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HE MIHI

Whakataka te hau ki te uru
Whakataka te hau ki te tonga
Kia makinakina ki uta
Kia mataratara ki tai
E hi ake ana te atakura
He tio he huka he hau hu
Tihei Mauri Ora

E papaki nei te tai o mihi ki nga kaitaunaki i tenei kaupapa nui whakaharahara. Ki te hunga na ratau i para i te huarahi, nga kuia, nga koroua, mei kore ake koutou, kua papatoiake rawa atu a matau mahi. Kaati, ki nga kaiwhakaropiropi, kaituhitahi i enei korero, he mihi mutunga kore ki a koutou katoa.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Proposal

This research project was developed in response to the Request for Proposals from Te Puni Kokiri for three literature review documents related to policy development for the Maori Potential Framework.

As noted in the Request for Proposals (RFP), Te Puni Kokiri wishes “to build its information data-bases related to whanau development, to Maori reaching their potential and to Maori succeeding as Maori, and is requesting the submission of proposals to undertake research”.\(^1\) The projects are to contribute to the development of a database that will provide Te Puni Kokiri with “baseline data on enhancing whanau well-being, on whanau leadership and engagement, and on innovation and enterprise which facilitate whanau development and the realisation of Maori potential, both to inform policy advice and to contribute to the outcome of Maori succeeding as Maori.”\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Te Puni Kokiri May 2005 ‘Building Baseline Data on Maori Whanau Development and Maori Realising Their Potential’ Request for Proposals: 1
\(^2\) ibid.
1.2 Contact Details

The contact people for the research team are Dr Leonie Pihama and Sandie Gusscott. Their contact details follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Director</th>
<th>Dr Leonie Pihama</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address</td>
<td>University of Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Bag 92019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>09 3737599 ext 85607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:le.pihama@auckland.ac.nz">le.pihama@auckland.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contract Manager</th>
<th>Sandie Gusscott</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Postal Address</td>
<td>Auckland UniServices Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private Bag 92019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier Address</td>
<td>Level 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70 Symonds Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Auckland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>09 3737522 ext 89469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fax</td>
<td>09 3737412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.gusscott@auckland.ac.nz">s.gusscott@auckland.ac.nz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. ASSIGNED PERSONNEL

2.1 Capability of the Team

The Project Team brings together a range of diverse skills and experiences within the Maori Education, Social Policy, Kaupapa Maori, Maori Innovation and Economic Development and Research areas.

IRI is based in the Rehutai Complex, Waipapa Marae at the University of Auckland. IRI has strong Iwi networks and as an entity have the ability and network to draw expertise from a wide and diverse peer network.

The involvement of Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith as peer reviewer also brings it a vast network of researchers across Aotearoa through her co-directorship of Nga Pae
The implementation and financial audit of the project will be supported by Auckland UniServices Limited (UniServices) and managed with proactive project management methodologies.

2.2 Core Team

The Core Team consists of Dr Leonie Pihama, Ms Mera Penehira, Ms Donna Gardiner and Ms Ella Henry as the Principal Investigators. It is noted that the Core Team is a highly skilled group of Maori researchers/academics who have the skills and knowledge to provide Te Puni Kokiri with a substantial research report in the defined areas.

Project Leadership of each area will be as follows:

*Overall Project Leader – Dr Leonie Pihama*
*Facilitating Engagement – Ms Mera Penehira*
*Developing Leaders – Ms Donna Gardiner*
*Inovation, Enterprise and Economic Opportunities – Ms Ella Henry*

Dr Leonie Pihama (Te Atiawa, Ngati Mahanga), BA, MA (Hons), PhD

Dr Leonie Pihama is the Director of IRI. She is experienced in evaluation research and teaches policy. Dr Pihama has had extensive involvement in Maori Education and is actively involved with Te Wharekura o Hoani Waititi. Her Masters thesis examined the Parenting programme ‘Parents as First Teachers’ and the relevance of the programme to Maori whanau. Dr Pihama has been involved in the evaluation of the Framework for Measuring the Effectiveness of Corrections Programmes for Maori for the Department of Corrections as well as being part of the research teams for Meeting the Needs of Maori Victims of Crime and the Evaluation of Programmes for the Protected of Maori Adult Persons under the Domestic Violence Act 1995. She has recently completed a major literature review on Maori pedagogies for ITPNZ which is being utilised as a framework for exploring Maori e-learning pedagogies. Dr Pihama is the overall Project Leader and Co-Investigator for this research.
Ms Mera Penehira (Ngati Raukawa)  M.Ed (Ed.Psych), Dip. Early Intervention, Higher Diploma Tchng (ACE), Tohu Mohiotanga, Dip Tchng (ECE)

Ms Penehira is currently a Project Manager and Researcher for Nga Pae o Te Maramatanga. Ms Penehira has extensive knowledge and experience in Maori Education and in particular in the areas of Te Kohanga Reo, Early Childhood Education and Special Education. She has worked as a contract researcher with the International Research Institute for Indigenous Education and similarly with Paewhenua Hou Partnership. Ms Penehira has worked as Service Manager and Early Intervention Teacher with Ohomairangi Early Intervention Service, a Kaupapa Maori special education provider. She is a trained teacher and has completed her Masters in Educational Psychology at the University of Auckland and has experience and skills in qualitative and evaluative research and indigenous methodologies. Ms Penehira is Co-Investigator for this research

Ms Donna Ngaronoa Gardiner (Ngai Te Rangi Ngati Ranginui)

Ms Gardiner brings to the team, a background in Community Development, the Public Service, Whanau and Hapu Development, and a lifelong commitment to Indigenous and Women's Development. Prior to joining Nga o Te Maramatanga Donna was employed as a senior Lecturer at Te Ara Poutama AUT and was the programme leader for the degree and undergraduate programmes for four years. Before that Donna was employed as the Outpost Manager Manukau for Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiarangi, for three years. Ms Gardiner is is Co-Investigator for this research

Ms Ella Henry (Ngati Kahu ki Whangaroa, Ngati Kuri, Te Rarawa)

Ella Henry has a diverse background in management, education and Maori development, politics, and iwi, hapu and whanau development, including sitting as a member for Nga Aho Whakaari, or the Maori in Film, Video and Television Incorporated Society since 1996. She has been involved with Maori moving image industries since becoming a member of Te Manu Aute (the Maori Communicators Network) in 1988. Ella has taught Maori Management and Business courses at The University of Auckland and was the Head of Pukenga at Unitech. She is currently a Maori Health Manager for the Plunket Society and is also currently
undertaking her doctoral studies in the area of Maori business development. Ms Henry is Co-Investigator for this research.

2.3 The International Research Institute for Maori and Indigenous Education (IRI), University of Auckland

The International Research Institute for Maori and Indigenous Education (IRI) was established in 1997 and is situated in The Faculty of Arts at The University of Auckland. The Institute consists of a multi-disciplinary team of mainly Maori academics with a proven research record.

The kaupapa of IRI is to conduct and disseminate research, scholarship and debate, which will make a positive difference to the lives of Maori, and other Indigenous peoples, by drawing together a group of highly skilled and respected scholars who are dedicated to quality outcomes for Maori and Indigenous Peoples. As such IRI is well placed to work on this project and within a collaborative team that will bring diverse cultural knowledge and research expertise together for this project.

2.4 Auckland UniServices Limited

UniServices is the contract arm of the University and it provides professional project management support to Senior Academic Staff engaged in leading new initiatives with external clients. It has a highly developed contract support infrastructure – which includes dedicated human resources and purchasing services, accounting, reporting, and audit.
3 KAUPAPA MAORI RESEARCH

This research is based within a Kaupapa Maori approach. According to Tuakana Nepe³ Kaupapa Maori derives from distinctive cultural epistemological and metaphysical foundations. This is further argued by Dr Linda Tuhiwai Smith⁴ who states;

_The concept of kaupapa implies a way of framing and structuring how we think about those ideas and practices._

Contemporary expressions of Kaupapa Maori are seen within the education system. Their development and ongoing survival has been driven by Maori. Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori are two well known examples. Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori developed as resistance to a mainstream Pakeha centered system that failed to address key needs of Maori. As a founding member of Kura Kaupapa Maori in Tamaki Makaurau, Dr Graham Hingangaroa Smith has argued that Kura Kaupapa Maori is a successful intervention for Maori. One of the key elements is that the development originated from and is driven by Maori. Within Kura Kaupapa Maori key features are consistently evident.

Expressions of Kaupapa Maori theory have been summarised by Graham Hingangaroa Smith⁵ in the following way:

- A Kaupapa Maori base (Maori philosophy and principles) i.e. local theoretical positioning related to being Maori, such a position presupposes that:
  - the validity and legitimacy of Maori is taken for granted
  - the survival and revival of Maori language and culture is imperative
  - the struggle for autonomy over our own cultural well-being, and over our own lives is vital to Maori survival.

These features speak not to content per se, but to Maori aspirations, philosophies, processes and pedagogies, which are consistently found within successful Maori initiatives.

---

Where much existing material related to Kaupapa Maori initiatives is located within the Maori education field, Kaupapa Maori is not limited to any one sector. Graham Smith notes that Kaupapa Maori is relevant to all aspects of society. The success elements that are evident in Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Maori derive from wider Maori knowledges, they are inherently a part of tikanga Maori. Kaupapa Maori can not be seen to be bound to any one sector (for example education or justice) as Kaupapa Maori does not know the parameters that are a part of defining those sectors.

There is a growing body of literature regarding Kaupapa Maori theories and practices that assert a need for Maori to develop initiatives for change that are located within distinctly Maori frameworks. Kaupapa Maori in research is concerned with both the methodological developments and the forms of research method utilised. The distinction between methodology and method is very important and can be summarised thus:

**Methodology**: a process of enquiry that determines the method(s) used.

**Method**: tools that can be used to produce and analyse data.

In this sense Kaupapa Maori is “a theory and an analysis of the context of research which involves Maori and of the approaches to research with, by and/or for Maori” (Smith, 1996).

A Kaupapa Maori approach does not exclude the use of a wide range of methods but signals the interrogation of methods in relation to tikanga Maori. Furthermore, Kaupapa Maori enables an analysis of issues with Aotearoa from an approach that is distinctively by and of Aotearoa. As such Kaupapa Maori is a ‘home grown’ theoretical and research approach that interrogates and investigates issues as they are contextualised within Aotearoa. This is a key element of Kaupapa Maori. It enables a critical approach from a Maori base. It also enables a process of analysis in regards to the colonial experiences of Aotearoa, as such Kaupapa Maori has a decolonising agenda that is also a key element of analysis. Such an agenda is

---


explicit in the phrase Kaupapa Maori theory. The centrality of te reo and tikanga Maori does not mean that researchers and academics working from a Kaupapa Maori base do not draw upon wider national and International frameworks as that is not the case. A Kaupapa Maori approach is both open to and inclusive of a range of methods however those methods are firstly interrogated for their relevance and appropriateness to the issues at hand. This is not new. Maori people have for the past 200 years shown a flexibility and adaptability in regards to new approaches. Kaupapa Maori provides the foundation from which this project will operate, it also determines the framework of thought in regards to the areas of development that are proposed here.

4 Background

4.1 Project Aim

The aim of this research project is undertake a literature review which provides insight and understanding into three key area (i) Facilitating Engagement; (ii) Developing Leadership and (iii) Fostering Innovation, Enterprise and Economic Opportunities. This research will be viewed alongside the literature review being undertaken by Professor Mason Durie regarding Whanau and Well-being. The reviews will include the key research objectives as noted by Te Puni Kokiri. These being;

Review One: Developing Leadership

- To undertake a literature review and analysis of the means and strategies used to assist Maori to grow leaders both for business and cultural purposes.
- To determine the effect of these means and strategies upon realising the social, cultural, educational and economic potential of Maori.
- To outline the nature of the programme/s, means, strategies offered.
- To determine how the programmes contribute to whanau development and Maori succeeding as Maori.
- What constitutes Maori/whanau leadership, how is it expressed and what forms does it take.

Refer Pihama, L., 1993 Tungia te Ururua, Kia Tupu Whakaritorito Te Tupu o te Harakeke: A Critical Analysis of Parents as First Teachers, RUME Masters Theses Series Number 3, University of Auckland, Auckland
• How does quality Maori leadership influence the realisation of whanau potential and success.
• What mechanisms are employed to ensure the transmission of leadership across generations.
• How has Maori leadership evolved over time to meet changing needs and demands.
• What are the dimensions of leadership by gender, age, purpose and succession.
• How best are leaders grown.

Review Two: Facilitating Engagement

• To investigate the concept of whanau engagement and its various dimensions.
• To identify processes, practices and contributing factors to effective inter and intra whanau engagement.
• To explore past, present and potential mechanisms for connecting whanau members with each other.
• To identify means whereby strong whanau engage effectively with other Maori collectives to mutual benefit.
• To identify success states of engagement and investigate the development of models for wider whanau use.

Review Three: Innovation, Enterprise and Economic Opportunities

• To undertake a literature review and analysis of available studies into Maori innovation, enterprise and economic opportunities and studies which suggest how Maori could engage such opportunities.
• To identify what are the causative or environmental factors which contribute to the development of an innovative, enterprising approach to economic opportunities.
• To identify exemplars of Maori enterprise and innovation at work in the economy.
• To describe those strategies that appear to contribute to raising Maori creativity, enterprise and innovation in regard to Maori and other business endeavours.
• To investigate the present or potential use of mentoring, business incubators and seed funding for Maori business.
• To identify the personality type or antecedent factors that contribute to Maori entrepreneurship both business and cultural.
As noted in the Kaupapa Maori section of this proposal it is intention of Kaupapa Maori to outline intervention and transformative elements that support Maori initiatives and developments. Those elements have been in practice within a range of Kaupapa Maori initiatives over the past twenty years. The Maori Providers project undertaken by IRI with Te Punī Kokiri identified a range of key elements. Other research projects led by IRI, and Maori researchers associated with IRI, have also outlined critical elements which enhance Maori wellbeing.

4.2 Defining Whanau


“The imagery of the harakeke is utilised in the programme ‘Atawhainga Te Pa Harakeke’ operated by the Early Childhood Development Unit. The Pa Harakeke refers to the flax plant which is recognised within Maori society as a symbol of whanau and protection. According to the Huhana Rokx the saying ‘Kua tupu te pa harakeke: The flax plant is growing’ is an indication that a whanau is secure and protected and therefore able to grow. The metaphor of the flax bush is prevalent in Maori whakatauki in any discussion regarding the Maori whanau. It is a broad and encompassing term, which includes a direct link to gods, ancestors and universe. Maori Marsden says that pivotal to the sustenance of the Pa Harakeke (the flax bush) is the centre shoot or ‘te rito’ which is used to symbolise the central importance of the child. It is a deeply

---

9 The International Research Institute for Maori and Indigenous Education in collaboration with Te Roopu Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pomare 2002 Iwi and Maori Provider Success, Te Punī Kokiri, Wellington
stratified human relationship complex. It is a total environment in which, Maori assert, the past stands as a resource to sustain the current and future generations.” (pg 30)

The report draws on the weaving analogy and refers to the writing of Joan Metge\textsuperscript{14} that indicates that the analogies draw with harakeke provides a visual representation of “the significance of parents and elders as protectors and re-generators”. (Ministry of Health 2003: pg). Joan Metge develops the view that:

“Maori use the flax bush (te pa harakeke) as a favourite metaphor for the family group they call the whanau. They identify the rito in each fan as a child (tamaiti), emerging from and protected by its parents (matua) on either side. [This also symbolises that two whakapapa or genealogical lines of descent arise from the two parents]. Like fans in the flax bush, parent-child families in the whanau share common roots and derives strength and stability as part of a larger collective. Like rito, children are the hope of continuity…” they represent life’s yearning for itself – the future. Like the flax bush the familial systems of whanau, hapu and iwi enter cycles of birth, death and regeneration. In this sense new life is made possible by the old.”\textsuperscript{15}

In a comprehensive discussion of Maori concepts titled 'He Hinatore Ki Te Ao Maori: A Glimpse Into The Maori World'\textsuperscript{16} whanau is described as:

“The basic unit of Maori society into which an individual was born and socialised. The whanau was the cluster of families and individuals descended from a fairly recent ancestor. Whanau derived from the word whanau (to give birth). On a purely descriptive level the whanau could consist of up to three or four generations living together in a group of houses.” (ibid:30)

The report further notes that whanau had social roles and acted as

“… a unit for ordinary social and economic affairs, and making basic day to day decisions. Its members had close personal, familial and reciprocal

\textsuperscript{14} Metge, J. 1995 op.cit
\textsuperscript{15} ibid.
\textsuperscript{16} He Hinatore ki te Ao Maori: A Glimpse Into the Maori World, Ministry of Justice, Wellington, March 2001:30
contacts and decision-making relationships with each other.\textsuperscript{17}

Whanau has been defined in general terms as ‘extended family’ consisting of up to three or four generations and was the basic social unit “under the direction of kaumatua and kuia”.\textsuperscript{18} The role of kuia and koroua was clearly noted and discussion of kaumatua in providing guidance and support was emphasised by both informants and literature drawn on in the report. The following comment from a kaumatua emphasises this point;

“Our kaumatua, kuia, grandparents, or even granduncles or whoever was around made it easier for a parent because it wasn’t just the parents focusing on each other. The responsibility in fact was shared, it was shared by your extended whanau, shared by your hapu and the community that you lived in.” (ibid:31)

Reflecting on her childhood Rangimarie Rose Pere writes;

“Every adult from my childhood community was involved with parenting as part of our social control and if I had difficulty communicating with my natural parents or grandparents, there were numerous others I could turn to for help.” (Pere 1979: 25)

The central role of whanau in wider Maori structures is clearly articulated by the authors of the ‘Te Hinatore’ report.

“Politically the whanau would meet to decide important matters, and the kaumatua would act as the spokespeople in the wider forum of hapu. Economically, the whanau provided its own workforce for subsistence activities and would work together to produce or gather food, hunt and fish. The whanau shared their wealth and resources, holding their houses, tools, stored food and effects in common... Therefore in most matters the whanau was self-sufficient.” (ibid:32)

Rangimarie Rose Pere also highlights the key position of kaumatua within whanau and as a Maori educationalist she notes that it was kaumatua that took responsibility for the education of their mokopuna and provided the initial introduction to a wealth of knowledge and the skills that pertained to their development.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{17} ibid.:30
\textsuperscript{18} Henare,M., 1988. Nga tikanga me nga ritenga o te ao Māori: Standards and Foundations of Maori Society in The Royal Commission on Social Policy, April, Government Printer, Wellington
\textsuperscript{19} Pere, R 1986
Until relatively recent time in our history Maori children were collectively nurtured, raised and educated in this manner. This ensured the child had access to a range of adults and siblings whom all contributed to their accumulation of knowledge, language, values, and belief systems essential to the maintenance and continuance of Maori societal structures. Te Rangihiroa states that for the Maori child the earliest "personal instruction" was received from their tipuna. This was made possible due to the whanau living arrangements. The child lived within an environment that embraced at least three generations and was exposed to a lifestyle that allowed for their nurturing and education from their elders. Makereti describes how children were taught all aspects of life through living and sleeping with their parents, grandparents, granduncles through whom they would learn of folk-lore, traditions, legends, whakapapa, karakia and of their relationship to the land, sea, rivers, mountains, forests, birds and all aspects of nature.

The ‘Te Rito’ report indicates that the definition of whanau in historical literature has been problematic.

Margaret Orbell has reviewed the works of Elsdon Best, Percy Smith, Raymond Firth, and Peter Buck, who is also known as Te Rangi Hiroa concluding their definition of a ‘traditional’ Maori whanau is mis-named. Orbell noted that the definition of whanau constructed by these anthropologists was better understood using the historical marker ‘classical’. It is noted that Metge was also critical of the term ‘traditional’ Maori family, with Metge viewing the term ‘classical’ as more appropriate in term of western anthropological constructions (Ministry of Health, 2003)

---

20 ibid.
21 Papakura, Makereti 1938 The old-time Maori. V. Gollancz, London
23 Elsdon Best 1924 The Maori As He Was. Polynesian Society, Wellington
28 Orbell, M.1978 op.cit.
The Report authors further state that there are general typologies that provide elements of whanau;

“a typology for whanau using anthropological ordering suggested that a whanau is:
a family group usually comprising three to four generations: an older man and his wife, some or all of their descendants and in-married spouses, or some variant (such as several brothers with their wives and families) representing a stage in a domestic cycle
a domestic group occupying a common set of buildings (sleeping houses or houses, cookhouse and storage stages) standing alone or occupying a defined subdivision of a village
a social and economic unit responsible for the management of daily domestic life, production and consumption
the lowest tier in a three-tiered system of socio-political groups defined by descent from common ancestors traced through links of both sexes, the middle tier consisting of hapu and the highest of iwi” (ibid:27-28)

Definitions of whanau have also tended to entrench western notions of gender relations, with authors such as Raymond Firth placing the decision-making for whanau directly with senior ‘male’ members. However there is little evidence to support the notion that whanau were ‘headed’ solely by males. Rangimarie Pere states that within her whanau, hapu and iwi experiences of whanau, both women and men worked together for the well-being of all. It would be appropriate therefore to read such assertions in the context of the social and cultural imposition of nuclear family structures and dominant western gender ideologies. This may also be said in relation to the reconstruction of nurturing roles of Maori men and women within whanau where the role for raising children is on the whole positioned with Maori women, however documentation by Anne Salmond highlights the contributions of both Maori women and Maori men in the raising of tamariki. The notion of balance in regards to Maori women and men is articulated clearly by Ani Mikaere.

---

30 Pere, Rangimarie Rose 1988 *Te Wheke: Whaia Te Maramatanga me te Aroha* in Middleton, S. *Women and Education in Aotearoa,* Allen &Unwin New Zealand Ltd., Wellington pp 6-19
“The roles of men and women in traditional Maori society can be understood only in the context of the Maori world view, which acknowledged the natural order of the universe, the interrelationship or Whanaungatanga of all living things to one another and to the environment, and the over-arching principle of balance.”

Whilst Elsdon Best also reproduced such beliefs when discussing the roles of women and men within whanau, he also stressed that whanau acted as a collective body in ensuring their survival and as such he notes that the concept of ‘whanau tahi’ is a reflection of the importance of the whanau as a kin group and in working collectively. He states that;

“Particular stress must be laid on the power of public opinion in the Maori commune. It was a peculiarly strong force in the preservation of order, in the attitude of a person towards his neighbours, and in the upholding of a strong sense of duty. The effect of a communal life was such that it was impossible for a person to ignore this force”. 34

Northern elder Pa Tate (1993) has developed a preferred framework for Maori working within whanau, hapu and iwi systems, esteemed focused on fundamental principles which might assist the restoration of healthy relationships within whanau. Whanaungatanga, he stated, is able to provide a restorative framework and as such is a clear site of intervention. Tate (ibid:1) develops his view of whanaungatanga in line with the notion of whanaungatanga as being the birth place of the collective;

Whanaungatanga

Whanau - to birth
Nga - the
Tanga - collective.

The link of notions of whanau, hapu and iwi to our wider physical and spiritual environment and whakapapa structures is important to understanding the multiple connections that we have as Maori. For example Tate (ibid:1) underlines that; “…whanaungatanga, relates to the Tapu of Being. Te Tapu o Te Tangata”.

33 Best 1924 ibid.: 339
34 ibid: 356
35 Pa Tate (1993) Unpublished paper titled presented to a Maori Community Workshop. The Dynamics of Whanaungatanga. This training workshop targeted Maori, in the first instance, working with whanau, hapu and iwi.
36 Tate (ibid: 1)
New developments culturally, socially and politically have meant that whanau is now viewed differently from how our tupuna viewed whanau. New formations of whanau have taken place to provide for the needs of Maori people within the social, political and economic contexts they find themselves in.

Maori development over the past 15 years has focused primarily upon Iwi development. For example, treaty settlement processes have, most often, operated at an Iwi level. In some instances this has meant the marginalisation of whanau. This may be an outcome of early colonial structures which effectively reduced the position of whanau through the introduction of western notions of individualism, the nuclear heterosexual family and capitalism. For example, Linda Tuhikai Smith\(^{37}\) refers to the Native Schools system as a form of ideological ‘Trojan horse’. Native Schools were built inside Maori communities as a means of ensuring certain forms of domestication occurred. A key element of the domestication process was the modelling of the nuclear family structure and its associated gender roles. Whanau was directly targeted as a site for colonisation and now 200 years later it is a site that is targeted by both the government and Maori as a means by which to transform existing disparities between Maori and non-Maori.

The position of whanau in the promotion of wellbeing for Maori has been increasingly articulated over the past 10 years on both a formal and informal basis. A growing body of literature indicates that Maori have, as a necessity, constructed a range of models of whanau\(^{38}\). Margie Hohepa\(^{39}\) describes the various ways in which whanau can be regarded. Whanau, she states, has both traditional and more 'evolved' meanings. Traditional in the extent that the construct of whanau through whakapapa connections remains as a key definition, and more recently the cooption of the term whanau in the linking of groups of common interest, or common kaupapa. She describes these groupings as "Whanau based on unity of purpose rather then whakapapa line".


Mason Durie\textsuperscript{40} also emphasises the diversity of whanau in contemporary Maori society. He notes that the term whanau has undergone changes in line with changes that have occurred in Maori society more generally, noting that there now exists a spectrum of whanau types that range from whakapapa whanau to kaupapa whanau.

Durie identifies the following whanau types;

- whanau as kin: who descend from a common ancestor
- whanau as shareholders-in-common: who are shareholders in land;
- whanau as friends: who share a common purpose
- whanau as a model of interaction: for example in a school environment
- whanau as neighbours: with shared location of residence
- whanau as households: urban dwellers
- the virtual whanau: that meets in cyberspace due to geographical separation\textsuperscript{41}

Durie utilises the terms ‘kaupapa whanau’ as a means of describing those whanau that are not based within whakapapa relations.\textsuperscript{42} They are constituted and maintained through a particular purpose or set of circumstances, and therefore have diverse roles and obligations to their members. The ‘kaupapa whanau’ reflects that discussed by Graham Hingangaroa Smith in regards to Kura Kaupapa Maori\textsuperscript{43}. Not only do such whanau provide general support on a day to day level because of their connectedness through the kaupapa but according to Smith these whanau enable forms of intervention in economic and social disparities.

The role of whanau as a vehicle for intervention is outlined in the ‘Te Rito’ report. Although the report is focused on whanau violence it provides insight into the nature of whanau in regards to our obligations and accountabilities to each other.

\textbf{4.3 Understanding Deficit Theory}

\textsuperscript{39} Hohepa, Margie 1999 ‘Hei Tautoko I Te Reo’: Maori Language Regeneration and Whanau Bookreading Practices, Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy thesis, University of Auckland, Auckland
\textsuperscript{40} Durie, M. 2001 op.cit.
\textsuperscript{41} ibid.
\textsuperscript{42} This is also discussed in Cram, F. & Pitama, S. 1998 ‘Ko toku whanau, ko toku mana’ in Adair, V. & Dixon, R. (eds) The Family In Aotearoa New Zealand, Addison Wesley Longman New Zealand Ltd., Auckland pp130-157
Given the emphasis by Te Puni Kokiri on the need to move beyond deficit thinking and understandings of whanau Maori, the research team also proposes including an analysis of deficit theories and how they are articulated in regards to Maori. Deficit theory has been dominant within understandings of social service sectors for many years. Deficit theory is articulated within notions of ‘the cycle of poverty’ which was advanced most strongly in the 1960’s by the Kennedy government in the United States. Deficit theory has had a particularly strong position within the social service sectors in that it provides an understanding of such things as underachievement, unemployment and crime as being based within the family unit.

Within education deficit theory has been expressed through terms such as ‘cultural deprivation’ and ‘cultural difference’ and has located the family environment and culture as lacking or deprived. Such understandings have had, and continue to have, a major impact on families in New Zealand. Much social policy of the past 40 years has remained grounded upon deficit theory. As such many families have been under considerable pressure to conform to a defined notion of what constitutes family and more critically what constitutes ‘good parenting’. Within deficit theorising the home environment and family background became the focus by which to explain differences in school achievement and underachievement, providing the framework through which to categorise children’s achievement levels. The categorising of children in such a way allowed for the development of the conceptualisation of those groups of children designated as "underachievers" as being "culturally disadvantaged" or "culturally deprived". An example of this was seen in the cultural deprivation theory advanced by John Forster and Peter Ramsay. In their article "The Maori population 1936-1966" they proclaimed

> It is generally agreed that his [Maori] low attainment is the result of a combination of other factors. Poor Socio-economic conditions, including such factors as occupancy rates, social attitudes, poor living conditions, and a different cultural upbringing impose severe limitations on the Maori scholar. 44

---

Leonie Pihama\textsuperscript{45} (1991) identified the foundations of deficit theory within the environmental theories of the 1960’s and 70’s. She notes that environmental theories have developed as a response to a biological determinism (ibid). The basis of deficit theories is founded upon the assumption that educational achievement is most influenced by the home environment and as such any ‘deficiencies’ in the child’s knowledge can then be located within the home environment. The articulation of deficit theory was highlighted in the statement by educationalist D.G. Ball when he stated that ‘the Maoriness’ of Maori children was considered their greatest handicap.

The implications of such theories in Aotearoa have been significant for Maori, to the extent to which deficit theories have been entrenched in the every day language of many New Zealanders. More recently the work by Russell Bishop et.al\textsuperscript{46} indicates that deficit theories continue to have a major impact on the ways in which many teachers provide explanations for underachievement of certain groups of children within our schools. Added to such research is the more daily articulation of deficit theory such as that expressed in the current Police recruitment campaign that targets families and ‘poor parenting’ as the reason for youth crime. Such campaigns provide examples of how deficit thinking continues to influence existing views in regards to what is required to bring about a change in whanau circumstances, and thus maintains limited understandings of the complexities of whanau experiences.


\textsuperscript{46} R. Bishop, M. Berryman, S. Tiakiwai and C. Richardson 2004 \textit{Te Kotahitanga - The Experiences of Year 9 and 10 Maori Students in Mainstream Classrooms}, Maori Education Research Institute (MERI), School of Education, University of Waikato, Hamilton and Poutama Pounamu Research and Development Centre, Tauranga
5. DEVELOPING LEADERSHIP: A LITERATURE REVIEW

‘Ma mua ka kite a muri: ma muri ka ora a mua’
Those who lead give sight to those who follow,
Those behind give the life force to that ahead

(Tipu Ake Leadership Model, 2001 Te Whaiti nui Life cycle:10)

The literature on Maori leadership reviewed for the purposes of this report ranged in nature from scholarly conference papers, academic theses, political speeches, published books and papers posted on websites. The topic of Maori Leadership is clearly a complex one and therefore required a wide reach in terms of accessing relevant literature. The research also included publications by Research Institutes and Reports commissioned by Government agencies such as Te Puni Kokiri. Maori leadership matters have been topical and of concern to Maori for many years and the material sourced certainly for the purposes of this report certainly reflects this. Of particular note was a publication called ‘Nga Toka tu Moana: Maori Leadership and Decision making’ (1992) a report that was commissioned by Te Puni Kokiri. It is noted that this report was referred to by a number of authors however it was difficult to access and has taken the researchers a considerable amount of time finding the report. It is our view that ‘Nga Toka Tu Moana’ is a report of significance in regards to discussions related to Maori Leadership. The report objectives were noted as follows;

“One is to rediscover and understand traditional models of leadership and decision making. Another is to survey the changes that have occurred from early contact times up to the present. Principles are then sought that might improve decision making today. Questions of mandate, power, authority are explored with a view to understanding the complexities in situations of the day – such as the Sealords deal. A clear objective was to provide some principles and guidelines which may help to prevent in future the kinds of difficulties that arose after the signing of the Deed of Settlement to purchase Sealords.” (Nga Tuara 1992:4)

This authoritative publication sourced material on Maori leadership produced by learned scholars such as Maharaia Winiata, Te Rangikaheke of Te Arawa, Himiona Tikitu of Ngati Awa and Tuhoe and Apirana Mahuika of Ngati Porou. The report confirmed that
(i) there was a well established leadership and decision making system in traditional Maori Society and

(ii) that the social groups of waka, iwi, hapu, and whanau provided the traditional Maori with an established social and political structure within which various levels of leaders worked and where decisions were made (ibid:20).

The term leader was taken to mean:

“a person who takes a prominent role in persuading the people to make decisions which affect their well being and future. It is a general term for the dedicated people, men and women, who have a vision for their people and who strive to work towards that dream. It includes both traditional and non traditional leaders” (ibid:6).

Where the notion of ‘persuasion’ is perhaps problematic in regards to notions of leadership, it is clear that the term ‘leader’ is related to collective wellbeing and having vision. Leadership is noted by Nga Tuara has having multiple manifestations, it also seen as potentially able to be co-opted. Definitions of leadership types are provided in the report as follows:

**Traditional Leadership**

The report identifies four forms of traditional leadership, these being, Ariki, Rangatira, Tohunga and Kaumatua. A general summary is provided below:

**Ariki**

*The more important was the ariki or paramount chief. The Ariki was the head of the iwi. The highest ranking Ariki, in whom the senior lines of the genealogy from tribal descents converged was recognised as the head of the waka* (ibid:12).

**Rangatira**

*A rangatira is a leader who is the prominent leading figure within the group and whose mandate is whakapapa based, that is to say the chief47 who is a member of a descent group and has a right of birth to lead.* (ibid:6)

---

47 The authors of this literature review consider the term ‘chief’ used in ‘Nga Toka Tumoana’ as referring to both female and male rangatira. This interpretation is in line with the general essence of the report itself.
The rangatira was the head of the hapu or subtribe and held a status slightly lower than that of the ariki to whom the rangatira was related, being a descendant of the original founding family along the junior line.

Tohunga

A tohunga is defined as a specialist in some field of knowledge and expertise and today is a person whose advise should be sort by the leader. A tohunga can also be a ritual expert but is not limited to that role. Sometimes the role of tohunga and leader coalesce in one person. (ibid:7)

Nga Toka Tu Moana (ibid) notes that within a contemporary context many communities are finding themselves short of leaders and in some instances are having to appoint those are available or prepared to “step forward and commit to their respective communities” (ibid:7). As such we have seen additional leadership roles being developed within Maori society. Some examples of those roles are discussed in the report and these are described below:

**Contemporary Leadership Roles**

**Intellectual Leader**

An intellectual leader refers to a university trained person of great ability who is able to match the knowledge base of the decision makers they meet but rarely ever share the same degree of power as Pakeha leaders enjoy. (ibid:6)

**Subaltern Leader**

The subaltern leader is a co-opted leader whose mandate comes from the government or from big business. In terms of real power, which the dominant Pakeha ruling group keeps to itself, a ‘subaltern role’ is junior and inferior. (ibid:6)

It is only when Maori meet as Maori that the “tino rangatira” (chiefly authority) principle manifests itself- i.e in marae hui run by Maori leaders on behalf of their people. everywhere else the leaders are constrained by the economic, social cultural and political control exercised over Maori by central and local government and by the nations institutions that are run in most cases exclusively by Pakeha decision makers. (ibid:6)
Additional to the Intellectual and Subaltern leadership roles, the authors also indicate that there exist other decision-making roles that may be viewed as managers or representatives rather than leaders. The two examples provided are (i) trust or business managers, who are employed to manage certain organisations and (ii) mandated representatives, who are mandated by whanau, hapu, iwi and/or waka to represent them within a certain context. It is noted in the report that often such mandate is restricted to a specific event or purpose and upon completion of that event or purpose the mandate is removed.

The need to engage leadership for Maori within a contemporary context has a long history. Edward Te Kohu Douglas in his foreword to the papers from the 2001 Hui-a-Taiohi, outlines the history of the Young Maori Leaders Conferences and the issues debated within that context. The first Young Maori Leaders Conference was held by the Te Aute Old Boys in 1897, and he notes it was surprising that such a conference was held and that the “idea of the younger generation of Maoris [sic] trying to influence the older ones was at the time most unusual” (ibid:2). The next major conference was held in 1939 which was a meeting of those chosen by their iwi or teachers as emerging leaders. The 1959 conference saw a mixture of both emerging leaders and elders and the range of knowledge, according to Douglas ranged from “very extensive to an almost total blank” (ibid:3). It is interesting to note the reflections of Harry Dansey, who as a participant in the 1959 conference noted the importance of leadership to all participants (ibid). The conference identified three general types of leaders:

1. traditional leaders
2. educated leaders
3. moneyed leaders.

Leadership, was not Douglas states, as critical a topic to the elders as it was to the younger participants. In his view the elders “likely saw themselves as leaders anyway so moved on to other issues” (ibid:5). Some of the key issues raised in regards to leadership were;

(i) a vacuum of leadership in many larger urban areas
(ii) a shift from autocratic to democratic leadership
(iii) the transmission of leadership roles within communities

(iv) the leadership roles of women
(v) the contexts in which leadership is demonstrated
(vi) the demise of the rangatira as leader and their roles being taken by kaumatua who were not rangatira.

Douglas states that issues of transmission of leadership were also noted. He writes:

“There was much general agreement that leaders need to transmit their skills to succeeding generations. In older times much of this was done by association, learning by observation and participation and through the sharing of knowledge and skills and actively promoting opportunities for younger people to take the lead locally or nationally. All agreed that leadership was changing as the world of the Maori changed and more deliberate leadership training was required.” (ibid:5)

In 1970 leadership discussion centred more on the qualities and characteristics of leadership with a recognition of the complexity and diversity of Maori communities and of issues confronting our people. It is noted that discussions highlighted “that different types of leaders were required for different situations” (ibid:8). Knowledge of te reo Maori, tikanga, fluency of English and education were seen as key areas by participating elders. The areas of focus for both elders and younger participants are outlined below.

Areas of leadership focus for elders included;
- Fluency of te reo Maori, especially for leadership in Maori organisations
- Facility in English
- Marae Etiquette
- Education – however this did not itself make a leader for those who had lost contact with their people
- Knowledge of the workings of Te Ao Pakeha

Areas of leadership focus for younger participants included;
- Knowledge of te reo and etiquette
- Ability to achieve harmony and guide, assess, reflect and absorb the opinions of followers
- Acting in accord with the wishes of the people rather than dictatorship
There was clearly a debate regarding the role of kaumatua in urban settings, which Douglas describes as follows;

“The relatively scare kaumatua had an advisory role which the work of running an organisation was left in the hands of younger people. None the less there was controversy in this debate. A significant proportion of younger delegates criticised kaumatua for running the show in some districts and squashing the initiatives of the young. They wanted kaumatua to ‘stick to their knitting’, providing leadership in the teaching of te reo and tikanga. Yet they still saw kaumatua as part of the leadership functioning to complement younger active leaders” (ibid:8)

By 1977 there was a strong Maori women’s voice with Mira Szaszy making clear statements in regards to Maori women’s leadership. She refers to the league as a key institution in regards to contemporary leadership.

“The formation of the league became the historical point in time when Maori women as a whole assumed leadership roles at a time when the Maori was seeking political and cultural autonomy. Therefore the time has arrived for a serious examination of the present day dilemma regarding the leadership role of Maori women within the full context of Maori society and cultural traditions.”(ibid:8)

The Young Maori leaders’ conference clearly maintained a debate regarding Maori leadership that continues today and which has been documented through the literature noted in this review.

Maharaia Winiata wrote the first comprehensive publication on Maori Leadership at a time when Maori society had already undergone extensive changes since pre-European times to post European contact. Winiata’s book ‘The Changing Role of the leader in Maori Society’ 49 was produced out of a doctoral dissertation that saw him graduate from Edinburgh University in 1952 as the first Maori PhD. His writings were a result of his own observations during his lifetime rather than those of a systematic study and he was himself an exemplar of leadership despite his very short lifespan (ibid:6).

49 Winiata, M. (1967)The Changing Role of the leader in Maori Society’ Blackwood and Janet Paul Ltd., Wellington
The research was intended to identify the effect that European society had on Maori leadership and its social context since the arrival of the European. Winiata identified what he considered to be traditional forms of leadership noting that leadership fell into four main categories namely ariki, rangatira, kaumatua and the tohunga. These leaders, who were separated by genealogical distance, were also brought together because of it. At the time of writing Winiata observed that the ariki were on the decline, rangatira had almost disappeared the tohunga continued a spasmodic existence but the kaumatua was the most persistent and universally found class of leader in traditional society (ibid).

His main theme as noted in the foreword by Professor Kenneth Little was “that there is in Maori Society an increased specialization of institutions” and this is reflected in the corresponding appearance of additional classes of leaders. A similar process had been noted among other traditional peoples undergoing industrialization. It also appeared from the data that the effective Maori leader was very often “the person who, while gaining success according to Western standards of achievement had not lost the esteem of his people” (ibid: 8). Furthermore, Little notes,

“All indicative of social change was the fact that Maori had undergone a long process of adjustment. Like other traditional societies confronted by a technologically superior social system they survived as a cultural entity by adapting their indigenous institutions to the new situations” (ibid: 9).

Little goes on to say that an example of adaptation was the role of Maori women. He notes that Winiata wrote of the inferior states of women but Little states that this had clearly shifted. He writes;

“Nowadays, women have greater social responsibility and the role of the kuia is correspondingly explicit, making her one of the three main classes of leader in the traditionalist society. If the husband of the kuia dies she becomes the symbolic head of the family and without her no community can function successfully. As well as being a repository of the tribes genealogies kuia would perform community duties and would often be responsible for all catering (ibid:9)”.

In pre-European times the status of aristocratic women in the political system differed from tribe to tribe. Maori women also managed to come to the fore through the strength of superior kinship and personal ability, although. Winiata noted in his writings that key characteristics of Maori women leaders were whakapapa (kinship
connections) outstanding qualities, personal abilities, energy in communal projects and education (ibid: 167).

Ranginui Walker has outlined Maori society as being characterised by kin-based structures that include whanau, hapu, iwi and waka, and that leadership within those structures was based on both the principles of ascription and primogeniture, which is noted as being from seniority of descent from founding ancestors. However, it is indicated that these principles are not exclusive of other possibilities, and Maui is cited as an example of a potiki, i.e. the youngest sibling, taking leadership roles within whanau. Furthermore, it is argued that if a whanau were ‘lacking’ a senior ‘chief’ then that mantle could be assumed by a junior. It is worth quoting Ranginui Walker in some depth at this point to highlight the key notions that he raises in regards to Leadership.

The leaders of the whanau were the kaumatua (male elder) and kuia (female elder). They made the decisions concerning the working of family land, the control and use of family property, and rearing and education of children. The kaumatua was usually the recognized spokesman on behalf of the whanau in the forum of the marae, the ceremonial courtyard of the village. The hapu was the autonomous political land holding group led by its own rangatira (chief) descended from the ancestor after whom the hapu was named. It was comprised of related whanau and numbered between two and three hundred people (ibid:1).

The iwi was the largest kinship group and comprised of a number of related hapu, descended from a common eponymous ancestor. Although the chiefs of the component hapu of an iwi could be ranked by seniority of descent, in practice they regarded themselves as first among equals. Among some iwi, with large territories and numerous hapu, ariki (paramount chiefs) emerged as unifying iwi leaders (Ibid:2).

Walker (ibid.) also goes on to examine the impact of colonisation on traditional leadership roles and the complexities of Maori working within Pakeha structures.

In the nineteenth century the external forces of European capitalism, missionaries and British Imperialism, impinged upon, and progressively

---

50Walker, R (1993) Tradition and Change in Maori Leadership, Research Unit for Maori Education Monograph 18, The University of Auckland, Auckland. Raymond Firth describes waka as an ideological confederation of tribes based on one of the ancestral ocean voyaging vessels that colonised Aotearoa.(Economics of the New Zealand Maori p111-115)
undermined the mana of traditional leaders. After the turn of the century the leadership initiative passed from traditional chiefs to leaders characterised by Gramsci\textsuperscript{51} as organic intellectuals. These are the thinking and organizing elements of a fundamental class such as Maori, who were subordinated by the Pākehā. At the forefront was the first wave of Maori university graduates, Apirana Ngata, Peter Buck and Maui Pomare. Ngata and his colleagues were essentially reformists who worked for the physical and cultural survival of their people. To this end they instituted health reforms, revived Maori arts and crafts, and started Maori land development schemes using state loans. For carrying out these functions of social hegemony and political government, they were honoured with Knighthoods however when Ngata began empowering his own people by replacing Pākehā supervisors of the schemes with Maori ones, public servants in native affairs turned against him."(ibid:6-7)

The Gramscian notion of the organic intellectual is important to Walkers discussion of contemporary Maori leadership\textsuperscript{52}. Gramsci identified two forms of intellectual, each of which has particular functions in relation to the State and communities. Maori-Chinese academic Jenny Bol Jun Lee notes that the social function of the organic intellectual is to transmit ideas within civil society, performing both ideological and organisational functions in ways that provide for change. She writes:

\begin{quote}
The ‘organic’ intellectuals are essential to the success of a revolutionary programme, they are those people who are located in the participatory process of the group which they belong to and are the product of ‘lived experience’. It is this group who will provide ‘organic’ leadership in which the oppressed and disempowered can raise themselves to a ‘philosophical’ as opposed to ‘common sense’ view of the world.(ibid:19)
\end{quote}

In further advancing the relationship of the concept of the organic intellectual to Maori, Graham Hingangaroa Smith attests that Maori intellectuals working in the struggle for change, that are driven by and for Maori interests, can rightly lay claim to the position of the organic intellectual.\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{51} Antonio Gramsci from his writings ‘Selections from Prison Notebooks’ p12
\textsuperscript{53} Smith, G.H. 1997 op.cit.
While researching for his article entitled “Social justice theory and practice: Pākehā, Kaupapa Maori and Educational leadership” Alex Barnes\textsuperscript{54} reviewed much of the literature on traditional and contemporary Maori leadership. His research intended to explore the intersection of leadership theory and practice using the experience of two Maori male leaders working in Kaupapa Maori education. One of the objectives for the article was to enable the two Maori educationalists to share their experiences of Maori leadership theory and practice. The research aimed to add current insight into the theorising and practice of social justice and leadership within Kaupapa Maori Education.

On Maori leadership Barnes explained:

“An understanding of Maori leadership depends upon an awareness of the fusion that exists between both traditional and modern discourses."

He quotes Rangi Walker as follows:

“Historically Maori have been subjected to radical changes in their social, cultural, and political organization. Urbanization has impacted greatly on the social organization of iwi, hapu and whanau” (Walker 1990; 1993)

He further refers to the assertion by Walker (ibid) that Maori political voices have been marginalised through the imposition of eurocentric colonial institutions.

Barnes in depth review of material written by Mead (1997), Royal (2001) and the publication by Nga Tuara (1992), concluded that leaders were attached to collective groups such as waka, iwi, hapu and whanau. Within these groupings were identifiable leaders who had been chosen based on whakapapa and personal qualities.

Nga Tuara (1992) argue that within waka, iwi, hapu and whanau, leaders were identified through their genealogy and personal qualities. Furthermore, it is noted that Te Rangikaheke believed rangatira came from “a chiefly union” which was described as a “moenga rangatira” (ibid:14). This is further described as follows;

“A person coming form a moenga rangatira inherited certain “pumanawa” or

\textsuperscript{54} Alex Barnes is a Pakeha graduate of Kaupapa Maori educational initiatives. Waikato University
such statements again emphasise the importance of whakapapa within Maori society and in particular in the process of identifying leadership. The report identifies leadership characteristics and qualities as defined by both Te Rangikaheke and Himiona Tikitu. Given the importance of such characteristics it is worth citing the report in some depth.

A leader was expected to possess certain talents; knowledge relating to some high priority areas; and expertise to manage the affairs of the iwi. This is the second factor, after lineage. The two authorities, Tikitu and Te Rangikaheke, differ on priorities and on the listing of talents. But they are agreed that expert knowledge is required. Firth (1959:132) described these talents as” executive capacity”.

Tikitu was very clear about the attributes or talents of a chief and what they must be able to do in an ideal situation. He lists eight talents as follows:

He kaha ki te mahi kai: Has the knowledge of and is industrious in obtaining or cultivating food.

He kaha ki te whakahaere i nga raruraru: Able to mediate, manage and settle disputes.

He toa: Is courageous in war

He kaha ki te whakahaere i te riri: A good strategist and leader in war

He mohio ki te whakairo: Has knowledge of the arts of carving

He atawhai tangata: Knows how to look after people

Te hanga whare nunui, waka ranei: Has command of the knowledge and technology to build large houses or canoes

He mohio ki nge rohe whenua: Has a sound knowledge of the boundaries of tribal lands. (Grove 1985:6-7)

Nga Tuara (ibid) notes that Te Rangikaheke identified talents for leadership in 1850 as follows:

He mohio ki te Whakahaere i nga korero o te mahi kai: Has command of the knowledge, science and technology of food acquisition and production.
… o te tangohanga whare, waka, pataka, hereimu: Has command of the knowledge, technology, rituals and traditions pertaining to the construction and acquisition of houses, canoes, storehouses and cooking sheds.

Ka mohio ia ki te whakahaere i nga korero mo te whawhai, toa tonu ki te riri, hopu tupapaku tonu atu, whati rawa mai ka riri, nana ano i whakahoki atu te whati: He knows how to conduct discussions on the strategies of warfare and is himself courageous in battle, is not afraid to kill, and can turn adversities into victories.

Ko te korero manuhiri ano tetahi: Involving and welcoming visitors is another (talent).
Ko te korero runanga ano tetahi: Conducting meetings of the people to discuss important issues is another.
Ko te Atawhai ano tetahi: Being able to offer hospitality and to take care of people.

In addition to these characteristics of early Maori leadership Api Mahuika (1992) articulates

“iwi were not homogenous; rather they exercised variable beliefs according to their own existing tikanga (process) and kawa (protocol). As an example Mahuika comments “the fact that women in Ngāti Porou have the right to speak on the marae indicates they were leaders in the fullest sense. If one accepts the marae as the centre of tribal affairs where the political fate of the tribe is decided, then to deny women the right to speak would support the view that they were figureheads.”(ibid:48)"

In identifying contemporary aspects of leadership Barnes quotes Ripeka Evans (1994) who argues that there has been a shift in power relationships as a result of colonialism that has seen a subordination of the role of women in leadership positions.

She states;

“As a consequence of the debasement of our own culture there has been an erosion of our power and status as a people and as women. A void has been created and a new set of power relations has emerged. The new power relations are dominated by cliques which accommodate to political pragmatism and are largely a revision of Maori ideologies” (Evans in Barnes ibid: 53)
Despite this erosion Evans emphasized the critical leadership roles that Maori women have played in recent Maori educational, activist, and organizational initiatives such as Kohanga Reo (Maori medium language pre-schools) Kara Kaupapa Maori (Maori medium language primary schools, Nga Tamatoa, and the Maori Women’s Welfare League. The leadership roles of Maori women within such organisations has been well documented and the critical role of Maori women in whanau, hapu, iwi and community based organisations has been outlined in a series of publications such as ‘Te Pua’ (1994), ‘Mana Wahine: Women who show the way’ (1994), ‘Te Timatanga Tatau Tatau: Early Stories from Founding Members of the Maori Women’s Welfare League’ (1993). What is clear is that despite the subjugation of Maori women’s leadership through colonisation Maori women continue to fulfil crucial leadership roles (Pihama 2003). To add further to the shift in power relations, The ‘Nga Toka Tu Moana’ report (1992) also provides a depth discussion related to the impact of colonisation upon constructions of Maori leadership. A key impact was noted as being the destruction of mana. It was stated;

*In the nineteenth century the external forces of European capitalism, missionaries, and British imperialism impinged either directly or indirectly on traditional Maori leadership structures. These forces progressively undermined the mana of traditional leaders. Those who resisted that colonial enterprise were put down by armed force. They were excluded from the power structure of the state, while others who accepted a “subaltern” role to the ruling class of metropolitan society were elevated as “auxiliary soldiers” (Gramsci 1982:12), court assessors, public servants and politicians. A structural relationship of dominance and subjection between Maori and Pakeha was established and reinforced over the years up to the present time.” (ibid:22)*

Ranginui Walker’s paper ‘Tradition and Change in Maori Leadership’(1993) which ‘canvasses the complexity of issues related to “Leadership” and “Decision Making” notes “western colonial establishments such as western governance structures, pre-empted the emergence of new forms and models of Maori leadership. These forms and models included “intellectual organic leaders” and ‘new institutional mandates. He argues

“traditional Maori values, processes and practices associated with Maori leadership and decision-making is often contradictory and incompatible with the modern demands of the contemporary social political and economic
Walker further comments

“Maori leadership is a contradictory mix of tradition and modernity. For most of this century, organic leaders in the various guises of intellectuals, prophets, politicians and radical activist held the political initiative in the counter hegemonic struggle for cultural survival and self determination. (1993: ibid:23)

Whilst both Winiata (1967) and Walker (1993) discussed traditional Maori leadership it was only really Walker that engaged the impact of western colonisation and structures. Walker described Sir Peter Buck, Sir Apirana Ngata and Maui Pomare as Intellectual organic leaders who epitomized a shift in the focus of Maori leadership; from a point of tradition to a point where leadership roles were determined from above by a culture of domination. While supported by their own iwi hapu and whanau, these leaders were ultimately subjected to measurements of leadership held within the structures, politics and culture of dominant Pakeha culture. (Walker 1999).

Walker (1993) further argued that western derived institutional structures such as runanga (tribal trust boards,) Maori councils, incorporations and the Maori women’s welfare league created shifts within the terms of Maori leadership .These shifts impacted on the representation and accountabilities of Maori leaders, as they were primarily created and legitimated by government sanction ( ibid.; refer also Nga Tuara 1992).

In his findings Barnes concluded that research on Maori leadership both traditional and contemporary noted the absolute importance of whakapapa within leadership and the associated mana that was held by those who held prestigious genealogy. However since the onset of western colonisation competing discourses and world views have continued to impact on Maori leadership styles, formations and representations.

“The research findings appeared to support this point with regard to the two educational leaders who both shared the view that their Maori identity (knowledge of their whakapapa, reo and tikanga) are important foundations in shaping their own theorising and practice as Maori educational leaders. …. However in addition to this they also acknowledged the other life experiences that had impacted on their cultural and general knowledge. For them these
other experiences added to their ability to operate both within a Kaupapa
Maori framework and within a variety of other cultural settings locally
nationally and globally reflecting the continuing intersection between what is
traditional and what is contemporary within a Kaupapa Maori framework.
The leadership programme that both participants are involved with has been
instrumental in re establishing core Maori values many of which echo those
values identified by Mead(1997), Royal(2001) and Nga Tuara (1992) as
traditional Maori leadership qualities.” (Barnes :n/d)

Commenting on Maori leadership in her editorial Te Pua vol 3 Leonie Pihama wrote
“The present construction of the notion of ‘Maori Leadership’ is problematic
for Maori women. Leadership on the whole is being defined as in line with
Pākehā concepts. These are attached to Pākehā patriarchal beliefs that the
term ‘leader’ equates to the term ‘man’.“(Pihama 1994:6)

Further to that she also recounts a Linda Tuhiiwai Smith commenting on leadership,
she writes

“Recently I heard Linda Smith make the statement “Pākehā people seem to
have the ‘take me to your chief ‘take me to your leader ‘attitude” and that in
that sense chief equates to being male”. The way in which leadership is
defined and negotiated is a necessary part of decolonisation and is an
indicator of why education must occur before any further negotiations take
place.(Ibid).

Annette Sykes (1994) indicates that in 1984 a remit was passed at a National Hui
that stated

“That because Maori women constitute over 50% of the Tangata Whenua
there must be equal representation in all areas of decision making in the
future” (ibid:15)

This remit indicates recognition of the implications of sexism and gendered
assumptions upon the role of Maori women in leadership. Recognition of this was
the claim lodged in regards to Maori women and leadership. Sykes (ibid) notes:

“The essence of the claim is to bring to the forefront of the current Treaty
jurisprudence the need to look at notions of governance in Aotearoa and the
exclusionary practices that exist which inhibit and prevent participation by
Maori women in the tribal models for self-determination, that have been erected under New Zealand legislation and the erosion that this in itself has had on Te Mana Wahine in Te Ao Maori. Maori women have been at the forefront of efforts to maintain that kaupapa Maori is the basis from which human rights should be phrased for this country. It is not surprising therefore that Maori women are the first group of individuals who have collectively across tribal boundaries now challenged the very essence of the constitutional arrangements that exist in Aotearoa. (ibid:16).”

Discussing Maori Leadership characteristics in the publication “He Matapuna” Tilly Reedy identifies the complexities of living our ‘taha Maori’ and our collective responsibilities within a context that prioritizes the individual. Such paradox she notes can “create conflict in a world of differing cultural obligations – Maori and western” (ibid). Such conflict has implications for how we determine leadership within a dominant system of democracy as is currently the situation within Aotearoa. She relates democracy to Maori leadership in the following way:

“The political reality is that a democracy can breed an elite group who stand apart with the power of wealth and decision-making in their hands. They can be found anywhere, even in Maoridom! Graham Latimer, President of the New Zealand Maori Council, reminded us of this when he repeated the advice given to him by his kaumatua: ‘The only successful leader is the one who arrives at his [sic] destination with his people beside him – never on his own.’ “(ibid: 44)

Tilly Reedy then goes further to identify what she considers to be important in a leader.

“What do I look for in a leader? The person, man or woman, must be someone I can trust; someone who will be honest; someone who will research the facts, encourage discussion, and make a decision when required. Someone who listens and is able to offer alternatives when this is required. Someone who gives a helping hand when it is needed. Someone I am willing to follow.” (ibid:44)

She further highlights a pathway for leadership that draws upon “a group of experts who can influence the system”; this in turn will support Maori development in the future and provide expertise in key areas of western politics; high finance; professional lobbying; and economic stability and strength. Active participation in
these areas and in determining leadership is critical for both men and women. Maori women she states must work to influence "other groups, other organizations and other people". Expanding on the importance of Maori women’s involvement she writes;

“We have always had the power to influence our men, though tradition decreed we stand behind them. Today we should not stand in their shadow, but with them. We need to be seen up front with them, adding our voice to theirs. When they move, we move forward with them. Strength can only come with this sharing. For me this can only be possible if our men recognize and accept the contribution we women make to Maori society.” (ibid: 44).

The positioning of Maori women within the realms of leadership is engaged in some depth by Tania Rangiheuea in her thesis ‘Theorising the Politicisation of Maori Women in the Late Nineteenth Century’. Rangiheuea argues that much of the historical documentation by Pākehā anthropologists and ethnographers have served to marginalize Maori women’s roles within Maori society. She writes;

“Pākehā male ethnographers and historians have monopolized historical discourses for almost two hundred years in this country and as a result, the historical specificities of Maori women has been subsumed as romanticized or insignificant subtexts to those narratives… Furthermore the majority of writings by Pākehā women up until recently have also neglected to present an account of Maori women in an inclusive way. Lacking in these accounts is the breadth and depth of the social, political and cultural interests of Maori women.” (Rangiheuea 2003:16)

Rangiheuea provides a depth analysis of the roles of Maori women within the historical movement of Te Kotahitanga and in particular the leadership roles taken within that movement through the establishment of the ‘Komiti Wahine’. She notes that the reports of the Komiti Wahine indicated the strength of Maori Women’s leadership in the movement and within their communities. A clear focus of Maori women in leadership roles was, she states, the wellbeing of their communities,

“A significant and recurring theme from all of the literature review was leadership; political activisms demanded effective leadership. Women leaders traditionally inherited their roles from a family member as in the case of Maata Te Taiawatea of Ngati Awa and Tuhourangi (Mead and Phillis 1982). Maata was an exceptional leader for her people and like many women leaders of her time she put the welfare of their people foremost. Rangatira
women held important positions in the tribe and were expected to play a complementary role with male leaders.” (ibid: 19)

What is clear from the research done by Tania Rangiheuea is that the Komiti Wahine structure within Te Kotahitanga had a significant impact on key issues within Maori communities. Furthermore, she highlights that the Maori women that led those komiti were themselves a part of a wider Maori leadership structures that were based within whanau, hapu and iwi considerations. For example, Rangiheuea indicates that the class and whanau connections were important in the positioning of such Maori women. She writes;

“It was important to attend to the class backgrounds to the women studied. Neglecting to do so would have resulted in a false impression that all Maori women had the same opportunities to organize and lead committees and event participate in them. In fact this was not the case and only certain women of rank were delegated to represent the women of their tribes in formal gatherings like Te Kotahitanga (Ballara 1994). For example, women leaders like Niniwa i te Rangi from Wairarapa, Takarea Te Heuheu of Ngāti Tuwharetoa and Sophia Herangi of Tuhourangi, all chaired their respective women’s committees. A failure to recognize the matrimonial support and advantages that these women enjoyed could significantly distort any conclusions regarding the respective abilities of Maori women to participate in political organizing… For example Meri Mangakahia whose husband Hamiora Mangakahia, was the premier of the Maori Parliament. Takarea Te Heuheu’s husband was the paramount chief of Ngāti Tuwharetoa of Taupo. He was also a prominent member of the Maori Parliament. Maata Mahupuku who chaired komiti wahine in the Wairarapa was married to Tamahou Mahupuku also a premier of the Maori Parliament” (Rangiheuea, T., 2003: 20)

These examples indicate that when participating in structures such as the komiti wahine, their participation was at least in part determined by their positioning within their own whanau, hapu and iwi. Other elements of Maori organization did however require mediation. Rangiheuea discusses the role of kawa for Te Arawa women and the need for Maori women in komiti wahine to create the means by which they could actively participate within the Te Kotahitanga movement and hapu and iwi affairs. This is clearly indicated in the following quote;

“For example Te Arawa kawa does not allow women to speak on the marae atea. This area also includes the mahau or front verandah area of the
wharenui. Women are permitted to speak in the wharenui only after the men of the tribe have dispensed with the formal protocols. The women’s’ petitions to government and committee reports are evidence that the kawa of the tribe did not deter them from speaking publicly on tribal issues. In fact some Te Arawa women, who were given a tribal mandate, spoke at the meetings of the Maori Parliament where only women with authority were given that right.” (ibid: 92)

The role of Maori women as leaders has been presented in some depth by writers such as Ani Mikaere (1996), Ngahuia Te Awekotuku (1991), Api Mahuika (1973), Linda Tuhiwai Smith (1992), Rangimarie Rose Pere (1982; 1988). These writings serve as critiques of the dominant anthropological material that locates Maori women in subordinate roles to Maori men. What each of these writers highlights is the impact of dominant gender relations upon the ways in which leadership is defined and determined within Maori society.

Ani Mikaere, in her introduction to her Masters thesis highlights the contradictions in regards to how Maori leadership was discussed and her lived realities of Maori women’s contributions to society. This spurred her to undertake a significant review and analysis of the literature pertaining to the roles of Maori women in Maori society. Mikaere’s thesis ‘The Balance Destroyed: The Consequences for Maori Women of the Colonisation of Tikanga Maori’ provides cutting edged analysis of the impact of colonization on Maori women.

“A popular view of Maori society is that it is inherently sexist, that it precludes women from having a voice and that it regards women as secondary to men. This view is not limited to non-Maori, for many Maori also subscribe to it. It is a view that regards the present status of Maori women as a Maori issue rather than a Treaty issue. While readily admitting the chauvinism of many Maori men, I have always instinctively resisted the argument that Maori society itself is inherently sexist. Yet, for a long time, I found it extraordinarily difficult to articulate my sense that such a characterisation of Maori society was misconceived. The messages I received about Maori women’s roles were so contradictory, so confusing. My grandmother, for example, always stressed the importance of women being there “to support the men folk”. This suggested that women were indeed cast in a secondary role. Yet I was also well aware that she fulfilled a vital leadership role within her whanau, hapū and iwi, a role that she had inherited from her mother. In fact, there were
countless kuia within our whakapapa who had clearly wielded considerable influence in their time, kuia whose waiata we sang and whose stories were told to us. Our hapū bore the name of a woman.” (Mikaere 1996:1-2)

These introductory statements are reflective of the confusion and contradictions that are a part of defining Maori Leadership. They highlight a need to think critically in analysing what determines Maori leadership in a context such as ours where colonizing beliefs have had such a major impact on our thinking and understandings. Fundamental to Ani Mikaere’s argument is that colonization has created a state of imbalance within Maori society and as a consequence of that there has been a reconstruction of Maori women’s positioning through a colonized framework (ibid.). The relevance of such an argument to this discussion is that in order to ascertain the role of Maori leadership there is a need to ensure a reframing of how leadership is understood and in doing so to seek to reach a form of balance that reaffirms Maori women’s roles in the leadership of whanau, hapu, iwi and Maori organizations.

The work of Ani Mikaere further affirms that leadership is not solely about the public domain, but is inherent to all parts of Maori society. The place of childbearing and childbirth is in itself an inherent act of leadership in a whakapapa based society. The critical nature of whakapapa is clear in the literature regarding leadership however there is little significance given to the role of Maori women as the bearers of rangatira. This however is something that is actively engaged in the writings of Maori women. Rangimarie Rose Pere (1982, 1988) highlights the importance of whakapapa and in the reproduction of Maori leadership. This is also emphasised in the work of Ani Mikaere provides an overview of these works in her thesis and begins with the discussion of the language that surrounds childbirth and pregnancy. This discussion is worthy of quoting in some depth,

“Pere also describes how rangatira women in particular "had the protection of special spiritual influences put on them during pregnancy or menstruation". This was a necessary precaution with respect to the whare tangata of future rangatira, but it also meant that such women had to take extra care that other people were not detrimentally affected by such protections. This sometimes meant that wahine rangatira did not play a full role in iwi affairs until after they reached menopause. This is consistent with the special roles reserved for ruahine that were discussed in relation to tapu and noa rituals. The significance of the reproductive process is reflected in the language associated with it. Atua, a word for god or supernatural being, also means
menstrual blood. Whanau, to be born, also describes the smallest kin group in Maori society and is often translated to mean extended family. Hapu, the word for pregnant, is also the word for the kin group which consisted of many closely related whanau. Often translated as sub-tribe, the hapu was the key political, social and economic unit, as Maori communities were almost invariably hapu-based.” (Mikaere 1996:28-29)

The role of te reo Maori in identifying the significance of words such as whenua, whanau, hapu, iwi is critical as it is within these structures and systems that Maori leadership is nurtured and grown. This relationship is clearly defined in Eva Rickard’s discussion of the word ‘whenua’

“Firstly whenua is land. Secondly, whenua is the placenta within the mother that feeds the child before birth. And when it is born this whenua is treated with respect, dignity, and taken to a place in the earth and dedicated to Papatuanuku . . . And there it will nurture the child. You know our food and living come from the earth, and there also this whenua of the child stays and says, “This is your little bit of land. No matter where you wander in the world I will be here and at the end of your days you can come back and this is your papakainga and this - I will receive you in death”.”

Mikaere further argues that the importance of these relationships is evident in a number of whakatauki, including ‘He wahine, he whenua, ka ngaro te tangata’. This whakatauki, has, she shows, been negatively translated as “by woman and land are men destroyed”, however the whakatauki is more likely to refer not to reasons for why ‘men’ die but to the significance of both Maori women and whenua in the survival of Maori people.

This whakatauki was analysed in some depth by Wairete Norman (1992) in her article; ‘He Aha Te Mea Nui’. Wairete concurs that

“Most discussions and writings about land and about Maori women in this country allude to this ‘whakatauki’ in some way. To which tribe this particular whakatauki is attributed, and who composed it is not certain but it has survived from traditional use to be perpetuated in a modern context” (Norman 1992 5).

---
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Wairete Norman provided an overview of the whakatauki and the variations that have been documented (ibid:4).

‘He wahine he whenua i mate ai te tangata’ generally translated as ‘for women and land men die’ or ‘on account of women and for land people die’.

Other accepted translations of these ‘whakatauki’ are:

He wahine, he whenua, i ngaro ai te tangata
Women and land are the reasons men die

He wahine, he whenua, a ngaro ai te tangata
For women and land, men will die

He wahine, he whenua, ka ngaro te tangata
For women and land men die (are lost to the tribe)

He wahine he oneone, i ngaro ai te tangata
Women and the land (the earth) are the reasons men die

He wahine, he whenua i ea ai te pakanga
By women and land the battle is assuaged

Norman (ibid) states that all five translations are valid but that they also illustrate the difficulty of translating from one language into another. All the translations arise from traditional or classical Maori language to English language translations based on the earliest Maori Grammars. She articulates the many ways that the words and concepts can be interpreted as follows;

“The term ‘ngaro’ can mean lost. As in ‘whatu ngarongaro he tangata’ the first line of another ‘whakatauki meaning lost to sight, lost to the, dislocated from that tribe or even death itself, all concepts of meaning of the term ngaro. Whenua on the one hand, means land, ancestral land, in particular, as Papatuanuku, mother earth is the land. Thus reference to ‘whenua ‘is almost always in the sense of ‘tupuna’. On the other hand, placenta or afterbirth is also termed ‘whenua’ and this is the ‘whenua’ that nourished the foetus as it grew within the mother and went back to the ‘whenua’ to the mother of all, Papatuanuku, when the child as born. Oneone, however is the term for earth, ground or soil. It is also, according to ‘tikanga’, synonymous with ‘kura’, the red ochre, the red earth or clay from which the first woman Hineahuone, at
Kura waka, was fashioned. The final example of this whakatauki is slightly different in meaning to the others because of the introduction of the term ‘ea’ in this context meaning paid for where a debt was owed and demanded in the payment of utu. The term ‘pakanga’ is evident in the translation meaning battle, usually such battles can be of some duration and pass down from one generation to the next. Aside from the land aspect, this particular whakatauki relates also to the concept of ‘utu’ payment in terms of muru retribution.”(6)

Her concluding remarks she acknowledges the primary importance of wahine and whenua in terms of procreation and more importantly to life itself, quoting one of her kaumatua who explains;

“The Maori says there are only two things they would die for, women and land, and of course it is true for kai whenua.....Nga kaupapa i timata te mea nui he tangata he whenua me nga kai o runga o te whenua. Kore hoki nga kai ra e kore te wahine e ora. Hore kau he pononga o te tangata.

Fundamental principles in te Ao Maori since the very beginning evolved around the importance of people, the land, and resources (food) harvested from the land. Without food women would not survive. Mankind, people could not survive.”(ibid:7)

What is important in this discussion is the locating of Maori women as leaders as indicated through te reo Maori and through a wide range of whakapapa and whanau, hapu and iwi examples of Maori women’s leadership. Where Tania Rangiheueua has outlined the Komiti Wahine structure as an example of how Maori women have engaged national structures there are many examples from pre-colonial times that indicate that Maori women not only held status within whanau, hapu and iwi but that selected Maori women were rangatira and ariki within their own right (Mahuika 1973, Mikaere 1996, Pere 1982, 1988, Smith 1992, Te Awekotuku 1991)

One of the few depth examples of leadership within whanau, hapu and iwi is provided by Apirana Mahuika (1973) in his thesis ‘Nga Wahine Kai-Hautu o Ngāti Porou : The Female Leaders of Ngāti Porou’. In the Introduction to the thesis Apirana Mahuika states that leadership in Maori society “has been regarded as the prerogative of the males only – who should rule being determined by primogeniture in the male line” but that such a position contradicted the case in terms of his own iwi, Ngāti Porou. As such, he states, the thesis “is an attempt to get the record straight
where Ngāti Porou is concerned” (ibid: 1). According to Mahuika the notion of Maori leadership is contexted within the institutions of whanau, hapu and iwi. Mahuika notes that the dominant view of Maori leadership is that of primogeniture from the male line and that this position has been clearly and firmly argued by authors such as Best (1924), Buck (1938 Firth (1929) and others. Primogeniture he notes is defined as;

“Fact of being the first-born of the children of the same parents... the right of succession belonging to the first-born, esp. feudal right by which real estate passes to the eldest son”. (OED cited in Mahuika 19...:11).

For Ngāti Porou primogeniture does not actually follow such a blanket definition but is more complex. In fact, it is clear that the definition of primogeniture has itself been influential in how Maori leadership is described. If the dominant anthropological definition is determined by gender then it seems logical to expect that such definitions will themselves be determined by the dominant gender discourses of the time. This of course, in western societies, led to primogeniture being defined not only in terms of birth status but also in terms of the patriarchal beliefs of the time. It may be argued that this has also influenced the writings of Maori academics. For example, Mahuika refers to the work of Buck, who defines primogeniture in Maori society as follows;

“Among the rangatira class, which comprised the aristocracy, extreme deference was paid to the seniority involved in tuakana birth. The first-born son (matamua) of a chiefly first settler succeeded to his father in rank and power and he was tuakana not only to his brothers but also to the families of his younger brothers” (Buck 1949:343 cited in Mahuika 1973:16).

Mahuika states emphatically that such a gendered definition does not apply to Ngāti Porou, where he states

“Primogeniture is the absolute determinant of seniority, regardless of sex of the first-born child. In other words, the longer the unbroken line one can trace through the first-born children, male or female, the greater one’s seniority in society.” (ibid: 16)

It may also be noted that Buck’s definition may also be problematic in regards to his own iwi history and the place of tupuna wahine within Taranaki, where figures such as Ruaputahanga (Mikaere 1996) and Te Ao Marama (Hohaia 2001) held significant status.
In short, the thesis of Apirana Mahuika provides a clear iwi based example of the deficiencies in the anthropological fixation with male leadership. Leadership, he posits, in Ngāti Porou is much more complex and can not be defined within simplistic definitions of primogeniture. Furthermore, Mahuika provides some insight into specific characteristics of leadership within an iwi context. These can be summarized as follows:

- Seniority in society/Primogeniture
- Mana Tangata – involving the right to make decisions for others
- The ability to unite the group and to protect it against others
- The ability to lead
- Having the necessary qualities to command respect and confidence of the people
- Having the mandate to lead
- Leadership was not necessary confined to one individual but there could be leadership across different spheres
- Achieved Leadership through gaining respect

Iwi leadership was also open to change and Mahuika provides some discussion of shifts in leadership. Leadership, he notes, can be gained in a range of ways other than through whakapapa. Leadership may be achieved in the following ways:

“I. By the usurpation of leadership from an ariki who lacks the ability to lead. In this regard, two points are noteworthy.
The usurper may be male or female
There may be more than one usurper
II. By migration
III. By the equal allocation of certain areas to heirs, male or female, thereby allowing each one to achieve leadership independent from others.
IV. By marriage
V. By inheriting the mana of a taina ancestor who achieved leadership.”
(Mahuika 1973:34)

Mahuika provides a range of examples that indicate the ways in which leadership has been asserted through these five processes. What is clear is that Ngāti Porou does not adhere to the universal notions of leadership that dominate anthropological definitions and as such it raises a key point that when investigating what constitutes
Maori leadership there must be a movement away from the ‘one size fits all’ definition of whanau or Maori leadership.

In an article on Maori Leadership Aroha Mead (1994) also raised the point that colonisation has had a significant impact upon Maori leadership. She further states;

“Current Maori leadership seems almost hell-bent on feeding people economic development. There is an assumption being made that because tangible gains make some leaders feel good, then it will make others feel good, as well. Is it surprising therefore that significant sectors of Maori society are feeling alienated from, and uncared for, within Maori society? To what degree are rangatahi and Maori women (who combined comprise the bulk of the Maori population) being included in Maori decision making processes, structures and institutions.” (ibid)

She makes the further point that rangatahi are almost invisible in decision making and in key positions on marae committees, iwi authorities, and national Maori organizations. She quotes her father Hirini Moko Mead (1979) who in a paper titled ‘He Ara Ki Te Aomarama’ wrote;

“We need a Maui-like plan to help guide us into the twenty first century and we need to begin the search for that plan now. It is worth pointing out however, that many of our leaders are not at all like Maui and would prefer more of the same rather than change. This is an easy way out for them, a way of avoiding unpleasant decisions, a way of not becoming responsible for our future.” (Mead, H. cited in Mead, A., ibid: 64).

Mead asserts that there exists a strong force of Maori women and men girls and boys ready and able to make a strong contribution to their iwi to the Treaty nation of Aotearoa and to the global community. There is an even stronger Kohanga Reo generation being primed. They remain largely invisible because the leadership who are still hosting the coloniser can’t or won’t see them. We can choose to develop policies and programmes now which the kohanga reo generation will proudly assume or we can risk losing them as they flee like refugees from a Maori leadership too rigid and unmoving to provide for their heritage needs and aspirations. Aroha concludes her paper by stating

“I believe that Maori are better organized and unified now than we have ever been. We stand at the cross roads of liberation or a more entrenched form of colonisation. Leadership has to improve their vision, seek our competent navigators, work in tandem with their crews or else face the inevitable consequences.” (ibid: 20)

Colin Knox’s (2003) paper ‘Maori leadership in Te Ao Maori’ notes, not surprisingly, that Te Ao Maori is different in the values that are articulated in regards to leadership. Despite the necessity for Te Ao Maori to survive alongside (if not within) the Pākehā world it nevertheless is based on some fundamentally different things. The most important difference is its source of inspiration and motivation, which is its common ancestry and history. Next is the reality of the spiritual realm, mostly expressed through the articulation and practise of old fashioned christian values but still incorporating many values which are still Maori.

Knox’s paper was developed as a vehicle for understanding Maori Leadership within the context of developing partnerships and with the intention of supporting the development of understanding. He argues that the move to ‘Westminsterise’ Maori interests has been promoted as a means of social control. He writes;

“The strategy is working in achieving the aim of making Maori whanau and hapu structures look like Pakeha structures. This introduces decision making models which are based on appointments to positions and voting rights and all the other artefacts of legislated organisations. Whanau and hapu are turned into structures resembling units of local government which is disastrous for them. The conflict in decision making models between family and legislative groups is corrosive of family structures, and has consequences which are far reaching in their social effect. The undermining of the authority and influence of kaumatua a by product of legislated structures means that a key aspect of family cohesion is eroded.” (ibid.)

Knox contends that many Maori still identify with old values and that a key difference between those values and Pakeha structure is the importance of family over individuality. Te Ao Maori is about family, which is why traditional Maori values are identifiably traditional ‘family’ values. Colin outlines values such as;

**Tikanga** –the custom lore which should be used as a basis of all important

---

decisions and personal lifestyle choices.

**Rangatiratanga** - A person should gain authority through displaying the qualities of integrity, generosity, bravery, humility, respect, commitment to the community, binding people together, facilitating rather than commanding, encouraging people to participate in all the important decisions which affect them.

**Whakapapa** - It is vital to be able to relate to people with whom who have common ancestry, cherishing places such as Marae as the symbolic home and sharing on that basis of kinship rather than legal responsibility or ownership acknowledging the importance of our ancestors.

**Wairuatanga** - The spiritual world is an important part of reality which must be accommodated on a day to day basis even when it conflicts with the rules of business as well as in their traditional leadership role.

**Kaumatua** - Kaumatua continue to play a crucial role in keeping families and the community together, though the role has become more difficult as well as in their traditional leadership role.

**Mana** - Maintaining balance and harmony through 'give and take', reciprocal obligations, honesty in all things, the punishment of wrong doing and the exchange of gifts are still essential practises which increase the welfare of the community and so are we more important than making money.

**Kaitiakitanga** - Acknowledging the mauri of the resources of the world, preferring the best materials and practices rather than the cheapest, ensuring safety and pursuing quality even over price.

**Whakawhanaungatanga** - Family bonds should be given priority over all other considerations in deciding who to employ or what action to take, with discussions at as many meetings of whanau as necessary to make decisions which benefit the whole whanau rather than just some individuals.

**Manaakitanga** - A Maori owned business should support the social
objectives of the Maori community through contributions of money, people and facilities, treating its employees as well as any partners or competitors fairly and generously in all respects.

**Whakarite Mana** - A contract is a statement of intention to form a lasting relationship and the elements of the contract should be one to review as circumstances change with the objective of providing long term satisfaction for both parties rather than focussing on the ‘letter of the law’ (ibid.)

Knox challenges the appointment of leaders outside the parameters of Maori control. What is clear from Knox is that leaders are not necessarily or solely those people that are promoted through Pakeha structures such as the political system, academia or the media, but are more often than not those people that are grounded within their own communities, their own whanau, hapu and iwi contexts, and who ‘mahia te mahi’ ensure that the work is done.59

“The leaders of Te Ao Maori are for the most part, not the leaders most people will be familiar with from television and newspaper exposure. Most of the people we see portrayed as Maori leaders are in fact leaders of non Maori organizations in the non Maori world. As such they are not required by the process which appoints them to display the qualities of Rangatiratanga, although the absence of these qualities is sadly missed and mourned by those whose hearts and minds are in Te Ao Maori. The responsibility of these so called Maori leaders is to another kaupapa, usually to a set of commercial or political requirements. This causes a number of serious problems.

Knox further states that ‘real leaders’ in Te Ao Maori are usually known and visible within Te Ao Maori, and in particular within whanau and hapu. What constitutes leadership in that context is the ability to be knowledgeable of the relationships between and within whanau and hapu. He identifies a number of key elements in regards to whanau leaders, these being:

- Having knowledge of whanau relationships
- Having knowledge of the obligations between neighbours, whanau, hapu and iwi

Having knowledge of healing and karakia for the whanau
Carrying the authority of the whanau without having to put it to a vote.
Able to settle disputes within families
Their approval is “cause for happiness” and disapproval is “cause for dismay”.
They are loved and honoured by their families
They work for little or no financial reward
They work endlessly for their whanau.
Their names are known in Te Ao Maori. (ibid)

The development of leadership from a whanau, hapu, iwi, Maori base is considered essential. The growth of leadership is being promoted in differing ways by Maori. Iritana Tawhiwhirangi states that there is a real need to ensure the growth of our next generation of Maori leaders.

"We’ve got to start early, to let people feel confident about themselves – there’ll always be someone that’ll come out of the group" (ibid:104)

For example, Whatarangi Winiata refers to Wānanga as a site of development and growth for future Maori leadership. He writes;

“there is a role for a place like Te Wānanga o Raukawa to talk about those characteristics of rangatira and rangatiratanga and try to ensure that the ideas are spread. In due course we will rebuild rangatira, there are people who will do those things. We are contributing to the ranks of rangatira.” (Winiata 2003:68)

Moving beyond rigid definitions is also raised by Whata Winiata in the publication “A Fire in Your Belly”.60 Winiata considers the term leader to be a fairly narrow word and determines that is more helpful to think in terms of rangatiratanga. He recalls the expression from Bishop Manuhuia Bennet regarding rangatira and rangatiratanga

“My old people tell me that there were three things to be said about a rangatira and rangatiratanga:
- te kai a te rangatira he korero, the food of chiefs is talk
- te tohu o te rangatira he manaaki, the sign of a rangatira is being able to

---

look after others, generosity
- te mahi a te rangatira he whakatira i te iwi, the work of the rangatira is binding the iwi. (Ibid: 67)

The discussion by Whatarangi Winiata provides us with an overview of fundamental elements of Maori leadership that are defined within Maori terms of manaakitanga and whanau rangatiratanga and collective movement. Furthermore he notes that such elements are often undermined;

“I think that there are not enough of our people who are clear about those things. We have been trapped by the Waitangi Tribunal claims, because the focus has gone to what you can get and claim back and in competition with your neighbours. That’s not manaakitanga. Secondly, I think that binding or unifying the iwi has lost ground to building up the putea of the iwi.” (ibid: 67)

Robert Mahuta61 in “Fire in your Belly” states that accountability to iwi is critical. He further comments

“we seem to be in a kind of vacuum, broadly speaking throughout Maoridom. It’s very difficult to see who’s coming through to plug the holes-I don’t think we are going to get anymore big men [sic] coming through. We’re going to get a lot of little men, who have skills for particular activities, but I don’t think we’ll get the big man who can spread his arms and cover the whole tribe like Hepi Te Heuheu and Jim Henare did. I’m sure it is to do with the diversity now of what it means to be Maori, all the different calls on one’s time, energy and resources; the gap between the old and the young, the have-s and have-nots, the educated and uneducated, all those splits are starting to become more pronounced. Kingitanga has the potential to unify it. (ibid: 140)

In further discussing the kingitanga Mahuta says

“I see the role of Kahui Ariki as a trusteeship thing and that the active leadership dynamic should be amongst the stronger personalities within the tribe. It’ll move because of different personalities within the tribe. I think that is happening now. For example I’ve been looking for a replacement for myself to be the Kāhui Ariki representative on the Tekaumarua. I’ve been racking my brains, I’ve come up with one person, but he’s stuck because of lifestyle. He’s

working at the freezing works, he can’t get off to go to the meetings and I said, well, you’ve got to make your choice. There aren’t many around with your leadership qualities. (ibid 140)

He also comments on the notions of primogeniture and achieved leadership in the recognition that performance is essential.

Rangatiratanga is enmeshed with whakapapa but it must be accompanied by performance. A rangatira is to a large extent quite humble in the way that he carries and deports himself within the tribe. You cannot afford to be arrogant other wise you are dead, and you’ve always got to have the good of the tribe at heart. (ibid 141)

This is also commented upon by Iritana Tawhiwhirangi,62 she states;

“There is a difference between assumed leadership and leadership that is bestowed. It’s a very stark difference and I think that there are some of us that think that we have a leadership role by divine right. Trust and empathy is the greatest call on leadership and to be able to assess your own role in terms of what people perceive.” (ibid:104)

Furthermore, she notes that leaders must also be able to make the hard calls.

“In a leadership roles there are times when you have to make some hard decisions. I don’t shirk them but I don’t see that as taking away from other people their potential.” (ibid:104)

Pita Sharples63 in discussing leadership said that for him leadership is

“to be a servant to the people, just getting out there and doing things, recognizing that something needs to be done and therefore making yourself the catalyst to do it… and you learned leadership as a result of having to look after peoples’ lives… I learned to attack the kaupapa not the person and really make an effort when you go to war on a kaupapa (ibid:186-192)

In his paper “Western and Maori Values for Sustainable Development” David Rei Miller concludes that Maori are well placed to become world leaders in sustainability.

However he draws attention to statements by Mason Durie (Durie, 2001) in his Opening Address to the Hui Taumata Mātauranga

“Maori leaders of tomorrow must be aware of their unique relationship with the environment, and of ways in which the long term sustainability of the environment, society, economy and cultural values can be assured. It is not enough to simply achieve short term goals of economic progress. It is necessary for Maori leaders to negotiate the interface between Te Ao Maori and te Ao Whanui, so that Maori can be citizens of the world while still retaining cultural identity. The four signposts to guide this negotiation are the exercise of control, the transmission of world views, participation in decision making and the delivery of multiple benefits”(Durie 2001)

In an address to The Inaugural Te Tau Ihu Maori Women’s Leadership awards 2004 Tariana Turia identified some key elements in regards to leadership.

“Leadership to me is about working within our whanau as the foundation of tangata whenua social, cultural and political organization. Whanau is the source of identity, security, support and strength. The greatest challenge is to restore our rights and obligations to ourselves and to work as a collective unit. Leadership based on whanaungatanga means we need to promote the principle of interdependence and collective arrangements in accord with Kaupapa Maori as opposed to individualism and separatism. She further suggests “we need to create a new generation of whanau leaders, who are neither saints, public servants nor politicians. We need whanau leaders that can situate themselves in their own whanau narrative, who can grasp the complex dynamics of our whanau and who can imagine a future grounded in the very best of our past, yet who are attuned to the opportunities ahead.”

These elements affirm the possibilities for leadership in the future. Such positive affirmation is also provided by the late Dame Mira Szazy, and by the concluding statements in the report by Nga Tuara (1992). We close this report with those words.

In quoting Susan Munroe from Time Magazine Dame Mira Szaszy stated:

“True leadership will not bind us, it will set us free”. I suppose that means, in leading people away from all the things which retard development, you set their sights towards a vision for the future. Ultimately many of you will
become leaders in your own right. I challenge you to look beyond material gain and discouraging signs – in the long term, trust and respect are food for the wairua. Perhaps what we do need, in essence, is a new Maori humanism – that is, a humanism based on ancient values but versed in contemporary idiom. Our current humanism does not seem to have found its own balance – with the rich lurching forward, disposing of their cultural roots and becoming rootless, and the poor, particularly unemployed, becoming poorer without even the sustenance of cultural or spiritual strengths”.

Nga Toka Tu Moana (Rocks Standing in the Ocean)

“The future leaders need to be well educated, politically astute, firmly grounded in their Maori cultural base, sophisticated, very able, strong, and committed to their iwi and their people.

They must be able to withstand whatever difficulties come before them, including the factor of racism which is a reality every Maori leader must learn to cope with. They must be able to accept criticism both from their own people and from Pakeha society and know how to deal effectively with it.

The metaphor of “he toka tu moana: has come from the heritage of the people. It is not a new metaphor but it is an old one to bring forward and apply to the leaders of the future. The strong leaders of iwi were described this way.

Ko ratou nga toka tu moana. Ka akina ratou e nga ngaru o te moana. Ka akina e te tai, ka akina e nga hau. Engari ahakoa pehea ka tu tonu, ka tu tonu. They are the rocks standing in the sea. They are bashed by the waves of the ocean. They are dashed by the tide. They are struck by the winds. But no matter what hits them they stand and they stand”. 
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