beaten) for speaking te reo Māori at school.

Although it needs to be noted that many research participants did not consider themselves as unintelligent, a significant number of individuals did express this self-understanding, which was accompanied by extreme shyness or whakamā. I considered that these negative internal narratives impacted on the ability of Māori landowners to develop the technical skills necessary to achieve development goals. This is because I believe that the self-belief that one can actually take on new skills needs to be present before new skills can be adopted. The issue is further compounded given that there is a fear of exploitation and paternalism at the hands of ‘outside’ institutions.

**The comfort zone**

The low self-opinion existing among many individuals gives rise to another phenomenon at the social level – the expectation of failure giving rise to what one research participant below calls the ‘comfort zone’. To explain this phenomenon it is worthwhile returning to the story of the woman with the cultural tourism business proposal at the beginning of this section. She had her business proposal accepted by the tour companies and even got to the stage of accepting bookings. However, at the last minute she pulled out. She said that everybody in her local community was expecting, and even desiring her to fail.

I considered that the expectation of her failure, and desire for her failure, by those in the community around her confirmed and reinforced her own self-doubt. I discussed these reflections with all case-study groups (excluding Case Study Three). They referred to the underlying motivation to stop or thwart individuals from ‘stepping out’ from the status quo as hae hae (in Case Studies One and Two) or jealousy (in Case Studies Four, Five, Six and Seven). The kaihautū from Case Study Two explained, from his particular perspective, that those leading a development initiative, like the woman outlined above, had the effect of highlighting the sense of failure experienced by other members of their whānau, tribe and community. Those who stepped-out were seen as arrogant in thinking that they could succeed where others had failed. As a consequence they wanted to pull down and thwart initiatives.
The kaihautū from Case Study Two also said that if an individual were to succeed in stepping out, and establishing a new development initiative, then it would demonstrate that a different future was possible. If new futures were possible then many in the community would be forced to look at themselves and explore why they had not succeeded. The effect of pulling others down, as described by the kaumātua using the eel fable, is that the status quo is maintained ensuring that whānau, tribe or community, do not move ahead, or excel past others. As stated by the kaumātua: ‘Every time a Māori starts to get ahead, to raise their head out of the bucket, other Māori will pull them down’. As a result they end up fighting one another and thereby remaining within the Pākehā’s (European New Zealander’s) bucket. As said to me by the kaihautū in Case Study Six: ‘You end up walking as fast as the slowest person.’

The phenomenon of maintaining the status quo through personal attacks I consider is outlined in the following quote from a research participant from a South Island case study. In this quote he outlines the reaction that occurs when development initiatives emerge in an attempt to change the status quo, or move out of the ‘comfort zone’, as he refers to it.

‘Yeah and that is the comfort zone, and that is what I was saying before, it is about keeping everything still, we haven’t got shots firing at us, that hit your head – bang! You know we keep still, cos nothing is happening here.’

However, there were other reasons given by research participants for attacking those that attempt to change the status quo, other than jealousy. The attack on the individual attempting to change the status quo can simply be an attempt to stop them from failing, given a history of failures, and unexpected outcomes. For example, in the previous chapter it was explained how a group of landowners refused to take on the management of a dairy operation generating good profits, from which they received a few thousand dollars. This was due to fear of losing land, because in the past when failure to meet land tax obligations had led to the confiscation of land. I consider that this phenomenon is illustrated in the following quote by a research participant: ‘We don’t want to rock the boat because we don’t know which way it is going to tip.’ Another research participant (the kaihautū from Case Study Seven), in a discussion around this topic, also suggested that this was ‘about playing it safe’. This social psychology described in the eel fable is outlined in Figure Twelve below.
However, some critical scrutiny does need to be applied to the statements and interpretations of the eel phenomenon provided by research participants. This is because these are statements made by individuals and groups that are relatively uncommon within their community contexts. Their attempts to drive changes are bound to generate negative reactions from those who might be considered more conservative. Additionally, a sense of frustration and failure at not achieving goals can often lead to a situation where case-study groups look for scapegoats, creating a situation where the community in which they reside is blamed for the challenges they are experiencing.

There were experiences that I had which might suggest that the interpretations made by case-study groups, regarding the eel phenomenon, were reasonably good representations of the social dynamics at play within their community contexts. For example, in my professional research position, I had a work colleague approach me and ask how the research was going with the case-study groups. He had heard that a significant crop failure had occurred at Case Study Five. However, the truth was the opposite – the crops were in fact doing well. This suggested that there were false rumours being spread suggesting that Paul and whānau had failed at their tunnel house venture. This type of false rumour, which I often experienced, I considered was designed to paint the attempts by landowners to make changes as either failing, or bound to fail.
In addition, case-study groups were not using the *eel phenomenon* as an excuse for the difficulties that they faced. Most groups were generally concerned for the well-being of their people and were working hard to make changes. There was an understanding of the phenomenon in a way that was generally based on understanding rather than judgement. Nevertheless, frustration and anger was at times naturally exhibited. Additionally the case-study groups did not talk about this phenomenon in a day-to-day manner. It was more my questioning about their experiences of attempting to make changes in their communities that made this phenomenon explicit.

**Inertia, addiction and leadership**

I consider that the comfort zone, created when the *status quo* is maintained, might also be termed a zone of inertia, or a place where change does not happen. This interpretation is supported by Paul, the kaihautū in Case Study Five, who referred to being stuck in the status quo as ‘the dead spot’. I deemed that he referred to it as the dead spot because the future possibilities of those adhering to the narratives of failure are limited to the status quo. In this manner, individuals with more potential than their community can support, end up suffering from the frustration of boredom, inertia and confinement. I would tentatively propose that this gives rise to a response in which the individual looks for a means of escape from the suffering of loss of control and ownership. I considered this is evident in the high prevalence of drug and alcohol addiction, which was referred to by the kaihautū in Case Study Two as the ‘suicide of our young people’, or the kaihautū in Case Study Five, ‘the monkey on our back’.

The challenge is that inertia appears compounded through drug use. There were a number of experiences that brought me to this conclusion, one of which is outlined below. When working alongside a whānau getting some urgent crops in the ground, a number of youth within one whānau did not participate in the planting, despite being asked to assist. At the time they were stoned and not really in a state to assist. Instead the older people were undertaking the work, despite being unable to complete it due to physical limitations. At a later date I asked one youth why he was not contributing to growing the crop, he half joked that ‘gardening was not for a Māori man’ and suggested that if he was going to farm, he wanted to farm beef. My interpretation of these responses was that he did not wish to assist in the gardens because they were below his aspirations but that his aspirations were currently beyond what he could
currently achieve – leading to a state of inertia.\footnote{It needs to be noted that this young man was a hard worker, with a number of different seasonal occupations. He earned quite a lot of income per year (well above the New Zealand average), which might suggest that this would put him in good stead for meeting his aspirations of farming beef. However, by his own admission he tended to ‘live for the day’ managing to spend for example $1500 in the pub in one night (shouting friends drinks).} I considered that the inertia in this case study was further compounded by the ‘soft income’ obtained from growing cannabis. One of the youth often joked about how much easier it was to gain an income from cannabis as opposed to growing a legal crop.

I therefore concluded that the combination of inertia, drug use and soft income provided an incredibly difficult challenge to overcome in this case study. However, what was interesting is that a kaihautū from two case studies had both been addicted to a combination of drugs and alcohol, becoming stuck in what the kaihautū in Case Study Five referred to as the ‘dead spot’ or inertia. Both had found their way out after hitting extremely low points in their lives, which had led them back to the land, and in particular to make a difference through providing others with pathways out of inertia.

Similarly, the kaihautū from Case Study One also indicated having hit rock bottom but did not provide a life story to illustrate the phenomenon. He described rock bottom as ‘\textit{mauri mate}’ – the death of life. Similarly, the kaihautū from Case Study Six had mentioned a life incident that resulted in ostracism from her community and church. She too said that this had brought her to rock bottom, causing her to re-evaluate her life. Again, the death of a close relative brought her to re-evaluate her life, which led her to return to the land to provide opportunities for others.

Hearing the stories of these research participants brought me to speculate about some of the similarities between case-study groups in regards to leadership. Most had leaders who had returned to the land to make a difference after having a life-changing moment, which caused them to significantly re-evaluate their lives. This did make them somewhat marginal or unusual characters in their own communities. However, they possessed a way of interpreting and understanding their communities from the ‘outside’. This was because they had once been immersed in a state of self-abuse and inertia, but had found a pathway out. This pathway for them was through healing the land, as the kaihautū from Case Studies One, Two, Five, and
Seven all said to me: ‘You heal the land you heal the people’. It was this kaupapa (philosophy) that they wanted to share with their whānau, and with other landowners, to bring them out from a state of inertia.

**Mechanisms devised by case-study groups to overcome the challenge to ‘stepping out’**

The first way envisaged by case-study groups to get over inertia, and step out into new territory was through mentoring support, which would assist in building confidence. As illustrated in the previous chapter, Case Study One sought to establish training courses on their own land blocks, through developing relationships with education providers, and research institutions. The strength of this vision was that the extension would take place according to the customs and standards of the case-study groups themselves, taking away the fear of exploitation and paternalism. In addition, learning would occur on the terms and conditions of the landowners, creating an environment where they felt comfortable.

Further, Case Studies Five and Six, wished to be partnered and mentored into their commercial ventures by their own highly successful corporate body, given that it was considered that this body would understand their needs, and have the skills and experience to guide them into taking ownership and control of their own enterprise. The notion of being mentored and partnered, on their own terms, into developing the skills necessary to run an enterprise, appealed to both of these case-study groups. Having an overarching body with more experience, was considered by both case studies to provide a high level of security and confidence.

Other approaches were also being devised by two other case-study groups, which were focused on rebuilding the self-esteem of Māori, which is fueled by the narratives of failure and exploitation. It has been outlined previously that Paul and whānau from Case Study Five had obtained tōtara logs, which were carved for a future wharenui (meeting house) on the land. The purpose of the wharenui was to provide an ‘identification point’ or a place where those with bloodlines to the land could come to and find their place as Tangata Whenua. Paul’s vision was that the wharenui would be used by the whānau to come and stay and for the development of a carving school. Paul had symbolically chosen as its location an old Pā site (fort), that Paul
called the ‘stronghold’, which is symbolic for revival of the Tangata Whenua, in a position of prowess and strength.

The wharenui was expected to provide a central point for ‘telling the stories of the land’ and also in Paul’s words ‘bringing the forbidden past forward’. After talking with Paul he outlined that the ‘forbidden past’ referred to the period of colonisation when Māori were forbidden to practice their language and culture, being made to feel ashamed for doing so. From his perspective, this had led Māori to be embarrassed about who they were and had created difficulties with Māori knowing themselves, because they had lost their history.

For Paul the building of the wharenui was seen as a central point for the ‘telling of the stories’ to address the identity crisis by tacitly reconnecting Tangata Whenua with their history on the land (including the ancestors that dwell there), and building a narrative that connects the ‘forbidden past’ with contemporary Māori existence. In other words, a new story will be generated to provide Māori with bloodlines to the land, an avenue by which they can understand themselves, overcoming the bifurcation in identity generated through colonisation.

The building of the wharenui on the stronghold was also, according to Paul, about ‘recognition’ [sic]. He considered that if they followed the ‘narrow path’, that is if they do everything ethically right, then they will gain the recognition they need. Recognition involved ‘getting the stories of the land documented’, or officially recognised, so that those in positions of authority and power will recognise the unique history and place of the Tangata Whenua on the Māori Reserve. In other words, Paul and whānau were not just looking to establish a strong identity through reconnecting with their past and the land, but were also seeking to ensure that this identity and history is recognised and respected by those in authority. There was, in this way, a desire to establish status and standing in the eyes of authority. Without this recognition, it was feared that decisions affecting Tangata Whenua, by regional or local government, tribal authorities, and government agencies, would be made without thought to the effects of the decisions on Tangata Whenua.

The construction of a wharenui on the stronghold was considered a key symbol of the revival of the Tangata Whenua. The stronghold represented a healing of the people through overcoming bifurcated identities generated through colonial domination, as well as asserting the standing
and self-determination of Tangata Whenua through recognition by authority. Without this recognition by authorities it was felt that the support from agencies necessary to achieve development goals would not take place. Therefore restoration of the stronghold had become a central and driving development goal of Paul and whānau.

In combination with the development of the stronghold, was the development of the river terrace gardens within this case study. Although in the foothills of the mountains, these terraces were once cultivated by Ngāi Tahu gardeners where they were used to grow subtropical kumara (sweet potato). The river terraces were a micro-climate developed through excellent frost drainage and a predominant northerly wind. They had also been previous cultivated 450 years ago by an earlier tribe, Ngāti Māmoe. Paul and whānau considered that the redevelopment of the gardens would put them back into the practices of their ancestors, creating an unbroken line, and on-going connection. I considered that this was a means of tacitly ‘bringing the past forward’ (in Paul’s terms) to overcome the ‘forbidden past’.

We had success in getting funding for the traditional gardens from the Ngāi Tahu Fund. However, getting funding for the wharenui was difficult. I worked alongside Paul in his attempts to bring his wharenui dream into reality but there were significant obstacles to making this happen. Although Paul had obtained the tōtara logs, and was having them carved, once again the whānau did not have much in the way of financial assets, to construct the wharenui itself. Consequently, we had to pursue the funding application processes through the Ministry of Māori development. Unfortunately, there has been, to date, no movement on any funding for this project.

Like Case Study Five, Case Study Seven had the goal of constructing a village of wharerau on their land. Wharerau are the traditional homes used by Māori in the south of the South Island. The shape of the wharerau is oval, constructed often from living branches and vines that are ‘bent over’ into an oval shape then thatched. Mud is then used to line the outside of the dwelling. The purpose of the wharerau was three-fold. First, it was considered that the wharerau could provide accommodation for whānau and friends being hosted on the land for holidays and various events, such as winter solsticite celebrations. Second, it was considered that the wharerau could be used for tourist accommodation. However, the third purpose of the wharerau was to provide, according to Aroha, a means of getting family together. Through getting family living
and staying together, she considered that the ‘openness and sharing’ necessary to pass on the traditions and stories would be present. This is outlined in the following quote: ‘If you don’t have that openness and sharing, how are you going to pass it (tradition) on to anyone’.

Additionally, Aroha in Case Study Seven was busy cultivating gardens to reconnect to the land, and provide food ‘for a return’. She expressed similar sentiments to Case Study Five, in that she considered working the land enabled identification with ancestors. In particular, she suggested that working together provided opportunities for storytelling as a family. Similarly, Paul and Rachael had gained funding from the Ngāi Tahu Fund for a traditional garden, which was designed to provide food to the local community, and act as a central point for community gatherings. They had discovered in the ngahere (forest) wild potatoes growing, which had been planted by their ancestors 200 years ago. These were replanted, and cultivated symbolising the reconnection to the past.

Consequently, I concluded that the construction of dwellings for storytelling, and the tacit learning of tradition through cultivating the soil, and engaging in the practices of ancestors, was a means of reconnecting with the past, and bringing the ‘forbidden past forward’. Aroha suggested that this storytelling was important because ‘our young ones need reflections of themselves that are true’. She also suggested that these reflections also needed to exist in broader society, including the media, rather than the distorted images she considered were currently portrayed.

The attempts by Paul and Aroha to reshape the way in which Māori view themselves, through the retelling of history and creating stories that generate true self-reflection, I considered were aimed at building the mana and standing necessary to ‘step-out’ and overcome the ‘dead spot’ or ‘mauri mate’ that both had seen in their communities. I concluded that without having the mana, standing, and self-belief in place, then the inertia cannot be overcome, and in turn the ability to learn, and take on the new skills, is compromised. Case Studies One, Five and Six all sought mentoring and partnerships, from institutions with the knowledge and experience to guide them into new skill-sets, to assist in overcoming the fear of moving into ‘unknown territory’. However, it was demonstrated that these Case-study groups considered that the mentoring relationship needed to be based on the custom of landowners, to create a comfortable learning environment and avoid exploitation and paternalism.
‘Lone rangers’, ‘likeable rogues’, and ‘token Māori’

Another challenge to Māori landowners achieving their development goals is the presence of community representatives who fail to act in the interests of their communities. To demonstrate this phenomenon it is necessary to return briefly to some previous discussion. It was demonstrated how Māori land owners are largely excluded from engaging with powerful institutions due to a ‘discourse barrier’ that can only be overcome by a specialist who can communicate on their behalf. The individual who communicates on behalf of the community as a result becomes a powerful figure because the community is dependent upon the figure for achieving its goals.

However, there is a second reason that this representative is a powerful figure. This is because in the New Zealand legislative environment many powerful institutions are required to consult with Māori, or have Māori participation in a range of areas, including research, health and resource management. Without Māori support and participation, in research for example, it is often unlikely that a research project will be funded. Consequently, gaining Māori participation is often paramount. Therefore those specialist individuals who provide a conduit between communities and institutions, are sought after individuals because they are to some extent the ‘gate-keepers’ of Māori engagement.

The problem is that the ‘gate keeper’, who acts as translator between the community and institution, could support the aims and objectives of the institution, against the interests of the community, particularly if it means that there is significant personal gain in doing so. There were incidences\(^{48}\) while I was undertaking this research, where community representatives or elites, established partnerships with institutions, on behalf of their communities. However, the purpose of the partnership was to pursue the interests of the institution, which were directly opposed to the interests of the community. However, the partnership was of significant advantage to both the community elite and the institution.

\(^{48}\) More detail on these incidences cannot be provided due to the possibility of harm coming to research participants.
Among Māori, an individual that puts him or herself and the community up to be ‘rented’ by institutions, were referred to as the ‘token Māori’ given that they are used by the institution to give their research or project credibility. Another term I also heard used to describe an individual who travelled around looking for opportunities to meet institutional requirements for community participation was ‘lone rangers’. This referred to the tendency of these individuals to act without going through the appropriate protocols of getting community sanction for her or his actions. In addition, institutions working with ‘lone rangers’ were referred to by research participants as ‘coming in the back door’, by working with an individual, acting alone and in self-interest, rather than with the community at large.

Ironically, although there was frustration at lone rangers within Māori communities they continued to emerge in leadership positions. I speculated that this was due to a number of factors. First of all an individual who acts in self-interest, in contradiction to community interest, may not do so all of the time. Often they may bring substantial benefits to the community, which can outweigh the costs. For example, in one of the incidences of community renting the community elite involved had also been involved in many projects that had provided benefit to his people over many years. There was consequently some loyalty toward him and appreciation for his work.

Second, I considered that representatives making their communities available for rent were often one of the few individuals in the community that had the necessary skills to overcome the discourse barriers between institutions and communities. In other words, they moved into representative and leadership positions by default, given the lack of alternative representation. I made this speculation on the basis that so many research participants were very shy or whakamā to talk with me at first because, as outlined previously, they did not consider themselves ‘learned’. I deemed that such individuals would be very unlikely to feel competent in positions working with macro institutions and so turned to whānau or tribal members who did possess the necessary skills. This contention is supported by the example of Paul, the kaihautū from Case Study Five. Paul always used family and tribal members to engage with institutions on his behalf because he was illiterate and had doubts about his own competency. This was despite Paul demonstrating intelligence and insight.
Third, I deemed that many viable leaders with the skills to represent their communities did not wish to do so. The kaihautū from Case Study Two, for example, was a well-respected member of his tribe and was continually sought for leadership positions. He always emphasised the need for good process in the hui I attended with him and would not have acted without community sanction. This led me to ask him why he would not stand. In response he expressed his dislike of ‘politics’. In particular, he said that he did not like being the centre of attention. Instead he suggested that he felt comfortable with his current role ‘sitting on the taumata’, which was status conferred upon him by kaumātua for obtaining a level of understanding and adeptness in mātauranga Māori.

I consequently concluded that in situations where ‘token Māori’ emerged in leadership positions, it was likely to be by default, due to their ability to overcome the discourse barrier between communities and institutions, and due to the reluctance of alternative leaders to become involved in ‘politics’. Furthermore, just because an individual could act at times in self-interest it did not mean that they could not act in the interests of the community at different times. However, another reason given for the continued presence of ‘token Māori’ in leadership positions came from the kaihautū in Case Study Six who suggested that ‘they are likeable rogues’. What she meant by this was that, at times, these individuals had charisma, and were more mischievous opportunists rather than ill-willed.

The irony of the presence of ‘likeable rogues’, or ‘lone rangers’, was that legislation designed to empower Māori through consultation was, in some cases, having the opposite effect of disempowerment because of the promotion of local elites, that acted against the interests of communities they represented. In some cases the rogue characters, were met in their communities with anger and cynicism. Incidences of community members simply withdrawing from the organisations that had provided these individuals with a mandate to represent their interests. Rather than blaming the representative for causing a split within the community group, a number of community members suggested that it was the goal of the institution ‘to divide and conquer Māori’ by tempting Māori to use their own people for personal gain. This

---

49 The taumata is a seat at the front of a marae (tribal community centre) where distinguished elders sit when welcoming visitors on the marae. It needs to be noted that some tribes refer to this as the pae pae as opposed to the taumata.
suggested to me that this issue needed to be confronted by the nation-state institutions, through requiring good process and procedure for securing Māori involvement and community support for initiatives.

**Looking for good leadership and representation**

The presence of elites partaking in *community renting* suggests that greater accountability is required of leaders within some communities. It is argued that these leaders need to possess the necessary experience and expertise to overcome discourse barriers with institutions. However, the challenge as outlined above is that alternative representatives, are either not qualified to overcome the ‘discourse barriers’ between communities and institutions, or wish to remain out of ‘politics’. The challenge is therefore having these individuals identified, encouraged and supported into leadership positions.

The purpose of this section is to identify at least some of the characteristics required of an individual assuming a position of leadership and accountability within a Māori community context. Through identifying such characteristics, institutions, such as tribal authorities, will be able to identify and promote individuals into leadership positions.

First, it would be helpful to look at the issue of accountability through a number of experiences that emerged through working alongside Paul, the kaihautū from Case Study Five. I asked Paul why he did not seek some sort of mandated representative position, such as a seat on the tribal authority. Apart from Paul’s own usual gentle self-deprecating answers that he was ‘not learned’ and ‘illiterate’, he gave a reply that he would rather remain looking from the outside, than engage in the infighting surrounding tribal politics (within his own rohe (tribal jurisdiction)). He suggested that this was because ‘they are like programmed people, they know their game, they obey their rules, and they don’t step outside them. Inside you become the judge. I look from the outside.’

In this quote Paul is identifying the different rationalities of individuals engaged in the politics referring to them as ‘programmed people’ and ‘players of games’ based upon certain rules. In particular, he suggests that this is all about ‘politics’ or the vying for power between the different individuals concerned. I asked Paul what he meant about being the judge when you are on the inside. He said that when you act as judge you assert your particular ‘programme’ as
true, while negating others. Finally, he said that he did not engage in the politics, and did not judge, but looked ‘from the outside’. In other words, he is not a programmed person so was not interested in the politics.

The irony with Paul’s statements was that he was a political activist. This political action he engaged in included staging land protests against the Crown, his own tribal authority, and a local logging company. However, this paradox can be answered by outlining and exploring a conversation that I had with Paul following the statement outlined above regarding ‘programmed people’. He said to me that the political game between programmed people ‘is what I have been talking about... that is the flag of the colonialist’. As I questioned him further it became apparent to me that, for him, the sign of the colonist now making its way into the tribal structure, was the presence of the will to dominate, based on the imposition of fundamentalist doctrines or programs.

The position held by Paul, that he refused to engage in politics, yet was a political activist, suggested that Paul distinguished the type of protest and activity he engaged in from politics, which he associated with the ‘flag of the colonialist’, or the ‘will to dominate’. The underlying motivation behind Paul’s politics, I considered, was a strong sense of accountability to both human and non-human beings, based upon certain sets of beliefs that he held. It is proposed that these beliefs, informed by an indigenous cosmology and shared by participants in most case-study groups, provide a good set standards for leadership accountability within Māori community contexts.

In order to demonstrate standards of a narrative outlining some of Paul’s political activity would be useful. A company wanted to come across the Māori reservation of Case Study Five using a designated paper road. The road needed to cross a river and pā (fort) site that Paul considered sacred, and that he was obligated to protect as kaitiaki (guardian). He was worried about disturbing his ancestors who rested there, and possible ramifications if they were disturbed – death or injury. Further, he was concerned about the life of the river being ‘choked’ or ‘killed’.

The company said that they were going to build the road despite the protests of Paul and whānau, who had set-up a blockade across the road. In response, Paul searched his land
boundary records and found that the road needed to cross a two-metre piece of land that he
owned. Because of this, the company was not able to build the road. In response the company
offered him $40,000 in compensation for building the road. He refused saying: ‘I won’t sell my
soul.’

However, the decision on whether or not to accept the money from the company was not
straightforward. Paul agonised over whether to take the money or not. In particular, he thought
about the benefit that might come from the money, which would allow a myriad of goals to be
reached, such as building the wharenui (a meeting house for those with ‘bloodlines’ to the land)
and the cultivation of community gardens. He also thought it might be possible to put
provisions in place to ensure that the road was sensitively designed to mitigate any damage.
However, he was concerned that if he took the money, his motivation might not be right, and
more benefit from the money would accrue to him than to the land and the people who came
from the land.

In the end he was convinced that doing a deal with this company would result in him ‘selling
his soul to the devil’. He said that the reason he came to this conclusion was in relation to the
way they treated him. At first they would not talk to him and brought in archaeologists to prove
that Māori had only inhabited the reservation area in the last 150 years, implying that the area
was not of cultural value. In other words they discounted, or considered his oral history a
fabrication. When they found that the Paul actually owned a portion of the land they needed to
cross, the company initially offered him $2000 in compensation to build the road. He suggested
that he was not gullible and that ‘blankets and muskets’ for land were no longer tenable.

Consequently, Paul felt a significant responsibility, as kaitiaki (land guardian), to protect the
health of the land, river and sites where his ancestors dwell, and act in the interests of those
with ancestral links to the reservation. The responsibilities of being Kaitiaki were felt so keenly
that he considered the act of pursuing his own material interests, by accepting the money
offered by the company, over those of the human, and non-human beings, whom he was
charged with guarding, would be immoral and put his soul at risk.

50 Incidentally the archaeologist told Paul to keep fighting because the land was ‘rich with life.’
However, it was not initially clear to Paul whether a deal with the company would be immoral and entail a ‘deal with the devil’. This was because he considered that a win-win situation might be possible, in which he would receive $40,000, to develop the land, but still retain control over the land – enabling him to fulfil his obligations as kaitiaki. However, the decision not to deal with the company was based upon one reason, the patronising disregard expressed by the company toward Tangata Whenua (the people of the land), which Paul viewed as the colonial mindset.

In the end it was the patronising superiority of the company, arriving from a dominant and forceful posture, which confirmed Paul’s decision not to make a deal. By assuming the posture of superiority the forestry company had immediately placed Paul into a role of subordination, and itself into the position of a colonialist. With this power dynamic in place a relationship based on equality was unlikely, and in particular the possibility of trust was precluded. Doing a deal with such a partner would be in Paul’s words, ‘a contract with the devil’, opening up the people, the land and sacred sites to possible exploitation.

If we examine closely the decision made by Paul, we find that his judgement was informed, in part, by faith-based knowledge, and in particular the belief that he had a soul, which he could lose through inappropriate action. The conclusion that we can draw from this is that Paul orientated his actions in the anticipation of his own death, and a life beyond that death. This notion is supported by several remarks by Paul like, ‘I just might make it to heaven’.

It can therefore be concluded that the decision by Paul was made, partly, out of fear of the outcomes from failing to protect the health of the land, river and sacred sites. However, fear was not the only motivating factor in his decision. Paul was also acting out of a genuine desire to preclude actions of the company that might diminish the health and vitality of the land and river. This was of utmost concern to Paul.

Paul felt that as kaitiaki he needed to ensure that the health and well-being of landowners, the river, land, and ancestors buried on the land, be enhanced by any decisions that he made. He considered himself accountable for his actions first of all to God. Second, he considered himself accountable to his ancestors, given that failing to please his ancestors would result in negative outcomes such as death or injury. Third, he considered himself accountable to the Tangata
Whenua (people of the land) given that as kaitiaki he was required to protect their interests and resources. This is evident in Paul’s strategies to maintain his mana and integrity with the people, outlined in the following statement ‘you can’t show personal gain when you ask in the name of others’.

As Kaitiaki, Paul considered himself accountable for protecting and enhancing the health and vitality of both human and non-human beings existing on his land. This sense of accountability emerges from both the responsibility of acting as kaitiaki (outlined in previous chapters), and a Māori cosmology that became evident through my experiences of working alongside Māori landowners. To demonstrate this cosmology, two underlying common Māori concepts are outlined below. These underpin the cosmology.

This first concept, which has already been covered briefly, is the notion of mauri, commonly expressed by participants in Case Studies One and Two. Mauri refers to the ‘life force’, of a being, or the health and vitality that a being expresses. For example, in Case Study Two, research participants referred to the mauri of rivers being diminished, when their health and vitality declined. The mauri of the river could be determined, among other things, by its life holding capacity, the clarity of the water, its smell, and general overall expression of health and vibrancy.

The notion of mauri can also be expressed through the kaupapa of the Māori sustainable farming group that possessed the kaupapa (philosophy): ‘to maintain and enhance the mauri of ngā taonga katoa’. When translated this kaupapa expresses the desire to ‘to maintain and enhance the vital and healthy life force of all things sacred’. The kaupapa reflects the desire of many landowners to act in ways to maintain and enhance the mauri of taonga, or in other words to encourage the management of resources in a way that facilitates the unfolding vitality and health of life. This sometimes involved, as with Paul from Case Study Five, political action to deter individuals, or institutions, from engaging in actions that might lead to the mauri of taonga being diminished.

A second concept that will assist in understanding the Māori cosmology experienced through working alongside Māori landowners is the term whakapapa (genealogy). Whakapapa is central to a Māori worldview. Through whakapapa/genealogy, the lineage of all beings can be traced
back to different atua (gods) who are in turn descendants of prior atua. For example Papatūānuku (Sky Father) and Ranginui (Earth Mother) had a number of children, one of which was Tāne – the forest. Human beings are also the off-spring of Rangi and Papa. Through this conception of the world, the cosmos becomes a whole family of beings interconnected through familial bonds. The implication of this family genealogical metaphor is that no family member can stand outside the family, no one member is an ‘island unto itself’ as each member is dependent upon another family member to provide it with an existence.

The world around oneself is a family, with the landscape, rivers and sky representing ancestors that are present. As the kaitiaki it is the role of Māori to ensure that the mauri (life force) of the family members is maintained or enhanced. However, although one is kaitiaki, one does not own the cosmos, one is a family member encapsulated within it, and who is dependent upon all other family member for existence (e.g. the sun, earth, water, air, animals and plants). This is illustrated in a statement by Paul, ‘I don’t possess this land – this land possesses me’. In other words he is owned by the land, or dependent upon many elements for his own survival and existence.

When the notion of mauri and whakapapa are combined, we arrive at a cosmos which is unveiled as an emanating wholesome vital energy, or life-force, unfolding genealogically as a family tree. From the perspective of many Māori landowners I worked alongside within this research, as kaitiaki they are accountable for ensuring that the vitality of this life unfolding is maintained or enhanced through human actions rather than choked or diminished, which would reduce mauri. With this cosmology in mind, a human being acting as kaitiaki must act to enhance life rather than diminish life.

The notion of kaitiakitanga, is not a one way process of human beings guarding other beings. Research participants also mentioned having kaitiaki, or different beings by whom they were nurtured and guarded. For example the kaihautū in Case Study Two mentioned local atua (gods) who acted as kaitiaki over the people. Similarly in Case Study One, taniwha (spirits of beings such as rivers, forests, or lakes) were also understood as kaitiaki by providing for the people. In Case Study Five, ancestors also performed a kaitiaki role. Consequently an individual both cares for the cosmos, and is cared by beings within it.
Reflection on experiences

From the cosmological understanding outlined, combined with the duty and responsibility brought about through kaitiakitanga (or guardianship), an individual given a mandate to represent others is charged with enhancing mauri. This involves enhancing the mauri of both human (living, deceased, and future generations) and non-human beings. As outlined in the example of Case Study Two above, Paul felt accountable to God, his ancestors on the land, and to other landowners. In fact his own soul, and mana, rested on whether or not he performed this duty. I would suggest that these features of character expressed by Paul (and many other Māori landowners I encountered who expressed themselves as kaitiaki), demonstrate the underpinning beliefs and characteristics that brought case-study groups to feel responsible and accountable to those they represent, both human and non-human.

I consider that the cosmology outlined above and the roles and obligations of being kaitiaki, also reveal much about the politics of individuals like Paul. Paul’s politics were not about having his particular doctrine dominate others. His politics were about assessing whether the actions he or others took would enhance life by removing unnecessary barriers that stopped or inhibited the unfolding potential of beings. Actions that he considered would diminish mauri needed to be challenged. As suggested by the kaihautū in Case Study Seven, their politics was ‘about new native growth rather than something on top that crushes’. This is demonstrated in Paul’s protest against the company. For Paul the decision whether to work with the company was always a balancing act. If the forestry company could put the road in without damaging the river, pā (fort) site, or urupā (gravesite) then he considered it might be a possibility – if he was given compensation for the use of his land.

Paul emphasised that his decision not to work with the company was in the end made on the basis of their domineering posture and paternalism. For Paul this was the ‘flag of the colonialist’, a sign of the company’s self-belief in superiority. This might also be termed a deportment-of-judgement which as outlined in Chapter Six precludes equality, mutual-learning and self-expression, due to an individual who has become fixated on a particular doctrine and wishes to impose that doctrine upon others. Consequently a partnership based on mutual respect and equality between Paul and the forestry company could not occur.
As a result, the core of Paul’s actions was seen by him as a rejection of superiority/inferiority relationships between himself as a landowner and outside institutions. For him the politics of inferiority/superiority was about a battle for supremacy, between ‘programs’ centred in a will-to-dominate. With a posture of superiority the Forestry Company could never learn from Paul and consequently the mutual learning required to understand one another could not emerge generating a colonial relationship of superiority/inferiority.

Paul’s openness to relationships based upon equality demonstrates a capacity and openness to continually learn. This appeared to be a reflection of his underlying cosmology, constructed on a metaphor of unfolding and movement. Further this is illustrated in his actions to construct a wharenui for learning, to carve, weave and tell stories, as a remedy for those that have become static and fixed in the ‘dead spot’, or ‘mauri mate’. Or in other words as a remedy for those who have ceased to learn and grow, becoming fixated in narrow self-interpretations. As demonstrated it is the ‘keeping still’, or the ‘comfort zone’ that gives rise to the eel phenomenon.

The need to keep moving and not become static is also outlined in a story by Aroha, from Case Study Seven. Aroha was once contracted with a number of other carvers to work on a sculpture. While she was working, a relative of hers saw her working and was highly indignant that a woman would be carving, and she requested that she stop. Aroha refused, so her relative went and got a distinguished kuia, (female elder) to get her to stop. However, the kuia said to Aroha’s aunty, ‘you’ve got to change with the times dear, she is doing a good job’. After telling this story Aroha said, ‘you have to move or your dead’, or in other words a culture cannot get stuck in forms or rules, but needs to be able to adapt to survive. In Aroha’s terms, ‘the kawa (rules) always change – you can’t stay there or you will die.’ Conversely she suggested that the ‘tikanga’ is always true.

51 Tikanga is often used to refer to Māori culture. However, the word when broken into its constituents, tika (right), and ngā (all that is), translates into ‘all that is right.’ This is what Aroha is referring to when she suggests that the tikanga (culture) is always true.
Conclusions

In this chapter two fundamental constraints on Aspiring Owners achieving their development goals are outlined. The first constraint is referred to as the *eel phenomenon* and is characterised by acts of domination that stall the emergence of development trajectories that may change the status quo. The *eel phenomenon* is driven by fear of change and the possibility of some community members becoming successful in achieving their development goals, which would exacerbate the sense of failure that others within a Māori community context experience.

To overcome the *eel phenomenon* case-study groups pursued two courses of action. The first course of action, designed to remove fear of failure, was to build relationships with institutions that could mentor case-study groups into developing the experience and skills necessary to implement their own development strategies. However, it was important to groups that the mentoring relationships were culturally matched. This consequently reaffirms the research findings from the previous chapter, which outlined the importance of culturally matched institutional support to case-study groups.

The second course of action to overcome the eel syndrome, according to Case Studies Five and Seven, was to rebuild a strong contemporary Māori identity embedded in the land. Both case studies sought to do this through similar means, namely the construction of buildings for wānanga, where a site for passing on traditional stories and practices is established. It was expected that through telling stories, the ‘forbidden past’ would be reclaimed overcoming the bifurcated identity, and low self-opinion that had emerged within communities. The importance of young Māori seeing reflections of them that were true was highlighted.

The second constraint identified for Māori achieving desired changes on their land was the presence of ‘token Māori’, or Māori representatives who were not accountable to their communities. These individuals positioned themselves to take advantage of legislative requirements for institutions to consult with Māori, renting their communities in an attempt for personal gain. Institutions were also complicit in this practice searching for communities, or community leaders, which would support their particular interests. The net result of these actions was that Māori communities had their power to build relationships with institutions, in a manner that would assist the communities in meeting their strategic goals, removed.
First, I consider that much of this issue is related to the problem of cooption. In this chapter it has been demonstrated that there are significant skill shortages within Māori communities of individuals that can overcome the ‘discourse barriers’ between communities and government institutions. However, there are many Māori with these skill sets within government institutions, or in consulting roles. Typically these individuals are answerable to the institutions that they are employed by. I would suggest that government institutions should employ staff that reside within Māori communities, authorities and tribes, and are answerable to Māori forms of authority. In this manner, projects, programmes and policies would be developed within government institutions with the support of the communities they effect. This would also encourage ‘rogue’ characters to comply with ethical guidelines established by their kinship groups.

Second, I consider appropriate engagement between indigenous communities and government institutions requires the continual development of indigenous leadership with the following characteristics: a strong sense of accountability for the wellbeing, health and vitality of the human and non-human beings that one has a mandate to represent; a cosmology of openness and continual learning; and a demand that relationships between Māori communities and institutions be based upon equality, and not dominant/subordinate colonial relationships. I would propose that Paul, Aroha, Mark and Rachael are each seeking to develop these characteristics within their whānau through immersion of whānau into cultural narratives and practices designed to overcome a bifurcated identity. These techniques squarely situate Māori within their whakapapa (genealogical) links to the land and cosmos. I consider that it is the responsibility of the nation-state to sponsor and support this form of identity reconstruction and cultural revitalisation given its fundamental role in the fragmentation of Māori identity and cultural injury.

However, I would like to avoid the idealisation of the leadership characteristics of kaihautū in identified in this study. Certainly some leaders demonstrated behaviour that was driven by a genuine desire to act as kaitiaki for the benefit of both current and future generations in what might be termed as selfless action. Nonetheless, at the same time, kaihautū could express behaviour that involved the unjust expressions of authority over other family and community members. Similarly ‘likeable rogue’ characters could also engage in behaviour that benefitted
their communities. Consequently a binary, or split, between rogue-exploiters and selfless heroes would be too simple a characterisation. Nonetheless the characterisation of selfless kaitiaki versus coopted elites, working to exploit Māori communities, does to a certain extent accurate, and is helpful in terms of the analysis of relationships in Māori land development contexts.
CHAPTER TWELVE: Discussion and Conclusions

Introduction

The function of this chapter is to critically engage the development theory from the literature review with the research results emerging from development practice. The chapter is structured around the research questions, and provides an answer to each question in a sequential order. The answer to each question is provided through the critical juxtapositioning and combining of the research results with development theory. Through this creative engagement a number of conclusions are reached that determine appropriate methods and means to address the constraints that Aspiring Owners experience on their development.

The development goals of Aspiring Owners

The initial motivation for this research, as outlined in Chapter Three, was to work with Māori landowners who were passionate about using their land as a vehicle for development, yet were struggling and unable to put in place the platforms they needed to reach their development goals. It was clear from a small number of studies, outlined in Chapter Three, that successful Māori land development is the result of having a number of key development platforms in place. All of the studies, excluding White’s (1997), identified what might be considered the ‘classic platforms’ for a profitable agri-business namely: governance; leadership; management; innovation; and technical skills. However, these studies missed out on something quite subtle and important, which was identified by White (1997).
White (1997) found that successful governors of Māori land needed to be consummate political managers, and in particular they needed to meet the demands of their shareholders for not only commercial success, but also environmental, political and social success. In this way, White (1997) demonstrated that Māori leaders could not simply take an agribusiness development model and apply it to a Māori setting. This approach would likely fail as it would not secure political support from shareholders. Instead, it was concluded that Māori leaders needed to take a triple-bottom-line development approach, where expectations were placed on them to achieve success across environmental, social and economic indices.

The research results from this study also clearly support the findings of White (1997). In 2002 I began a process of working with case-study groups of Aspiring Owners to determine their development goals. In a similar vein I found that all case-study groups adopted a multi-faceted, triple-bottom-line approach to development. Commercial success was considered an important factor in development but it was not placed on a footing above or below other important goals. In this manner case-study groups inherently understood the need to achieve development outcomes that were sustainable. However, this study has gone significantly further than White’s (1997), exploring in-depth the development goals of Māori landowners.

I found that the goals of Aspiring Owners were innovative, diverse, multi-faceted, holistic and coherent. The first goal that all case studies identified and shared was a desire to establish and maintain good governance to provide clear direction and impetus for the implementation of development plans. Second, all case-study groups identified that their development should be squarely built upon an approach that balanced the restoration of environmental health with commercial ventures, and community building. By meeting these goals it was expected that an avenue would be opened for the reestablishment of nohoanga kāinga as a home for whānau.

Also, this study explored the underlying values underpinning the goals of case-study groups. In Chapters Two and Three a number of Māori development theorists were reviewed to provide conceptual ground for thinking about Māori development aspirations. Three of these theorists, Henare (2002, 2005), Winiata (2000) and Harmsworth (2002) identified similar sets of Māori values that they considered underpinned Māori development aspirations. Furthermore, from an international development perspective, human-ends theory was also reviewed and significant alignment between the Māori values approach to development, and the human-ends approaches
to development, was demonstrated. The research results from this study confirm that a common set of Māori values, or human-ends, does underpin the development aspirations of Aspiring Owners.

In two case-study groups these values were made explicit, and were used to guide planning. In other case-study groups values were not made explicit but commonality between the goals of all case-study groups indicates a universal set of cultural values guiding behaviour and strategic thinking. The key values identified include the following: manawhenua; whanaungatanga; arohatanga; manaakitanga; wairuatanga; kaitiakitanga; tino rangatiratanga; taonga tuku iho; and whakapapa. Together these values demonstrate a common commitment to guarding and protecting natural resources for future generations; concern for the well-being of others; self-determination and control over resources; as well as recognition of spiritual and faith-based beliefs.

**Constraints of reaching development goals**

Following the articulation of development plans with case-study groups I worked with each to pursue their development objectives. This phase of the research began approximately in 2003 and in two cases has continued to the present day. Over this time I have followed the progress of each case study and am still in contact with all, apart from Case Study One. Despite significant effort being placed on achieving development goals only one case study has made significant progress toward achieving their aspirations, one case study has lost ground, while five have remained largely unchanged. Most case studies simply encountered too many barriers to achieving their aspirations.

**Financial and Human Resources**

In the literature review I used a number of development approaches to theoretically structure discussion concerning constraints to development. The development approaches of Sen (1999), Sustainable Livelihoods (2001), and Durie (2005) were used to conceptualise development according to the level of entitlement that Aspiring Owners had to endowments/livelihood assets/resources. I found, through my research, that Aspiring Owners do not have access to the resources they require to meet their development goals. However, the issue of access, or entitlement, is complex. It was clear that case-study groups could obtain financial capital to
invest in physical capital and land development, if they had in place the structures and plans required by finance companies. However, there was a fear of taking on any debt without a significant and coherent partnership with an institution that could provide underlying support and mentorship. Consequently, although there was access to financial capital, the mode of its delivery was not culturally matched or suited to context.

I also determined that case-study groups needed to build their human assets in a number of arenas before they could adequately achieve their development goals. In particular, building technical knowledge in farming and horticulture, business administration, and the discourse of government agencies, was important. However, there was a general reluctance to engage in conventional forms of institutional training, due to a combination of factors including distance to facilities, illiteracy, desire for practical on-site training, fear of failure, and lack of time. Consequently, although there was access to training from conventional institutions, the mode of its delivery was not culturally matched, or suited to context.

**Governance**

In Chapter Two, the metaphor of navigation used by Durie (2005) was outlined. It was adopted in this thesis to encapsulate the theme of strategic direction. A number of theoretical perspectives investigated in this thesis sit under this theme, including a body of governance research in the area of Fourth World Development. This research suggests that indigenous nations that establish culturally matched governing and bureaucratic structures significantly increase their odds of successfully meeting their strategic aims. Furthermore, on a micro-scale, it was outlined in the Māori land development literature from Chapter Three, that establishing governance and management increases the odds that Māori landowners will effectively design and action development strategies.

It was therefore hypothesised that a constraint on Aspiring Owners not achieving their aspirations would likely be the absence of necessary management and governance structures. However, the research results found that five out of the seven case studies did have governance structures and delegated management in place and, as a result, this potential constraint on indigenous development did not feature strongly in this study. However, Case Study Four, which had no governance or management structures, was by far the most politically volatile group, with highly insecure tenure. This led directly to this case study failing to ‘hold ground’
and actually heading away from its development goals. This one case study does support the contention that good governance and management structures support Māori land development. Nonetheless Case Study Seven had no governance or management structures in place yet its tenure was relatively secure. However, I would suggest that this had more to do with the small number of shareholders in the case study – only six – in comparison to Case Study Four, which had over 2000 owners.

Nonetheless this research did find that the effectiveness of governance and management in establishing and implementing strategic plans was correlated to leadership. Without good leadership the ability of governing structures to design and implement development strategies was constrained. This research finding is supported by the Māori land development literature, presented in Chapter Three, which suggests that strong leadership is required for effective Māori land governance. What is not detailed in this literature is the nature of the leadership required. I found through this research that leaders that acted in the collective interest, rather than personal interest, were more effective in securing support and generating social cohesiveness among communities of landowners. However, simply acting in the collective interest was not enough on its own, leadership also needed to possess good networking and communication skills to convey their actions and intentions to communities of fellow landowners. It was through good communication that the high levels of suspicion and distrust prevalent within communities could be alleviated. The level of communication required appeared to go well beyond the reporting requirements usually demanded of governing institutions by their constituents.

Critical planning
It was also hypothesised that case-study groups might lack the necessary navigation frameworks for critical planning that would enable the development of informed strategic plans, and the continual revision of plans based on action and reflection. However, it was also outlined in Chapter Six that there was no evidence to support this claim and, in fact, case-study groups may already possess effective endogenous methodologies for critical planning. Consequently this was an area for open investigation.

The research found that the capacity of case-study groups for critical planning varied according to the type of leadership, or dominant figures involved in planning discussion. Leaders that
possessed what is termed, in Chapter Seven, a *deportment-of-humility* tended to create conditions in which open and critical discussion was made possible. The *deportment-of-humility* is characterised by an ‘open’ frame of mind that creates an environment that is free from judgement. Without judgement participants in planning feel much more comfortable in expressing their stories, ideas and perspectives.

In such an atmosphere, I demonstrated that a *common learning narrative* emerges that implicitly broadens consciousness and understanding through continually building a richer and more complex understanding of a problem situation under investigation. This enables narrow perspectives and understandings, or truncated narratives, to be continually transcended. Conversely, I found that critical planning became constrained when leaders carried a *deportment-of-judgement*, which produces a *defence-and-attack atmosphere*. This atmosphere emerges when attempts are made to impose particular plans for development on a group by a leader, cornering other individuals into having to defend plans that might differ.

These research results are valuable in that they demonstrate the limitations of Freirean pedagogy and participatory approaches to learning and development, discussed in Chapter Five, which are commonly used within the development field. These methodologies adopt processes that encourage the elucidation of axioms underpinning the constructs of participants. Constructs are then exposed to critical examination to identify weaknesses and shortcomings. In this way the Freirean and participatory approaches are inherently polemical and encourage the formation of *defence-and-attack atmospheres*. While such an approach may work well in some contexts, I consider that it has poor cultural match to the contexts involved in this study.

The presence of leaders with the *deportment-of-humility* was not the only criterion required for critical planning. Also required was the presence of other individuals within planning forums who carried other deportments. In particular, the deportments of autonomy and pragmatism were necessary and valuable. The *deportment-of-autonomy* was expressed when individuals tacitly withdrew from planning discussion when they felt that their own plans were being imposed upon. This deportment encouraged the development of plans that established collective goals at a community scale that contributed to the expression of autonomy and independence at whānau scales. I considered that this cultural practice was an expression of the traditional
political forms outlined in Chapter One, where significant political autonomy existed at whānau and hapū scales.

Critical planning was also dependent upon the *departure-of-pragmatism*. This deportment was represented by characters in planning forums who were primarily concerned with the ‘nuts and bolts’ of development, and in particular how aspirations were actually going to be achieved. These individuals tended to contrast with those termed *Visionaries*, who were inclined to imagine new development futures, but often failed to detail a practical pathway for achieving the vision. Together the pragmatic and visionary tendencies worked in a complementary fashion to formulate development pathways.

The research findings demonstrate that critical planning was constrained when leaders carried the *departure-of-judgement* within planning discussion. However, it was also found that critical planning emerged when the deportments of humility, autonomy and pragmatism were present.

**Intercultural planning and cooptation**

It was argued in Chapter Five that indigenous nations and communities are reliant upon the settler society and nation-state to provide supporting policy, resources and, in particular, human assets, that can provide technical and specialist input when charting a development course. As a consequence it was hypothesised that frameworks for intercultural planning are required, to transcend persistent and paternalistic expert-ignorant colonial dynamics, and ensure that Aspiring Owners have supporting policy, resources, and technical expertise to achieve their development goals. The research results suggest that intercultural planning between the government agencies and Māori landowners did occur, but that it was ineffective.

The research demonstrated that government agencies did employ Māori liaison staff whose job it was to assist the institution in developing policies, and providing services that support Māori land development. Nevertheless, it was found that institutions were primarily concerned with pursuing their own interests and the role of the Māori liaison person was primarily to fulfil the government agencies’ requirements for consultation. It can be argued that this absence of interest to genuinely support the needs of communities, demonstrates disinterest, or even cynicism and scepticism regarding the validity of Māori landowner concerns and aspirations.
Furthermore, it was found that many Māori ‘freelance’ professional ‘intermediaries’ were discovered to position themselves in a manner that took advantage of legislative requirements for government institutions to consult with Māori. This could result in communities being rented for personal gain, demonstrating that these communities were viewed according to their utility, rather than from a position of inherent equality, value and respect. The existence of this phenomenon is well-noted within the Fourth World Development literature reviewed in Chapter Two, and is referred to as cooptation, while Māori exploiting Māori in a colonial fashion is referred to as mimeticism within the postcolonial literature.

Within the communities of Aspiring Owners there was some annoyance at the existence of coopted individuals who were referred as ‘token Māori’, or ‘likeable rogues’. Blame for their actions was primarily directed at the agencies engaging their services, rather than toward the individuals themselves. I consider that the characteristics of the ‘likeable rogue’ are very similar to the characteristics of the pōtiki outlined by Tapsell and Woods (2008), given that the pōtiki is described by these theorists as a precocious, talented, and skilled opportunist with a tendency to work outside the social sanctions of the kinship group. However, Tapsell and Woods (2008) only categorise the pōtiki as a constraint on Māori development when their skills and talents fail to be harnessed by the collective. They argue that the pōtiki needs to be brought back within the social sanctions of the kinship group for their talents to be put to good use.

Overall the impact of inadequate intercultural strategic discussion and planning was to constrain the development of Aspiring Owners. This phenomenon was further illustrated in the poor cultural match in support service provided to Aspiring Owners by the Ministry of Māori Development/Te Puni Kōkiri. The only support available was a fairly limited access to agribusiness specialists who offered services to improve business acumen in the following areas: governance training; business planning; and specialist advice. This service was discovered to be haphazard and disjointed, with specialists that lacked detailed and nuanced knowledge of the contexts they were working in. However, the real problem with the support offered was that it was tailored to the development of agribusinesses on Māori land.

This suggests that the development approach of Te Puni Kōkiri has not been based on adequate research and evidence, given that an agribusiness development service is being applied to a
context that requires a holistic development intervention that includes environmental, commercial and community development components. Further, it might be argued that Te Puni Kōkiri is exhibiting mimetic tendencies by exclusively valuing a development approach based purely on the building of business acumen common to Pākehā legal and business consultancies, over and above a broader approach that not only values business acumen but also other dimensions of human development.

However, despite poorly designed development support the research did discover that Aspiring Owners do have pre-existing endogenous frameworks for intercultural critical planning that assist in the design of effective development support. It was detailed above how the deportments of humility, autonomy and pragmatism, when present within communities, encouraged critical planning. Nonetheless, communities also carried the deportment-of-trust-building, which provided an avenue for individuals outside the community, such as technical specialists, to contribute their perspectives. It is outlined in detail within Chapter Eight, how the deportment-of-trust-building aimed to challenge the expression of dominance and superiority, common to intercultural exchange in postcolonial settings, through a two-pronged approach. The first prong involved the expression of challenges designed to place intense scrutiny on the ‘outsider’ regarding their motivations and intentions. Over time, once it became clear that the ‘outsider’ was not carrying a sense of superiority, and was not acting to dominate, the level of challenge began to diminish. Conversely, the hospitality component involves manaaki, which permits the ‘outsider’ to develop close relationships and personal ties with the community concerned. Together these two prongs work to establish conditions of trust and co-learning.

This suggests that to develop conditions for critical co-planning and co-learning, the colonial dynamics of superiority and inferiority between Māori communities and nation-state agencies must be transcended. This is illustrated most apparently within Chapter Eight, where Case Study Two outlined their ‘rules for engagement’ for working with State agencies. The conditions for engagement seek to develop mutual respect and equality, which it may be argued transcend the dominant/subordinate power dynamic. A summary of these conditions are provided below:

- Ensure the whānau knows what it wants from the institution;
- Ensure that representatives of the institutions are treated as manuhiri (or guests) and respected;
• Ensure that the institution respects the whānau and its local custom;
• Ensure both parties are open to learn and respect each other’s kaupapa (philosophy);
  and
• Build whanaungatanga or strong personal relationships.

Given that Case Study Two was able to form a constructive development partnership with an education institution the conditions for engagement it articulated appeared to be sound.

**Internalised colonial narratives**

Within Chapter Four and Five a detailed review of postcolonial literature was undertaken. This literature identified a key constraint to development in indigenous communities – the existence of internalised colonial narratives within the communities of Aspiring Owners, which precluded coherent action being taken toward reaching development goals. It was hypothesised that this would likely be a constraint on development within communities of Aspiring Owners. The research results confirm this hypothesis.

It was clear from the research results, outlined in Chapter Eleven, that some research participants possessed internalised self-deprecating narratives. Within communities these stereotypes could create an atmosphere of despondency and failure. A number of participants mentioned the existence of this state as ‘the comfort zone’, ‘the dead spot’, or ‘mauri mate’, which referred to a state of inertia in which nothing happens.

The results in Chapter Nine illustrate how communities can act to maintain a state of inertia, which constrains Aspiring Owners in reaching their development goals. This process is referred to as the *eel phenomenon*. This occurs when leaders that seek to change the status quo highlight the sense of failure and lack of self-belief experienced by others in their community. As a result, those who have their own feeling of incompetency highlighted act to belittle or attack the individual who is attempting to lead changes in an effort to ‘level’ them.

One research participant explained that this was a reason why attempts to develop their land would fail as those attempting to lead development learned not to ‘rock the boat’. The process of pulling down initiatives is referred to as the *eel phenomenon*, based on a parable told by a kaumātua. The parable refers to a situation when tuna, or eels, are caught in a bucket and act to pull each other down in an attempt to stop any other eel getting out. One research participant
referred to this as being ‘smacked down’, which has the effect of thwarting the attempts of individuals to move out from the ‘comfort zone’.

The desire to retain the status quo creates a situation where Māori end up oppressing other Māori. As outlined in Chapters One to Five, the constant and deliberate attempts of colonisers to stereotype, belittle, and place indigenous peoples into an inferior position results in these populations adopting the categories applied to them. Once internalised in the communities the eel phenomenon acts to maintain these narratives within communities through thwarting actions that might cause colonial narratives to be questioned. Consequently, the act of maintaining the status quo is unfortunately also the act of enforcing the original colonial government’s intentions. I consider that overcoming this constraint on Māori land development is a significant factor to be overcome.

**Mechanism for overcoming constraints to development**

The discussion above has highlighted the constraints to Aspiring Owners reaching their land development goals. There have been six major constraints identified, which include the following:

- Poor methods of delivering financial services to Aspiring Owners;
- Poor methods of delivering and building the technical knowledge and skills of Aspiring Owners;
- High levels of distrust and suspicion within communities of Aspiring Owners;
- Leadership within planning forums carrying a *deportment-of-judgement* precluding critical planning;
- Failure of government agencies to engage in the inter-cultural planning required to design and implement tailored and culturally matched development support; and
- The presence of internalised colonial narratives that create despondency and inertia within communities.

Despite these constraints the results of this research also provide, or point toward, solutions to each of these constraints. These solutions are outlined below.
However, it first needs to be outlined that delivering solutions to the problems outlined above, first and foremost, I consider needs to be the responsibility of the New Zealand nation-state. This is because Aspiring Owners are reliant upon the settler society and nation-state to provide supporting policy, resources, and human assets for their development. As outlined in Chapters One through Five this dependency is a direct result of colonial policy, which included the deliberate undermining of the early rapid economic expansion of Māori, dispossessing Māori of their land and resources, and undermining the coherency of their identity and culture. Consequently, investment in Māori land development is simply considered a compensation process to address historic injustice and in turn address persistent inequalities between Māori and settler society.

**Delivering Appropriate Financial Services**

The research results in this thesis suggest that addressing each of the constraints outlined above requires support from some sort of government or iwi institution that has the correct combination of human and financial resources to fill resource gaps. It is also clear from the research results that such an institution should be able to provide support in a manner that is culturally matched and centred on a relationship of equality and respect. First, in regards to overcoming the constraint of poor financial service provision, it is clear that a well-resourced support institution can reduce the anxiety experienced by Aspiring Landowners from taking on debt. This can be first achieved by working with the case study to undertake detailed business planning for any planned commercial initiative to determine feasibility. The research results suggest that this process is required before financing can be accessed. However, once feasibility is determined, I would argue that financing, or venture capital, should be provided that is accompanied by a strong mentoring partnership with highly experienced professionals to support decision-making. I consider that strong underpinning support would suit the development context of Aspiring Owners, given that case-study groups sought to have this need met through partnerships with external institutions.

**Delivering the technical knowledge and skills**

Second, it was identified that there were constraints on building technical knowledge and skills in the areas of farming and horticulture, business administration, and the discourse of government agencies. The research results suggest that this constraint might be overcome by providing the right environment for learning. It was found that although research participants
had access to training from conventional institutions, the mode of its delivery was not culturally matched, or suited to context. In response to this constraint, I secured volunteers to provide on-site and marae-based workshops that involved practical demonstrations, and the presentation of case study success stories. These workshops were run by specialists from diverse fields. This approach to learning I considered created a low pressure and convenient environment for learning, which achieved high levels of participation. However, it was beyond the capacity of this study to undertake an evaluation of education outcomes to determine the efficaciousness of the approach. Nevertheless the popularity and interest suggested that it may have promise.

**Overcoming distrust**

Third, the research suggested that there were high levels of distrust and suspicion within communities of Aspiring Owners – a condition common to postcolonial societies. The suspicion was primarily directed at Managers and Trustees leading development, who were thought to be gaining personally at the expense of the collective. It was considered that solving this problem in-part involved the presence of governance structures that provided accountability and transparency. However, as outlined above it was found that stable governance structures really required the presence of leadership that acted in the collective interest. The research results suggest that the key principle of leadership is serving the collective, which aligns closely with the Kingitanga leadership philosophy communicated by Herangi and the research findings of Tuarā (1992). I consider that endogenous leadership philosophies could be used as a basis for building culturally matched leadership within communities of landowners in situations where this leadership is absent. However, it is likely that each hapū, or iwi, will have its own philosophies similar to the Kingitanga, which could be adopted or used.

It was also found that leaders need to be consummate communicators to maintain backing and support of the collective. The value of a rangatira being able to gain cooperative support through good communication was also highlighted by Herangi which is outlined below:

> ‘All achievement and progress depends on gaining the cooperative support of those whom one leads. The prime objective therefore, is to have the strategies of communication clearly in mind before utterances of any kind leave the lips’ (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 26).
It should also be added that support in contemporary contexts might require communication planning through the use of technology such as the internet and other media. Consequently, I consider that endogenous leadership training should also involve a syncretic mix of tradition and contemporary forms of communication.

Building the Deportment-of-Humility through wisdom traditions

Fourth, it was identified that leadership within planning forums that carried the deportment-of-judgement precluded the development of critical plans for development. The research results suggested that this constraint on development could be overcome through the presence of leadership with the deportment-of-humility, which is characterised by an ‘open’ frame of mind that creates an environment that is free from judgement. Once again this character trait aligns with the Kingitanga philosophy of Herangi, where she argues that it is through the humility of rangatira that the sharing of knowledge is enabled in a way that benefits all. She warns against endeavours that act to ‘restrain the broadening of knowledge’ (Mitaki and Ra 2004, p. 21).

Furthermore, as outlined by Pfeifer (2006), it is the modesty and patience of Māori leaders that ‘weaves’ the people together. Without humility the conditions are not created where the diverse forms of understanding, held within whānau and hapū, can be expressed. In particular, the ideas of visionaries and pragmatists cannot be expressed to imagine new futures and establish the steps by which new futures can be reached.

There are questions regarding how the virtue of humility, or an open frame of mind, can be cultivated within communities, and in particular within leadership. It was hypothesised in Chapter Five that the virtue of humility is cultivated through wisdom traditions. Certainly, the philosophy of Herangi suggests that such wisdom traditions exist within Māoritanga that emphasise and cultivate humility. However, there are questions whether such wisdom traditions existed within the case-study groups.

I consider that there was evidence to suggest that a number of research participants expressed a cosmology, or wisdom tradition, which inherently encouraged humility. To begin with the theme of ‘keeping still’, or being static, was frequently raised and outlined a state where the ability to adapt and change is lost. This was illustrated first in the eel fable whereby eels are ‘stuck’ in a bucket and second in the story of Aroha where she suggests that ‘you have to move, or you’re dead’. Similarly, other research participants referred to the ‘comfort zone’, or ‘mauri
mate’. Conversely Rachael, the kaihautū from Case Study Seven emphasised the need within her community for ‘new native growth, not something on top that crushes’. Furthermore, the desire to promote growth and life is illustrated in the desire of case-study groups to act as Kaitiaki (Guardians), to enhance mauri and protect the people, rivers and land, from influences that might ‘choke’ or ‘crush’ life.

As outlined in Chapter Eleven, underpinning the desire to maintain and enhance life was a cosmology constructed upon whakapapa, a genealogical metaphor demonstrating the interconnectedness of all things, and their familial relationships to each other. Additionally, a number of research participants, from case-study groups, expressed faith-based beliefs that charged Tangata Whenua with a responsibility to protect and enhance the unfolding of life within a cosmic family. Ultimately, it was shown that the cosmology opens a view of the cosmos as a dynamic, unfolding, growing and moving entity, rather than as something fixed or concrete. Such a view of the cosmos precludes fixation on particular forms of knowledge as truths. This is because all things are in a constant state of change, which includes the knowledge individuals possess to orientate themselves in the world.

Paul referred to existing in a state of an open mind as ‘looking from the outside’, in juxtaposition to those who ‘look from the inside’. Those looking from inside, according to Paul, have become ‘fixated’, which he referred to as being ‘programmed’. In other words, they could not see outside their own particular rationale or logic. Paul considered that this fixation was the sign, or ‘flag of the colonialist’. Relationships based on mutual learning, equality, and respect were, according to Paul, not possible with those whose minds had become ‘programmed’, or colonised.

At the heart of this cosmology, I argue, is the virtue of humility. This is because the Māori cosmology, or wisdom tradition, is constructed upon metaphors of movement, unfolding, growth and life, which if held, must encourage an openness to learn, continually evolve and change. This requires that an individual be open to learn from others, a way of being founded on mutual respect and equality, which transcends the hierarchies of domination and subordination. Furthermore, this wisdom tradition counteracts the emergence of mimeticism and reactionary traditionalism within Māori communities.
This ability to continually learn, and unlearn, was contended in Chapter Five to be the foundation of sustainability, given that learning is essential for adaptation. Māori cosmology provides a basis for continual change and adaptation as it permits the incorporation of new forms of knowledge. This is clearly outlined in Chapter One where Māori rapidly adopted European technology and incorporated it into their cultural setting. It is further reflected today in the statement by Aroha ‘the kawa always change – you can’t stay there or you will die’ but the ‘tikanga is always true’.

**Intercultural planning**

It has been outlined in detail above that a constraint on development is the failure of government agencies to engage in the inter-cultural planning required to design and implement tailored and culturally matched development support. However, this does not mean that the institutions encountered in this research do not invest time and resources into creating policy or designing development interventions through engagement with Māori communities. For example, the research results demonstrate that staff from tertiary research institutions looked to develop research bids designed to realise opportunities and overcome problems experienced by Māori communities. Further, it was outlined that coopted Māori acted as liaison staff on behalf of government agencies to develop policy designed to improve development support for Māori. However, it was found in both cases that the relationships primarily benefited the institution and staff concerned, rather than the communities being engaged.

I consider that a potential solution to the problem is outlined by Tapsell and Woods (2008) who suggest that pōtiki need to be made accountable to the kinship group. I consider that the accountability lines should not be back to the institution for which government agents are making policy or designing development interventions for Māori. Instead I consider that their work should still be funded by government agencies, but they should be employed by the Māori communities that their work is designed to support. This would create the lines of accountability for policy, or intervention design, back to the group for whom the policy or intervention is being designed to benefit. An approach, such as this, would not permit the design of policy and interventions that benefit the government agencies, or ‘intermediaries’ at the expense of communities. Once accountability is brought back into the kinship grouping, then the endogenous methodologies for critical planning and decision-making can be used to facilitate process.
**Story-telling – rebuilding identity**

Case-study groups in this research were aware of the constraint on development presented by internalised colonial narratives, which caused inertia and despondency. It was hypothesised in Chapter Five that an alternative process for developing a critical consciousness and addressing self-stereotyping, could be immersion within te ao Māori through the use of narrative as critical pedagogy in traditional wānanga. Case Studies Five and Seven supported this hypothesis, both of which sought to rebuild a strong contemporary Māori identity embedded in the land through wānanga. Both case studies desired to construct traditional buildings where a site for passing on traditional stories and practices could be established. The purpose of the story-telling was to ‘reclaim’ history, and in particular tell stories that enabled young Māori to have true and accurate reflections of them that could address bifurcated identity, and combat the low self-opinions that had emerged within communities. The importance of young Māori seeing reflections of them that were true was in particular highlighted. However, it was not just story-telling that was highlighted, but also engagement in traditional practices such as carving and gardening that could provide tacit connections to culture, assisting in the reconstruction of whole identities.

**Conclusions**

Overcoming the constraints experienced by case-study groups of Aspiring Owners to achieving their goals will require institutional support from a well-resourced institution, possibly either an agency of the government, or tribal authorities. The research clearly demonstrates that there are multiple constraints to be overcome, which in turn requires multiple solutions from different disciplinary perspectives. It might be assumed that a multi-agency approach is required to address the problems identified. However, I would argue against this type of method and would instead argue for a multi-disciplinary team from a single agency working in unison to address problems. First, this is because significant coordination between specialists is required. Second, I consider that the trust-building process with Māori landowners can be challenging, and it would be far less threatening and imposing to build a single relationship with one agency than with multiple agencies.
I also conclude that the type of agency to deliver the support required for development is not particularly relevant as long as it transcends paternalistic expert-ignorant colonial dynamics and engages from a position of equality and respect. It may be the case that the bureaucratic structures of post-settlement iwi may be best placed to deliver this type of service given that sensitivity and awareness of dominant-subordinate relationships may be higher, and therefore relationships based on equality and respect more likely to develop. However, there is also tension between hapū and their iwi authorities, particularly in regards to the management and use of collectively owned resources, which many landowners feel should come under their management. Regardless of the delivery structure, I consider that power should be centred with the community being worked with. This is mostly likely to occur if those providing a service are directly accountable to landowners, based upon satisfactory delivery of services and completion of desired outcomes.

It can also be concluded, based upon the researching findings in this thesis, that a service delivery agency should provide specialists and capacity in the following areas. First the institution should possess the capacity to provide social lending and venture capital. Second, a team of highly experienced professionals and technical specialists is required to support landowners in decision-making and engagement with external government and corporate institutions in commercial, sustainable land management, and community development areas. Third, specialists either external or internal to a land owning community are required that possess the cultural competency to develop endogenous and contextualised critical learning and planning programmes that encompass the following areas:

- Endogenous leadership philosophies and cosmology;
- Identity reconstruction through immersion narratives and practices that encourage a positive and contemporary Māori self-image; and
- Agriculture, horticulture, business administration, and the discourse of government agencies.

I consider that a development agency that embodies these key attributes is likely to address the constraints or challenges experience by the case-study groups explored in this thesis.
Future Research Directions

First, this thesis could only provide a preliminary scoping of the problems facing Māori landowners developing their land, and possible solutions to the problems identified. This is due to the multi-disciplinary nature of this thesis, which means that it has been unable to ‘drill down’ into each disciplinary area. I consider that a more comprehensive study is required first to determine whether the same problems and solutions identified from the case studies in this thesis can be identified across a large cohort of Māori landowners. This would enable the solutions to problems identified in this research to be applied generally. Second I consider that more detailed research can be undertaken within each of the disciplinary areas explored.

The first area warranting further investigation is the manner in which deportments, or ways of acting, give rise to critical planning. This is a new and novel way of conceiving of participatory group learning. Far more research is required in this area given that this thesis was only able to glance at this topic. In particular, this line of research would be pertinent to the Participatory Development, Participatory Action Research and Planning fields.

Second, the techniques used by case-study groups for rebuilding a positive Māori identity through narrative immersions and the tacit reconstruction of history, offer a number of insights for approaching trauma associated with oppression and colonisation. In particular, liberation psychologists may be interested in exploring such endogenous methods. Additionally, liberation psychologists that currently rely on participatory processes to undertake their liberatory praxis may find the deportments theory an illuminating means of understanding and interpreting group learning processes.

Another line of research opened up in this thesis is the relationship between virtues, openness to learn, sustainability and indigenous cosmologies. More in-depth research, beyond the beginnings made in this thesis is required on how wisdom traditions can create the non-fixation necessary to remain open to learn, and how this openness to learn relates to adaptation. In addition techniques, such as narrative immersion, to combat the fixation on narratives that are environmentally and socially detrimental, may provide significant clues on how to address the challenge of sustainability.
In regards to future research that is directly related to Māori landowners, an exploration of different media that can be used to raise consciousness of mechanisms to overcome barriers to desirable change would be useful. For example techniques such as video and documentary making might be used alongside wānanga to increase consciousness among Māori landowners.

The second area for research is in regard to the development of protocols and processes for inter-cultural planning. In particular protocols that compel agents within institutions to engage with Māori communities on the basis of equality, mutual respect and dignity are necessary. Similarly, more research is required on methods for encouraging accountable leadership and representation within Māori community contexts. Some initial insights have been provided in this thesis on how accountable leadership might be developed through narrative immersion techniques, and on-site training in the technical discourses of institutions.

**Recommendation**

Should future research show that the solutions to problems identified in this research can be applied generally, I consider that a specialised agency should be established to deliver support services to Māori landowners. Currently the capacity and funding to establish such an institution is present within the office of the Māori Trustee. Currently there is $66 million held in a common fund which consists of money that has not been claimed by Māori land beneficiaries.\(^2\) I consider that this common fund could be used to support a team of specialists and provide venture capital, or social loans, to support Māori land development.

---

\(^2\) Refer to the Māori Trustee Annual Report, 2010.
References


Bhattacharya, K. (2007). "Consenting to the consent for: what are the fixed and fluid understandings between the researcher and researched?" *Qualitative Inquiry* 13(8): 1095-1115.


336


