CHAPTER THREE: DEFINING IWI

> *To control a people's culture is to control their tools of self-definition in relation to others.*
>
> (Ngugi 1986:19)

This chapter argues that, in the process of colonisation, we are constantly struggling to maintain control of our own definitions. Colonisation, in part, is the process of the inscribing and reinscribing of identities. What is looked at here is how our identities are being reinscribed through looking at the concept of iwi. Also, in recent years, there has been the attempted co-option of the term iwi by the state and this is examined in the second part of this chapter.

Writings on decolonisation tell us that power can be wielded in a number of ways by dominant groups. There are overt means such as physical force, legal and political methods; and there are also covert forms that encompass moral and cultural forms, based on habituation and consent.

Antonio Gramsci (1971), in analysing the way that power is exerted, discusses the concept of hegemony. Hegemony is the winning of mass consent to the public order. The desires and goals of individuals are influenced by public opinion and the moral climate, and consequently individuals `freely' consent to the public order. Institutions such as schools play a part in this process. Writers such as Ngugi (1986) and Fanon (1967) have gone further than this idea of winning mass consent and have shown that, for the colonised, there are aspects such as the rendering of people as invisible and the taking on of self-denial and self-hatred aspects by the colonised that are also consequences of colonisation.

Discourses are forms of power, they are more than just words, they are proposals for constructing reality and organising the world in a particular way. Discourses include supporting institutions. Algerian writer, Edward Said in his book *Orientalism* (1979) takes up the theme of wielding power discursively. By looking at the relationship between the West and the Orient, Said shows that by securing a cultural predominance of certain images and ideas the West has been able to foist the principle of its own superior identity, on to a much larger population. He argues that discourses of power are wielded in three key ways:

- in `the cultural universe of identifications, meanings and stipulations of truth'. Important questions to ask here are: what is measured as the norm? what is forbidden?
- the dominant group constantly defines and redefines the dominant discourse
- the dominant group dominates the discourse of `self' and `other' representations however it is largely ignorant of its own discursive fabrications.

Discourses embody particular interests, they `establish paradigms, set limits and construct (human) subjects' (Wyner 1991:235). Whilst competing discourses exist, some will have more power and will dominate the field. The following examination of the struggle to define iwi looks at two areas:

- the area of overt power by discussing the struggle between iwi and government to control the definition of iwi ethnicity
- the moral, cultural form of power, based on habituation and spontaneous consent that is evident in the schooling of Maori

Ethnicity, as a classificatory system, is viewed to be something that one identifies for oneself. But `self' definition becomes problematic when we look at the writings mentioned above. There are two key ways that this idea of self-definition is problematic. Firstly, Maori exist within a particular socio-political context. Other groups, besides Maori have an interest in the shaping of iwi ethnicity e.g. the state. For Maori, who live within a colonised land, this means that the world is very often named on their behalf. Secondly, colonisation has helped to shape the way in which we talk about and view ourselves. What we, as Maori people, view as being iwi has, in part, been shaped by over 150 years of colonisation.

(3.1) ANTHROPOLOGY AND IWI DISCOURSE

Anthropology has been a very powerful influence in formulating the way we describe ourselves. It is not the only influential discipline that has shaped Maori self-definition: psychology, English, history, education and many others have also been part of the colonising process. However, when looking at the writing that has been appearing across a wide range of literature by Maori writers, such as the Royal Commission On Social Policy (1988), academic writings, novels and government policy documents etc, there is almost a uniform way of describing iwi, hapu and whanau. They are invariably described as `tribe', `sub-tribe' and `extended family', or explained as `kinship' groups. Often there is talk of Maori `life and custom' as it was viewed `traditionally'. This propensity to use anthropological terminology has become a `commonsense' way of explaining ourselves.

To illustrate this I have extracted quotes from first year, Maori university students assignments to illustrate how we do talk about ourselves despite the fact that none of these students has ever taken anthropology as a subject, two strong themes are apparent:

Seeing Ourselves As `Other':

> *Many Maori grew up not knowing their native language and as they became parents themselves, concern was to spare their children the suffering they had to endure in earlier years.*
>
> (written by a Maori mother)

> *There are some positive innovations involving Maori education, initiated by Maori themselves to help a cultural and language revival. Kohanga Reo was established with the goals of halting the loss of the Maori language, while also giving Maori control over their resources (mana motuhake) and their own lives.*
>
> (written by a Maori male who has a child in Kohanga Reo)

Using Anthropological Terms To Describe Ourselves:

> *The teachers came to Native Schools knowing nothing of the tribal life and customs of the Maori. Tribes provided the government with the land, teachers salaries and teaching utensils......*

These two ways of talking about ourselves, using anthropological terminology and writing about ourselves as if we are someone else are, in part, connected because anthropology is the science of studying the `other'. But why do we talk the jargon of anthropology? In order to understand why, it is necessary to look at historical and social process.

As we saw in the previous chapter colonisation has always been on more than a physical level, it has also been a process of the mind. Edward Said in *Culture and Imperialism* (1993) says that colonisation and imperialism were more than acts of `accumulation and acquisition':

> *Both are supported and perhaps even impelled by impressive ideological formations that include notions that certain territories and people require and beseech domination: the vocabulary of classic nineteenth century imperial culture is plentiful with such words as `inferior', or `subject races', `subordinate peoples', `dependency', `expansion' and `authority'.*
>
> (Said 1993:8)

These ideological formations also get taken on by the colonised, what Paulo Freire (1972) describes as accepting the myths of the oppressor. Schooling plays an important role in shaping the way we define ourselves, that is, we are taught to speak about ourselves a certain way. The further up the academic ladder we go, the more we are required to remove ourselves from our writing. Consequently, writing personal pronouns in academic writing is often frowned on. This sets up a dilemma for the students quoted above because they are describing situations that they are part of, for example, they are part of the political movement that is Kohanga Reo but they have to write as if it is happening to someone else, thereby creating a third person consciousness.

Franz Fanon (1967) has said that schooling, schools the coloniser to be the coloniser and the colonised to be colonised. This dual agenda is often achieved through the provision of the same schooling. An example of this is the near invisibility of Maori histories in the

secondary school curriculum. The effect of this on Maori students is to render Maori histories as invisible, which in turn legitimates to Pakeha students the `Captain Cook `discovered' New Zealand stories.

When looking at how iwi is being shaped as a discourse, it is clear that anthropological theories have been particularly influential, not only in the way that we are defined by others but also in to the way that we define ourselves. This is not surprising given that anthropology is a discipline that was tied to colonial expansion and could provide justifications for the process of colonising the `uncivilised'.

In the early years of colonisation anthropologists were usually funded by colonial governments. To say that anthropologists were totally in the service of colonial administrators, however, is probably too simplistic. As Adam Kuper (1976) argues, they often had their own agendas that would clash with colonial settlers and administrators. The broader aims of colonial policy goals were control of territory, maintenance of law and order and stimulating native production and labour whereas anthropologists had other concerns such as the study of `alien beings' (Trask 1993).

British colonisers tended to be evolutionist, that is, they believed that when the natives `grew up' they would be able to rule themselves. But anthropologists such as Raymond Firth (1929) and Elsdon Best (1925, 1929) used a structural functionalist approach. Their concern was with social structure and its continuity. Colonial settlers and administrators were invisible in these studies. Maori society was seen as a separate, cohesive, functioning

whole and Maori people were seen as a homogenous group. Cosmology and kinship were a common focus of anthropologists. Any change in Maori society was seen as `disintegration'.

These ideas can be seen being played out today in discussions over what constitutes a `real' Maori. `Real' Maori speak Maori, send their children to Kohanga Reo, etc. What structural functionalism did not deal with was internal conflict and social change. Colonisation was invisible in the studies done during this era. It failed to come to terms with the ideological and political implications of the historical analysis of colonisation and the part that the West played in this.

Raymond Firth (1929), one of the leading anthropologists in New Zealand, wrote a book called *The Primitive Economics Of The New Zealand Maori,* in which he broadly outlines four phases of Maori development:

> *Phase One:* *Phase of initial impact.*
> *Phase Two:* *Enthusiastic adoption of the alien material culture.*
> *Phase Three:* *Mood of reaction.*
> *Phase Four:* *Acceptance of European standards.*

What Firth outlined, was a model that showed the inevitability of assimilation as the way forward. Furthermore, it shows that Raymond Firth, Felix Keesing (1929) and other anthropologists were using a social planning approach in their work. By the 1920s, they were clearly making suggestions as to the best way to administer native races.

What anthropology has been part of, is to describe a view of Maori society that is `traditional'. They have then taken the view that the `traditional' must be preserved. However what they have articulated as `traditional' was viewed as a fixed entity rather than an evolving, dynamic society within a colonised context. This view legitimates the notion that indigenous groups are part of the old world, it is the Europeans that bring civilisation, progress, development and modernity. Chapter Four looks more closely at these tensions.

Latter day writers have argued against these definitions that see colonised peoples caught in a time warp. Stuart Hall has a more fluid view of cultural identity:

> *Cultural identity....is a matter of `becoming' as well as `being'. It belongs to the future as much as to the past. It is not something which already exists, transcending place, time, history and culture. Cultural identities come from somewhere, have histories. But like everything which is historical, they undergo constant transformation. Far from being eternally fixed in some essentialised past, they are subject to the continuous play of history, culture and power. Far from being grounded in a mere `recovery' of the past, which is waiting to be found, and which when found, will secure our sense of ourselves into eternity, identities are the names we give to the different ways we are positioned by, and position ourselves within the narratives of the past.*
>
> (Hall cited in hooks 1992:5)

So why do we define ourselves in anthropological terms? To understand this it is necessary to look at the development of Maori Studies as a discipline within Universities. The battle to begin the teaching of Maori within Universities has been ongoing since 1908 (Webster 1989). Ta Apirana Ngata and Te Rangi Hiroa, two of the first Maori graduates were keen anthropologists. Makereti Papakura, of Te Arawa, wrote her thesis in

Anthropology in England in the 1920s. At this time there was no other place for Maori graduates to study Maori subjects within Universities. Anthropology was seen by Pakeha as being the `natural' place for Maori to be.

It was Ta Apirana Ngata, who in 1923, pressed for Maori to become a university subject but was told, by the Senate of the University of New Zealand, that this was not possible given that there was no body of literature in Maori. Ngata counter-argued that he would write a body of Maori literature in the form of *Nga Moteatea*. He also pointed out that there was a collection of Maori writing called *Nga Mahi A Nga Tupuna* that had been collected by Governor Grey. Although the Senate eventually approved the decision to have Maori taught at Universities it was not until 1952 that Maori was finally introduced at the University of Auckland (Walker 1990:194).

Hirini Moko Mead points out that resistance from Universities was linked to ethnocentric assumptions about what `high status' knowledge is:

> *Universities were concerned with Western subjects such as Classical Studies (for Greece and Rome are acceptable), history, geography, Latin, geology, there was no room for this non-Western, non-European and non-Pakeha subject called Maori.*
> (Mead 1983:336)

Maori Studies, until recent years, has only been seen as an `adhering child of anthropology' (Mead Ibid). Maori Studies began, and continued, under the umbrella of Anthropology and in Auckland the ties were not cut until 1990. In Canterbury Maori was introduced in the Department of German.

1929 Maori included as a U.E. subject.

1952 University of Auckland introduces Maori Studies as a subject.

1967 At Victoria, Maori Studies introduced as a subject.

1968 Maori taught at Waikato.

1972 Waikato University Centre for Maori Studies and Research begins.

1972 Massey University Chair of Anthropology and Maori Studies established.

1973 Victoria University Chair in Maori Studies advertised and not filled until 1976.

1974 First M.A thesis written in Maori by Te Kapunga Dewes, Victoria University.

1978 M.A. programmes introduced at Victoria and Waikato.

1979 M.A. programme introduced at Auckland.

1982 Te Wananga O Raukawa established, an iwi based whare wananga. Bachelors of Maori and Administration.

1984 Canterbury began graduate programmes.

(Mead 1983, Webster 1989)

This timeline shows that the development of Maori Studies as a separate discipline has been a long and enduring process. Because Maori Studies were established under Anthropology Departments, so Maori students have had to study themselves as the `other'. At Auckland, Maori Studies was not a separate department but came under the umbrella of Anthropology until 1990.

The construction of Maori Studies as a discipline have seen a focus on two areas, language and culture. Culture was viewed as `pre-history, traditions, tribal histories, art, oratory and customary concepts' (Mead 1983:333). Mead argued for a broadening of the selection of what was acceptable within Maori Studies. He reasoned that any subject could be taught under the heading of Maori Studies. However the anthropology influence was clear

and Maori students were safely studying a de-politicised curriculum.

After 1952, when Ralph Piddington established Maori Studies at the University of Auckland, such academics as Bruce Biggs, Joan Metge, Hugh Kawharu, Rangi Walker, Pat Hohepa, Hirini Mead, Bob Mahuta, Pita Sharples, Graham Smith passed through here. Other Maori graduates in anthropology have been Muru Walters, Roger Marker, Syd Melbourne, Hone Kaa, Tai Black, Hemi Flavell, Margaret Mutu, Waerete Norman, Pare Hopa, Te Wharehuia Milroy. Add to this the list of Pakeha writers writing on Maori society such as Joan Metge, Ann Salmond, Peter Cleave, Jeff Sissons, Bernie Kernot etc. This is not a comprehensive list of those who have come through Anthropolgy, however it is clear that the majority of earlier writers, and many of the contemporary writers, writing on Maori society have emerged from this discipline. It becomes evident why anthropology is strongly influential and has become part of the `commonsense' way of explaining ourselves both within and outside universities.

Whilst anthropology was not the only discipline that had colonial agendas, anthropology was where Maori were allowed to have space within universities and although Maori Studies was once viewed as being the adhering child of anthropology, today Maori Studies have separate departments. The majority of writers on Maori society have emerged from the discipline of anthropology or have had an association with anthropology because of the situating of Maori Studies within this discipline. This is only just beginning to change now.

There are also links between anthropology and the emergence of the discourses on iwi development. In 1968 Ralph Piddington published a paper, called *Emergent Development And `Integration'*, which was one of the first early references to Maori development. He argued that there was a need to move away from the social policy term `integration' and to `think of Maori development, which implies no preconceived notions as to what direction development will or should take.' (Piddington 1968:260)

Raymond Firths book, *The Primitive Economics Of The New Zealand Maori*, takes the stance that Maori society was inherently capitalist, the seeds of capitalism were already there and it just needed western forms to `develop' this inherent inclination. This is a powerful argument that emerges in a number of present day Maori economic writings such as some of the writings from the Maori Economic Development Conference. This is a theory of progress. Those indigenous societies that were considered further along the road got a better deal. By having the `seeds' of capitalism, Maori were considered more redeemable than say the Aborigines who were considered beyond modernising.

Anthropology has been under fire for a number of years because of its cross-cultural assumptions and because of its complicity in the exploitation of indigenous peoples. Controversy still surrounds some of the theoretical assumptions that emerge from anthropology. In 1992 Marshall Sahlins presented a paper at the University of Auckland and it touches on the theme of indigenous peoples `inventing' their traditions and `inventing' their cultures.

Haunani Kay Trask, in her paper `*What Do You Mean "We" White Man?*' (1993), is critical of anthropologists adopting the stance that indigenous peoples have `invented' aspects of their culture such as a traditional love and caring for their land. It is claimed that certain cultural aspects are `invented' because indigenous peoples need a political and cultural rallying symbol of protest in the present day. Trask makes the following points:

> *The Hawaiian relationship to land has persisted into the present. What has changed is ownership and use of the land (from collective use by Hawaiians for subsistence to private use by haole and other non-Natives for profit). Asserting the Hawaiian relationship in this changed context results in politicization, thus, Hawaiians assert a `traditional' relationship to the land not for political ends, as Linnekin argues, but because they continue to believe in the cultural value of caring for the land. That land use is now contested, makes such a belief political. This distinction is crucial because the Hawaiian cultural motivation reveals the persistence of traditional values, the very thing Linneken claims modern Hawaiians have `invented'.*
>
> (Trask 1993:168)

Writers such as Edward Said do not hold out much hope for anthropology. In his paper, *Representing The Colonised: Anthropology's Interlocutors* (1989), Said says:

> *Perhaps anthropology, as we have known it, can only remain on one side of the imperial divide, there to remain as a partner in domination and hegemony.*
>
> (Said 1989:225)

Perhaps the key words that Said is using are `anthropology as we have known it'. These words suggest anthropology has to be transformed dramatically in order to move away from the study of alien beings. Some latter day anthropologists have moved to more of an advocacy role and work alongside indigenous groups.

(3.2) STATE DISCOURSES AND IWI

Although there is clearly a concept of iwi that is distinctly Maori, what the first part of this chapter has argued is that colonial discourses have helped to shape the ways in which we identify ourselves. The rest of this chapter argues that the current definitions of iwi, that have appeared in government policy, are far too narrow. It also argues that what constitutes an iwi is for iwi to determine, not the state.

Government has only been interested in iwi as an ethnic grouping over recent years. Since the time of the first European explorers, there have been differing stories constructed by Pakeha about group and intergroup relations of Maori people. Joseph Banks, the botanist aboard Captain Cook's ship, refers to Maori as the `New Zealanders' in his journal. In 1840 Hobson's instructions were that he was dealing with an `independent Maori nation'. Gradually as colonisation proceeded Pakeha became the New Zealanders with Maori as an add-on to Pakeha society. Maori were gradually seen less as a nation and more as a culture or a race (Wetherell and Potter 1992:198).

In their book, *Mapping The Language Of Racism* (1992), Wetherell and Potter found that when they conducted interviews with Pakeha New Zealanders, they viewed the term New Zealander as applying to those of European origin and it was unclear if Maori were considered New Zealanders at all.

Within Aotearoa, the notions of whanau, hapu and iwi have historically been considered antagonistic to the assimilationist policies of government. Nineteenth century politician Sir Francis Dillon Bell expressed some of the hostility to Maori social structures and ideologies:

> *The first plank of public policy must be to stamp out the beastly communism of the Maori.*
>
> (Bell cited in Puao-te-ata-tu 1986:87)

`Beastly communism' of Maori tribal organisation has, until recently, been seen as something to be deplored (Renwick 1990:105). Government policy reflected this through such means as the individualisation of land title and schools promoted the `removal of children from the demoralising influences of their villages'[1]. The Land Wars of last century were fought over the right to retain iwi, hapu and whanau sovereignty.

The term `Maori' was, and still is, the most common form of reference. According to Herbert Williams[2], *A Dictionary Of Maori Language* (1971), it was in the 1850s that Pakeha started to use the term Maori. It was out of the experience of colonisation that the term Maori developed as a group label for the indigenous population. Prior to colonisation, the term Maori was not used in this way. In the 1970s John Rangihau pointed out that the label Maori homogenizes us and overrides our whanau, hapu and iwi histories:

---

[1]This quote is attributed to Governor Grey. See Barrington (1966:1)

[2]This dictionary was first published in 1844 by W. Williams in Paihia. There have been seven subsequent editions since then.

I can't go round saying because I'm a Maori that Maoritanga means this and all Maoris have to follow me. Thats a lot of hooey. I have a faint suspicion that Maori is a term coined by the Pakeha to bring tribes together. Because if you can not divide and rule, then for tribal people all you can do is unite and rule. Because then they lose everything by losing their own tribal histories and traditions that give them their identity.

(Rangihau 1975:175)

Api Mahuika indicates some of the fluidity of the whanau, hapu and iwi relationship:

A person fluent with the operation of the whanau, hapu, iwi structures will know that in terms of the hapu or whanau matters, identity is parochially whanau or hapu, so that to the uninitiated, it would appear to be a separate tribe with no relationship whatsoever with the other groups within the same geographic area. However when threatened or where required to front up nationally whanau and hapu take second place to the iwi.

(Mahuika 1987:6)

At government level, the term iwi has only come into use in recent years. Prior to this, Maori ethnicity was the focus. When it came to counting Maori, different views, of what a Maori is, were expressed in different areas of the state. Statutory, census and other official definitions did not always agree (Poole 1991). What was unanimous about these statistics though, was the fact that Maori were not asked how they saw themselves.

The last census was an example of how the world is often named on behalf of Maori. Under the heading of ethnicity there was a choice of ticking a box to identify if you were Maori, Cook Is, Samoan etc. But then, if you were Maori, you were asked to identify one main iwi. Space was provided to write in other iwi that you have `strong ties to'. Very

few Maori identify with only one iwi. For many Maori their parents or grandparents come from different iwi. What this means is that, when you filled out the form, you had to choose which part of your whakapapa that you are not going to include. The alternative was to insist on entering all your iwi affiliations knowing that, probably, only the first iwi written would be taken into account.

This is not a small issue because the mana of ones ancestry is at stake. The census form illustrates that what constitutes ethnicity is being determined elsewhere. The framework of what constitutes iwi ethnicity had been determined in the process of deciding which questions would be considered relevant on the form, how these questions were to be worded and what questions were not asked. Another ramification of this is that each person will only be counted as affiliating to one iwi. Many people affiliate and maintain regular ties with more than one iwi.

The statistics do not give iwi an accurate picture of who affiliates to that iwi. The state is deciding not only who has membership of an iwi, but also who counts. Census figures are used by a multiplicity of state agencies for determining such issues as the distribution and allocation of resources.

Since the 1970s Maori people have mounted a counter challenge to the right of the state to impose state definitions of Maori ethnicity. Sally Weaver (1984), in her article *Struggles Of The State To Define Aboriginal Ethnicity*, points out that similar struggles were being played out between indigenous peoples and governments in other parts of the

world as well. She argues that the challenges posed by indigenous peoples presented western liberal democracies with a number of dilemmas. Challenges of self-determination and rights of indigenous peoples required new policy paradigms because the conventional modes of action and thought in dealing with the public were no longer appropriate. Calls by indigenous groups for the power to define themselves in the policy making process meant that there had to be indigenous involvement in the policy-making process.

Both iwi and hapu are often translated as tribe. But tribe is an anthropological term that has particular connotations:

> *Tribe/tribal/tribalism have been used as labels by anthropologists to designate groups regarded as pre-modern, non-literate or primitive*
> (Bullock A et al. (eds) 1988:875)

Evolutionary ideas underpin the tribe label. Tribes are considered to be a less developed form of social system than the more `advanced' capitalist or democratic forms. For this reason it is preferable to use the terms iwi and hapu, rather than tribe. However, some indigenous groups have politicised dominant group labels. An example of this are the Hawaiians who have claimed the term Native and assert their own definitions of this term (Trask 1993).

(3.2.1) The Waitangi Tribunal and Iwi

This section looks at the state discourse about iwi which has begun to appear in policy documents since 1988. The two key areas of this discourse have been in the devolution of Maori Affairs policy documents as well as Waitangi Tribunal reports.

The Treaty of Waitangi has had a chequered history within the legal process. Deemed to be a legal nullity in 1877 by Judge Prendergast, the Treaty was relegated to the legal wilderness until the State Owned Enterprise Act of 1985, when the Treaty was deemed to be a solemn compact between the Crown and Maori.

The Waitangi Tribunal was set up in 1975 to hear Treaty claims and was directed by government to take into account both the English and the Maori texts of the Treaty. This has caused some major contradictions because the two texts are fundamentally different. Writers such as Rangi Walker (1989), Bruce Biggs (1989) and Claudia Orange (1987) have argued that the translation of the English text into Maori was deliberately written differently.

The Waitangi Tribunal has been directed to take into account both versions of the Treaty and they have consequently upheld the view that Maori people ceded sovereignty. This is contested by Maori writers, Moana Jackson and Rangi Walker:

> *Ceding governorship is not the same as ceding sovereignty.*
> (Walker in Kawharu 1989:264)

Despite these views, the Waitangi Tribunal has maintained that sovereignty has been ceded to the Crown and is absolute and non-negotiable, which has helped to legitimate the states view.

The Maori text of the Treaty says the signatories are `ki nga hapu, ki nga rangatira', iwi are not mentioned. The English text uses the terms `confederation of united tribes'. The

Treaty speaks of a Crown-hapu relationship but the focus of government policy has been iwi.

In *Labour and the Treaty* (1990), Jane Kelsey argues that government discourse about the Treaty occurred simultaneously with the large rise in unemployment, when Maori people were being laid off in large numbers. The Waitangi Tribunal played a major part in giving the appearance of equity issues being addressed when in actual fact Maori people, were becoming worse off, particularly in the area of employment.

The Waitangi Tribunal has bought to light quite a bit of history that until their establishment had been swept under the carpet. In regard to what they have written about iwi they have continued their `cession of sovereignty' argument and in the Mangonui and Muriwhenua reports have determined that iwi do not have sovereign rights over their own territories.

> *Tino rangatiratanga therefore refers not to a separate sovereignty but to tribal self-management on lines similar to what we understand by local government.*
> (Muriwhenua Report 1988:187)

These interpretations are elaborating the view that iwi rangatiratanga[3] is subsumed under the umbrella of kawanatanga[4]. Partnership is obviously an illusion. Within this view is

---

[3]Rangatiratanga is a term for chieftanship, but is also a term used in the Treaty and indicates self determination or sovereignty.

[4]Kawanatanga is another term used in the Treaty that refers to governorship. At the time of the signing of the Treaty, kawanatanga was in a subordinate position to rangatiratanga, the authority of iwi and hapu.

a normative view of what `tribalself-management' might look like - i.e. local government. Even then it is doubtful that iwi would get the jurisdiction powers that local bodies have. So far there has been strong resistance by government to the idea of a separate or partially separate justice system.

Within the articulation of iwi discourses are a number of implications. One of these involves the naming of what constitutes leadership of iwi and therefore deciding who the `experts' are. Governments choose which `experts' they will believe when it comes to compensating for past injustices. Consultation is therefore a selective process.

Interpretations of the Treaty through the Waitangi Tribunal have caused the Treaty to become subject to complex legal interpretations. The basis of the British legal system is the notion of individual and a concern with property rights. Consequently the early Waitangi Tribunal claims were concerned merely with property rights, only later bringing in social rights. Iwi gets defined down the lines of - how can iwi best be fitted into the legal framework? It is viewed as a problem. Not surprisingly the Tribunal urges the need for legally recognised forms of tribal institutions:

> *The main problem as we see it is that the legal status of tribes is ill-defined*
> (Mangonui Report 1988)

and further on in the same report:

> *a) The Treaty requires the recognition of tribal self-management rights*
> *b) Modern circumstances compel the need for legally cognisable forms of tribal institutions with authority to represent the tribe on local issues and adequate resources to assist the formulation of tribal opinion*
> (Ibid)

(3.2.2) Iwi And Government

Language is not merely contemplative or justificatory, it is performative. Analysis of political discourse helps us elucidate not only the systems of thought through which authorities have posed and specified the problems for government, but also the systems of action through which they have sought to give effect to government.
(Rose, Miller 1991:5)

The restructuring of Maori Affairs as part of the Labour governments devolution policies saw an iwi focus emerge in government policy. Within the discussion documents of *He Tirohanga Rangapu* and later in *Te Urupare Rangapu*, restructuring of iwi was proposed. Iwi were to become the service and delivery agents of government programmes. At this point there was discussion of iwi functions in the envisaged changes, but no defining of iwi. The next step was to introduce into parliament the legislation to back up the policy. This came in the form of the *Runanga Iwi*[5] *Bill* and was put before the House by the Minister of Maori Affairs on the 5 December 1989. It set out a legal definition of iwi, which is quoted here:

(a) Descent from tupuna
(b) Hapu
(c) Marae
(d) Belonging historically to a takiwa
(e) An existence traditionally acknowledged by other iwi
(Runanga Iwi Bill 1990)

---

[5]Runanga Iwi is ungrammatical Maori, the title should have been the Runanga A Iwi Bill.

What was interesting about this definition of iwi was its similarity to what David Pearson identifies as an ethnic community. Pearson quotes Anthony Smith from *Ethnic Origin Of Nations* (1986) and defines an ethnic community as having the following characteristics:

- a collective name
- a common myth of descent
- a shared history
- a distinctive shared culture
- an association with a specific territory
- a sense of solidarity

(Pearson 1990:15)

The Runanga Iwi Bill, which sets out a definition of iwi that was very close to Anthony Smiths view, is a very limited view of iwi. From this definition we get the view that iwi are unified actors with considerable autonomy, ruling their particular areas and pursuing their ends through consultation or struggle. Iwi clearly do have a small degree of autonomy. But they do not have the powers of local bodies for example, who derive income from all those living in their areas, through water rates, housing rates, building permits etc. Nor do they have powers to create and enforce laws. But also iwi exist in a context of dominant power relations. Iwi interests are always going to be compromised by laws, by the state and by local bodies, all of which are serve dominant group interests.

This definition fails to acknowledge that culture is a changing dynamic, it does not have the fixity that this definition suggests. This definition of an iwi is structural functionalist[6]

[6]Raymond Firth and other anthropologists viewed Maori society through this type of lens.

in nature. This means that iwi is viewed as an institution and is analysed by looking at its structures.

Overlooked, in the definition set out by the Runanga Iwi Bill, is the lived dynamic of iwi. When examining the lived dynamic of iwi it becomes apparent, for example, that Maori people often affiliate to more than one iwi. Other lived dynamics are the fact that sometimes a hapu is viewed as an iwi and sometimes it is viewed as a hapu. For example our family from Te Aitanga-a-Hauiti can be either viewed as an iwi or a hapu. This flexibility does not present a problem in Maori communities because there are good whakapapa[7] arguments that allow both viewpoints. But legally fixing a definition would exclude one of those viewpoints. Legal definitions require the defining of property rights, as vested on individuals. British law has great difficult encompassing notions of the collective and it also has difficulty accepting that several histories can exist simultaneously without negating each other as Maori histories accept under the notion of tangata whenua.

There also exist other ways of defining iwi, for example, within Maori National Congress, Ratana[8] have been given the voting rights of iwi. Yet they can not be viewed as an iwi under the above legal definition if they so wished, they are a collective that is not kinship based. With the majority of Maori resident outside iwi territory, other structures may want

---

[7]Whakapapa argument means historical and genealogical reasons.

[8]Ratana are a movement that has two sides, the spiritual and the political. Established by Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana, the movement began around 1918 when Ratana received a vision from God. At the time of the 1991 census, Ratana numbered 41,835 members, making them the largest Maori religious group in the country. See Iwi Population And Dwellings published by the Department Of Statistics, 1993.

iwi status. Pre-colonisation, new hapu, whanau and iwi were being created all the time and there is no reason that any definitions should not allow for this possibility in the current context.

Also iwi have in the past become hapu, some have redesignated their status and hapu have become iwi. One of the most powerful stories of the redesignating of an iwi is told by Maarire Goodall (1993) when a group of 233 prisoners were taken, in Taranaki, last century, following the battles between Titokowaru's people and government forces over land in southern Taranaki. Many of the prisoners, who were sent to the South Island, died in the harsh conditions. The survivors returned to Taranaki and Goodall notes that they remembered the incident on their return by calling themselves Ngati Otakou.

Another example of a created iwi is Ngati Kapo, a national group made up of visually impaired Maori and their whanau. They have designated themselves as an iwi, for they have distinct needs, and have formed a group that is not kinship based but have a common purpose of support and political action. Ngati Kapo is not set up to negate the iwi roots of its members, rather they see themselves in an advocacy role between whanau and the visually impaired. They see their role as being one of `mutual support, advocacy and self-advocacy'[9]. It is quite possible that other iwi may develop in this manner.

24% of the Maori population now live in Auckland, that is over 100,000 Maori people (Auckland Regional Council 1991:1). There are numerous whanau groups within

[9]Communication with Mark Tibble, Foundation For The Blind, 2 February, 1994

Auckland, and other cities, that are united, not always because of kinship ties but are urban groups. In Wellington Ngati Poneke[10] is an example. Some whanau are engaged in joint purposes, such as Kohanga Reo whanau, marae whanau and so forth. Iwi may develop out of these groups. If iwi are defined in the narrow sense of the Runanga Iwi Bill then resources would be channelled through runanga with urban groups cut out unless operating through runanga structures. The majority of urban Maori groups are pan tribal groups.

The Runanga Iwi Bill was to contract iwi to the state through the incorporation of iwi. It was charters as well as the Act which were to be the means of ensuring accountability. Government gave a very short time for submissions, but despite this, practically every major iwi responded. Many iwi were opposed to the `diminishing of tino rangatiratanga and the elevating of kawanatanga' (Renwick 1990:125). Others were appalled at the defining of iwi. The force of Maori protest saw the dumping of the Bill in 1990.

The next major piece of writing that mentions iwi is The Fisheries Settlement Report 1992, more commonly known as the Sealords Deal. Written by the Waitangi Tribunal, it is a report to the Minister of Maori Affairs Doug Kidd. The same issues were being contested: who qualifies as iwi? who represents iwi? who has property rights? how should compensation be allocated? Customary rights were deemed to be held by the hapu in this situation.

---

[10]Ngati Poneke originally referred to the culture club, begun in Wellington, but sometimes Ngati Poneke is used as a wider term for those who live in Wellington.

The Fisheries Settlement Report noted the following:

> *How the iwi reaches an agreement is an internal domestic matter, not (for) the Crown to work out.*
>
> (1992:14)

The Settlement was dubbed the `tinof sardines deal' by Maori. In reaching a `settlement', the government were to choose who iwi representatives were, they framed the arena of negotiation, the rules for negotiation and they remain the final arbiters of any final decisions. It was considered that iwi were allowed to reach agreement among themselves, what this meant was that the iwi representatives chosen could determine how the tin of sardines was to be apportioned. In the report, who represents iwi is looked at. Trust Boards, Maori councils, federated Maori Authorities and runanga are mentioned and some recognition is made of iwi variations when it comes to representation. In the end the Sealords deal was signed but amidst a storm of protest. Discontent revolved round the charges of trading `mana for money', by selling out for thirteen pieces of silver. Subsequent moves have seen the appointment of a 13 member commission to decide on the allocation of resources. The story is still unfolding.

(3.3) IMPLICATIONS FOR IWI DEVELOPMENT

What this chapter has set out to do is to look at the concept of iwi as a discourse of power. The classification systems for Maori may have changed but the power relations remain the same. Pakeha are still viewed as the norm and ethnic groups are seen as deviating from the norm. For Maori, being viewed as an ethnic group overrides the unique status they have in this land, the status of tangata whenua.

The inscribing of identities involves the power to create narratives that also block other narratives, with the creation of grand narratives. For Maori women this has seen the reconstruction of our histories. Controlling definitions has:

> *been for many of us, a theft of matrilineal descent by Western patriarchal descent.*
> (Trask 1993:136)

This theft has meant the denial of the right to own land, the right to be considered spokespeople and represent at national level, in the courts and so on. Maori women are to the fore in certain areas, such as education, law and so forth but certain areas are considered male domains such as corporate management.

Identity is continuing to be reinscribed in patriarchal Western modes. Within the reo `rangatira', `kaumatua' are gender neutral terms, yet it is now common for people to say kuia, kaumatua as if kaumatua is a male only term. I have heard it said by a fluent speaker of Maori that rangatira is a male only term.

Through the devolution of Maori Affairs a battle took place between iwi and government over the right for iwi to determine what an iwi is and who represents iwi. These battles have still not ceased. The two areas of the inscription of identity, looked at in this chapter have been through schooling and through official policy discourses, but these struggles over identity underlie all areas of struggle between Pakeha and Maori because they are fundamental to self determination.