

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Homes for Māori Language Development in the 21st Century

A Māori development thesis presented in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Māori Studies

at Massey University,
Palmerston North
New Zealand

Jasmine Diane Cooper
December 2001

Abstract

Why, in the 21st Century, is the New Zealand Government still in the business of making policy concerned with Māori resources, and why do Māori continue to allow this to happen?

This thesis looks at an important Māori resource, the Māori language, and reviews the role of both Māori and the State in its development. It questions the sense of Government controlling Māori language and cultural development at the national level, given that cultural survival, including linguistic survival, is a fundamental Māori development goal, and this has never been a priority for any New Zealand government.

The thesis suggests that while Māori might be achieving greater levels of self-determination at the iwi or community levels, the lack of an effective unified Māori body allows successive New Zealand governments to continue what is a very reluctant and reactive involvement in Māori language and cultural development.

The New Zealand Government and the wider society it represents is not yet ready for substantial constitutional reform which would recognise the Māori right to self-determination. This thesis suggests, however, that it is ready, and in fact, may welcome, greater input and leadership from Māori, particularly in the area of Māori language and culture.

Māori language and cultural development at the beginning of this millennium offers an opportunity for Māori to become involved in key policy development as a precursor to the inevitable time when Māori self-determination will be formally realised at the national level. While one day Māori will be wholly responsible for decisions relating to Māori language and culture and indeed all other Māori resources, for now, it must work with the Government to ensure that language and cultural development has a secure 'home' underpinning all Māori development.

Acknowledgements

Many people have helped me at different times and in different ways during the writing of this thesis. My thanks to you all.

Special thanks to the staff and students of Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, School of Māori Studies, Massey University. In particular, thanks to Ian Christensen, my primary supervisor. Thank you for your gentle guidance, advice and support over the last year, and for the prompt attention you have given the various drafts, questions, queries and requests along the way.

I would also like to thank Professor Mason Durie, for providing me with the inspiration and confidence to continue to explore the world of Māori development.

Special thanks also to Ngāti Manawa for agreeing to participate in the research.

I would also like to thank a number of my colleagues at Te Puni Kōkiri for sharing their knowledge and time with me, in particular, Dr Phil Matthews and Tipene Chrisp. Thanks also to the library staff, Glen Taitoko, Gabrielle Hikaka and Vicky Taylor for the amazing service you have provided over the last year. Thanks also to Te Puni Kōkiri management for providing me with study assistance.

I thank Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi Post-Graduate Fund for its financial contribution to the fieldwork component of the thesis.

Last but not least thank you to those members of my family who have encouraged me and made sacrifices over the last year. In particular, thank you Daniel.

Table of contents

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| A Word From the Researcher/Methodology | 5 |
| Introduction | |
| Overview of the thesis and structure | 7 |
| Homes for Māori language development – an explanation | 10 |
| Key definitions | 11 |
| Chapter One | |
| Māori Development and Māori Language to 1975 | 14 |
| Chapter Two | 32 |
| Māori Development and Māori Language 1975 – 2000 | |
| Chapter Three | 53 |
| Māori Development into the 21 st Century | |
| Chapter Four | |
| Māori Language Development into the 21 st Century – A ‘Home’ within Government? | 69 |
| Chapter Five | |
| Māori Language Development into the 21 st Century - A ‘Home’ within Maoridom? | 99 |
| Chapter Six | |
| Summary/Conclusion | 116 |
| Appendices | |
| Fieldwork Information Sheet/Consent Form | 123 |
| Glossary | 126 |
| Bibliography | 129 |

A Word from the Researcher/Methodology

This thesis does not purport to provide a definitive view on Māori development. It is simply my own perspective on a number of aspects of Māori development, informed by a wide range of sources.

A number of research methods were used in the development of this thesis. My studies as an undergraduate and post-graduate student of Māori Studies helped to inform the views presented in this work. So too has my experience as an employee of a range of Māori units within government agencies. In particular, recent experience as a policy analyst working on Māori language policy for Te Puni Kōkiri, provided me with an insight into how Government makes policy in relation to Māori resources, and this has been drawn on in this research.

At the outset a set of hypotheses was developed in order to provide focus, and to provide a useful framework upon which to proceed.

The thesis has also drawn on a wide range of literature on Māori, Māori language and indigenous peoples' development. The authors of these works are both Māori and Pākehā. The thesis therefore is informed by an eclectic mix of views.

Quotes from a variety of sources are used throughout the thesis to emphasise and or to support particular points of view. The thesis is particularly influenced by the work of Professor Mason Durie, with regard to overall Māori development. In particular, I have related one aspect of Māori development, that of Māori language development, to Durie's ongoing argument that the lack of a national Māori body politic allows the Government, rather than Māori, to control Māori resource development through policy making at the national level.

While much of the thesis is based on available literature, I have also used case studies to illustrate particular points. A case study into an example of Government policy making for Māori, the Government's 'Māori Language Strategy' was conducted. This involved an in-depth look at the development of the policy and its implementation to date. The policy was analysed against a Māori development framework and against what experts in the field of language revitalisation prescribe for successful minority language revitalisation. Discussions with public servants involved with Māori language policy at the time that the Strategy was under development helped to inform this case study.

In addition, two small case studies were conducted into iwi language planning. One was based purely on information publicly available. However, due to the general lack of information as to the types of language planning and activity being undertaken by many other iwi, the second case study involved a piece of primary research with one particular iwi, Ngāti Manawa. A trip was made to Murupara, where discussions with the appropriately mandated representative of Ngāti Manawa took place.

In keeping with convention, a definition is provided in brackets immediately following a Māori word, when it appears for the first time in the text. A glossary listing all Māori words/terms and their definitions, in the context in which they appear, is provided as an appendix, for additional reference.

This thesis is submitted with a great deal of humility and respect for the kaupapa, and was approached with significant caution, in particular with regard to issues surrounding a researcher, not of Māori descent, conducting research in relation to kaupapa Māori.

INTRODUCTION

Overview of the Thesis and its Structure

This thesis is a study of Māori language development one-year into the new millennium, and the respective roles of both Māori and the State in that development. Inevitably, this has meant placing the language in the broader political context of overall Māori development.

Although it might now seem in the distant past to many of us, the passing of one millennium and dawning of another, was, in New Zealand, as no doubt all around the world, a time for reflections and predictions. It was a time for thinking about our country's past and possible future. Central to the discourse in New Zealand was discussion about the current state of Māori development and where that might be heading, given emerging development trends amongst the world's indigenous peoples. Some believed the new millennium held promise as a turning point into a new stage of Māori development.

As we entered the new millennium, key commentators on indigenous development called for an end to the adversarial, grievance based relationships that had come to characterise so many of the relationships between indigenous peoples and their Governments over the last part of the twentieth century (Coates/McHugh 1998, Durie 1999 b. et al).

They suggested that these difficult relationships had come about because Governments and their indigenous populations have continued to pursue different development goals, and were therefore, often talking at cross-purposes. They claimed that cultural survival, self-determination within the confines of an established nation-state, and partnership with the non-indigenous populations, are indigenous peoples' fundamental development goals, while Governments, at best, simply want to acknowledge past injustices and to make full and final settlements with their indigenous people.

The same commentators called for new partnerships between States and their indigenous peoples, based on agreed, or at least mutually acknowledged, development goals and recognition of the fundamental right of indigenous peoples to control their own future.

This thesis looks at Māori language development, within the context of Māori development in general. It explores whether cultural survival, in particular linguistic survival is a key Māori development goal, and the importance it is being accorded by the New Zealand Government. It explores whether the current Māori-State relationship is conducive to Māori language development.

There is significant evidence to support the assertion that the Māori language, as a key factor in cultural survival, remains a central development goal of Māori. The Māori

language, while still endangered, has been brought back from the brink of extinction, largely due to the ongoing efforts and determination of the Māori people.

Yet Māori have from time to time been criticised for either not caring enough about the language or for focussing on economic resource development at the expense of social and cultural development. While Māori continue to develop and implement initiatives aimed at revitalising the Māori language, they appear to be localised, sporadic and lacking in overall planning and coordination. Socio-economic disadvantage and difficult Māori-Māori relationships also appear to hinder any unified Māori language efforts at the national level and these are also explored.

On the other side of the divide, the New Zealand Government appears to be content in pursuing a Māori development policy which focuses on concluding the Treaty settlements process and on attempting to achieve social equity between Māori and non-Māori. Māori language and culture development seems to take a marginalised position within Government, ranking low in Government priorities. The other key related Māori development goal, self-determination, has at least at the national level, scarcely made it onto the Government agenda.

The following hypotheses are tested throughout the course of this thesis and are used to inform the final summary and conclusion:

- That power to ensure cultural survival, including the survival of the Māori language, has always been, and remains a key Māori development goal;
- That survival of the Māori language and culture has never been and is unlikely ever to be a key priority for the New Zealand Government;
- That the Māori –State relationship has historically been weak because it has never been based on agreed development goals, including language and culture goals, or clear strategies and plans for achieving those goals;
- That the current Māori –State relationship is based on a structuralist model and is focused on historical grievances and risk aversion, and that Māori language development is a prime example of this approach;
- That until Māori and the State move towards developing a new ‘relational’ partnership based on common development goals, (including Māori language development goals), Māori development will continue to be stilted and adversarial;
- That in spite of the ongoing difficulties surrounding the nature of the Māori-Crown relationship and intra-Māori difficulties, there is much to be optimistic about and the next 25 year period of Māori development will see a continued strengthening of the Māori language, as Māori continue to pursue self-determination and cultural survival.

The thesis begins with an overview of Māori development until 1975. It reviews the impact of colonisation on the Māori language and the responses of Māori and the Crown over the years. It examines the priority that was given to Māori language and culture by both Māori and the State, and examines the nature of the relationship between Māori and the State, prior to 1975.

It then moves to look in more depth at the recent period from 1975-2000 in which the endangered state of the language and calls for its revitalisation became more prominent within the context of indigenous development worldwide. It examines the State's reaction, in particular, the instigation of a process to settle grievances relating to breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, and the type of relationship that this established between Māori and the State.

This is followed by an examination of the trends for indigenous people's development in the years leading into the new millennium. The thesis considers whether a new phase of development is emerging in New Zealand and, if so, what its characteristics are. In particular, it asks whether Māori and the State are showing signs of developing a new relationship based on agreed development goals, or whether both are continuing to work in an adversarial manner.

The thesis then turns to an in depth look at Māori language development in New Zealand today. After providing a snapshot of the current health of the Māori language, it examines whether Māori and the State are working together or in isolation from one another on Māori language development. It examines whether any agreed Māori language development goals exist, including, most fundamentally, the goal of revitalisation.

The next two Chapters look at language activities currently being undertaken by the Government and by Māori. Firstly, Government's current approach to Māori language development is explored to consider whether the language is being accorded any priority on the Government's agenda. A case study into the Government's 'Māori Language Strategy' is conducted to find out whether it is a bold new direction by Government towards Māori language development into the new millennium, or whether it is little more than a continuation of previous approaches. Secondly, the thesis looks at the current approach/es being taken by iwi/Māori to Māori language development and the priority it is being accorded. It explores whether iwi/Māori have clear Māori language goals and strategies and plans for achieving those goals. It also considers what factors, apart from the Māori-State relationship, might be hindering progress in this area. Two case studies into iwi language planning are conducted.

The final section summarises the thesis, and reviews the original hypotheses to inform the final conclusion.

While this thesis focuses on Māori language development, it is, in fact, a thesis about Māori development. It contends that the health or otherwise of the language can be used as a barometer for overall Māori development. If Māori language development is not

progressing well, then there should be concern for the state of overall Māori development. This is because the revitalisation of the Māori language is a critical component of Māori cultural survival, and therefore Māori development. If, on the other hand, the Māori language is flourishing, or at least shows signs of being revitalised, then we can take heart that Māori development is progressing positively.

Homes for Māori Language Development in the 21st Century – An Explanation

The title of this thesis, ‘Homes for Māori Language Development in the 21st Century’ conveys many of the central themes of the study.

This thesis attempts to show that the retention of the Māori culture, through the survival and revitalisation of the Māori language, remains a key Māori development goal. It also shows that the New Zealand Government has accepted that it has obligations and responsibilities to support Māori endeavors to revitalise the Māori language. Yet, why is it that neither Māori nor the Government has secured a safe ‘home’ for language and culture development at the national level, as part of their development policies? Is this a weakness that is hindering not only Māori language development, but overall Māori development?

While Māori are leading a range of language revitalisation activities at the whānau (extended family), hapū (sub-tribe), iwi (tribe) and Māori organisation level, this thesis argues that the lack of Māori unity overall, is preventing meaningful Māori involvement in language policy development and associated resource distribution at the national level.

As a consequence, the Government continues to take, what has traditionally been a rather reluctant leading role in the cultural heritage sector, particularly Māori cultural heritage. This thesis shows how the lack of a strong national Māori voice can result in ineffective policies for Māori, such as the Government’s Māori Language Strategy.

This thesis supports the need for a mechanism to be formed which would ensure Māori lead policy development relating to Maori resources such as Māori language and culture. It also suggests that the Government should ensure that Māori language and culture development is a core factor underpinning its Māori development policy.

On another level, international research clearly indicates that, more than any in any other domain, language revitalisation must take place in the homes and communities of those who belong to the language. Yet to date, both Māori and the Government have tended to focus on the education and broadcasting sectors to revitalise the Māori language, neglecting Māori homes and communities as the key domain for revitalisation. The thesis supports the need for both Government and Māori to make homes and communities the focus of future language revitalisation activities.

Finally, this thesis advocates a new Māori Language Strategy be developed. A Strategy developed and led by Māori and supported by the Government in the joint recognition that the survival and vitality of the language and culture is a key goal for Māori.

Key Definitions

Before beginning, it will be useful to define some of the key terms used frequently throughout this thesis.

Māori development

‘Māori development’ is a term that has become en vogue in this country’s more recent history. In the past, successive New Zealand Governments used phrases such as ‘Native Affairs’, ‘Māori Affairs’, or even the ‘native/Māori problem’ to describe any matters relating to Māori development. Māori themselves, on the other hand, have talked about development in terms of protecting and advancing tribal, and more recently pan-Māori mana (power, prestige, authority) and rangatiratanga (self-determination).

Māori development is not a trendy new phenomenon but has existed since the time iwi first arrived in this country, and is part of our nation’s history and progress. It simply hasn’t always been called Māori development. For a long part of our history the dominant culture sought to assimilate Māori into their culture and later pursued a policy of integration. This meant that the notion of Māori development, as something distinct from the overall development of the country, was not acknowledged amongst the dominant culture.

Today ‘Māori development’ appears to be the politically correct jargon, used by both Māori and non-Māori for describing the ongoing process by which Māori live and progress in this country.

The lengthened phrase, ‘positive ‘Māori development’ was coined at the Māori development conference, Hui Taumata (summit conference), held in 1984 and has today also become commonly used alongside ‘Māori development’ and ‘indigenous peoples development’ for describing the development of Māori and other indigenous peoples in the wider societies in which they live.

Self-determination

This thesis argues that self-determination is a key Māori development goal and the term recurs throughout. For the purpose of this thesis, Durie’s understanding of self-determination, as explained by Fleras is used. “Mason Durie equates tino rangatiratanga with self-determination – that is, the advancement of Māori as Māori through the implementation of mechanisms for governance of Māori resources” (Havemann 1999 Pg. 207).

Language/language and culture

While this thesis concentrates on Māori language development, it is based on the assumption that language is an integral and essential part of any culture and that it is difficult and sometimes impossible to separate the two. To look in depth at cultural issues, other than the language, would simply be outside the scope of this research. As the thesis develops, it will show how Māori attempts to retain and revitalise the language are part of the overall development goal of cultural survival.

Survival of the language/language revitalisation

Another term central to this thesis, which may be useful to define at the outset, is 'language survival'. This thesis equates the term 'language survival' with the notion of a healthy living language. In other words, a language that can be used as the chosen language of communication for the whole range of everyday topics, within a range of language domains or communities.

The process by which a language moves from being an endangered language to being once again a healthy living language is referred to by linguists as 'language revitalisation'. The two crucial components of language revitalisation are that intergenerational transmission of the language is restored by those people for whom the language is part of their culture (reversing language shift) and that the maintenance and development of the language is controlled by those same people (Fishman 1991). Language revitalisation is discussed in more depth in Chapter Four.

Language status, corpus and acquisition development

Language status, corpus and acquisition development are terms commonly used by sociolinguists with reference to language development and are referred to in this thesis. As defined by Baker, status planning is concerned with "raising the status of a language within society", corpus planning concerns "the vocabulary, spelling, grammar and standardisation of the minority language", and acquisition development is concerned with "creating language spread by increasing the number of speakers and users (via empowerment) by, for example, language teaching (Baker 1996 Pg. 65).

Kotahitanga/Unity

The words kotahitanga and unity are used frequently in this thesis, in particular in relation to the argument surrounding the need for a united national Māori body politic. This is not intended to convey the unrealistic expectation that iwi/Māori should at all times and in all matters be 'united'. Māori, like Pākehā and all other ethnic groups, will have diverse opinions on any given topic. The argument is not that a national Māori body politic would or should bring 'unity' as such, but that it would be a vehicle for reaching consensus on issues of common importance and agreed courses of action.

Structural/ Relational relationships

Finally, this thesis argues that the current Māori-State relationship is based on a 'structural', as opposed to a 'relational' model. A structural relationship is described as being one in which the State deals with its indigenous people at a number of levels or structures such as "nation, state, tribe and family" (Coates/McHugh 1998 Pg. 111). In the New Zealand context, the Government has tended to deal with Māori at the iwi, hapū, or Māori organisation levels.

A relational model, on the other hand, is referred to as one in which the relationship is based on ethnicity rather than tribal identity. McHugh describes it as the post-structuralist approach saying 'This approach is founded upon the principle of 'ethnicity' and sees the tribe not as the source but as an expression (the major but not exclusive one) of aboriginal identity (Coates/McHugh 1998 Pg.113).

CHAPTER ONE

Māori Development to 1975

Introduction

This thesis begins with an overview of Māori development and the place of language in that development, in order to understand the position of Māori language in our country today, its place in overall Māori development and to consider future directions. The overview attempts, by capturing the key events and themes of the last thousand or so years, to place language development within the context of overall Māori development.

Chapter One looks at Māori development from pre-settler days up until 1975. Durie (1999 d.) has identified four distinct phases of Māori development over the last 100 years. After discussing the pre and early contact days, the Chapter briefly explores the three phrases, 1900-1925, 1925-1950 and 1950-1975. It looks at the key events and their overall impact on Māori development, as well as the effect they had on language development. A key focus throughout is on the interface between Māori and the State as one of the key factors influencing Māori development. In doing so, Chapter One tests several of the hypotheses outlined in the introduction.

This overview argues that the survival of the Māori language and culture has not historically been a key priority for the New Zealand Government, while it has always been fundamental to Māori. It will attempt to show that the process of colonisation and its aftermath, resulted in the near death of the Māori language, and that at no stage did Māori, consciously or voluntarily give up their desire to retain their distinct identity as Māori, by giving up their language and culture. It will also examine the changing nature of the relationship between Māori and the State over the years up until 1975.

Before beginning this brief review of Māori development using the key periods identified by Durie, it is necessary to point out that these are not clearly delineated periods, but rather reflect a gradual process of Māori development and that there are many examples where overlapping occurs between the periods. In relation to the Māori language in particular, the near demise of the language, while more accelerated in some periods than others, was a gradual process. The potential threat came as soon as the first settlers arrived and a second language was introduced. The threat gained momentum throughout the process of colonisation and the possibility of language death became a reality after the rapid urbanisation of Māori in the 1950s.

It should be emphasised that this can only be a brief overview. To include more detailed accounts and analysis of the history of Māori development is beyond the scope of this thesis.

Pre and early contact days to 1900

Overall Māori development

There is evidence that before and during the early contact days with European, Māori, then organized as whānau, hapū and iwi were thriving, the population increasing and the economy booming. European contact resulted in new trading opportunities, new technologies and the introduction of a cash economy, which contributed to a period of 'positive Māori development'. Iwi at the hapū level, which were the main political unit (Walker 1990 Pgs. 64-65) acting as mini self-governing nations, based on tribal rangatiratanga, made policy 'by iwi for iwi'. Māori language and culture were intact, and Māori controlled their own development. "At this stage Māori tribes controlled their own transformation, managed their own economy and set about the development of their own institutions" (Pūao Te-Ata-Tū (Day Break) 1988 Appendix, Pg. 5).

Language during this period

Iwi at this time spoke one language, their own dialectal version of the Māori language. The language, as well as being the primary means of communication, served as a marker of identity between the iwi, which were structured, autonomous groups based on whakapapa (genealogy) and whānaungatanga (kinship).

The language was the vehicle whereby all knowledge, including its significant body of literature (Karetu 1992 Pg. 58), was transmitted from one generation to the next. This knowledge was transmitted orally, and skill in oratory was highly valued and looked upon as something of an art form. Those that excelled in this art form were highly esteemed. In short, the "Māori language was distinctive to Māori, essential to the Māori personality and to the maintenance of Māori culture" (Cormack 1997 Pg. 2).

During this early period of contact, the first settler groups to Aotearoa (New Zealand), made up predominately of whalers, sealers, traders and missionaries had no choice but to learn to speak 'Māori' in order to do their business or even simply survive. For example, in order to convert Māori to Christianity, the missionaries needed to learn the Māori language and teach Māori the skills of literacy, reading and writing. For this purpose, between 1827 and 1830 many sections of the New Testament were translated into Māori and distributed (Bawden 1987). The early mission schools therefore did their teaching in the Māori language, and while the early influx of settlers also resulted in a small number of Māori learning English, Māori remained the dominant language (Te Puni Kōkiri, 1999 a.). The 'status' of the Māori language remained high as the first language of the country.

This was a period then, during which the Māori language, in its various dialects, was a healthy living language. It was used as the daily means of communication, naturally transmitted from one generation to the next, and was controlled and developed almost exclusively by the people who spoke it.

While it was a healthy living language, the mere introduction of English and the associated skills of literacy, which Māori were keen to obtain, (Garlick 1990) resulted in a lessening of Māori control over the language. As Garlick discusses, the work of the early missionaries in producing what they felt was a necessary 'standardised' Māori language and grammar, posed a threat to iwi control and maintenance of the various dialects.

This early period in Māori development was one that will never be repeated. The arrival of the first settlers, and subsequent dramatic escalation in the numbers arriving, was to result in change for iwi, perhaps inevitable, when others with a different culture and language move in with you and within a very short period of time come to out number you. Today, only the most radical or perhaps naive would cling to the hope that iwi will ever again exclusively reside in and control this land, or that the Māori language will again be the primary language of communication in this country.

Colonisation and its impact on Māori development

The tide of positive development quickly turned as the process of colonisation of New Zealand unfolded.

One of the key trends to emerge during this period was the sudden change to the population of New Zealand. While the influx of settlers rapidly increased, the Māori population began a sharp decline, and was decimated as a consequence of European diseases and the tribal wars, fought with muskets, in the 1860s (Walker 1990). In 1840, the Māori population of approximately 200,000 greatly outnumbered the non-Māori population of approximately 2,000. However, by 1870, the Māori population had been decimated to approximately just 56,000, while the non-Māori population had increased to approximately 250,000. This rapid decline in population was so great that it was accompanied by a belief in some circles that Māori as a people might become extinct (Pool 1977).

The British Colonial Office represented the British settlers from 1832 to 1840 through its British Resident, James Busby. In 1837, Busby expressed his concerns to the Colonial Office at both the difficulty in maintaining law and order amongst the British citizens and at the falling Māori health standards and population decline. He recommended a British protectorate be established but without a cession of Māori sovereignty. Until this time Britain had been reluctant to intervene in New Zealand. However by now, a duty to protect its citizens, the possible threat that France might 'get there first', and the recognition of the sovereign rights of Māori, including title to their own land, meant that a Treaty seemed the best option for annexing New Zealand to Great Britain.

The Treaty of Waitangi

Governor Hobson was dispatched to New Zealand to negotiate a Treaty. The Treaty of Waitangi of 1840, the nation's founding document, guaranteed iwi, in return for cession to the Crown of the right of *kāwanatanga* (the right to govern), “te tino rangatiratanga o rātou wenua, o rātou kāinga, me o rātou taonga katoa” (Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act 1985). Literally translated, this means the guarantee of rangatiratanga over all their lands, homes and other valued things. Put more simply, it guaranteed Māori the right to continue to develop as Māori.

A Westminster system of Government was introduced and immediately after the signing of the Treaty, the British Government appeared to take the Treaty seriously and insisted that its representatives in New Zealand strictly adhere to it. A ‘Protectorate Department’ was established in 1840 and senior missionary George Clarke was appointed as ‘Protector of Aborigines’ by Governor Hobson. The goal of the Department was to protect the rights of Māori people guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Waitangi. (It was abolished in 1846 on the grounds that it “had failed to promote the civilization of the Māori” (Butterworth 1990 Pg. 21). At this stage, the law seemed to support the validity of the Treaty as a solemn contract by declaring the Treaty valid and binding in the 1847 case of *The Queen v. Symonds* (Temm 1990).

Yet, once the Settler Government was established, the Treaty was soon set aside. The country became self-governing in 1852 with the passage of the New Zealand Constitution Act. Māori were effectively disenfranchised from participating in the parliamentary system because of a ‘freehold land’ property qualification, which was at odds with Māori concepts of land ‘ownership’. The Māori Representation Act 1867 established four Māori parliamentary seats out of approximately seventy. This measure of token Māori representation, designed to appease ongoing Māori calls for self-governance, was meant to have been temporary. However it continued until 1995!

With the settlers came the need for land for their own development, and Māori were rapidly dispossessed of the large majority of their most fertile land. This was achieved through a number of dubious deals and laws specifically designed to have land ownership secured by the settler and colonial Governments and individual citizens. The Native Land Act 1862, and the resultant Native Land Court, were particularly instrumental in alienating Māori land. The introduction of individual title to land had the effect of pitting Māori against Māori. It contributed to the destruction of tribal *mana* and rangatiratanga by giving the Court the power to determine matters relating to the retention or disposal of Māori land. Ongoing resistance by iwi to the sale of land led directly to the land wars of 1860s.

Other legislation in blatant breach of the Treaty followed. The Suppression of Rebellion Act of 1863, which led to the confiscation of land as a punishment for rebellions that had not taken place, is one example. The 1908 Public Works Act which authorised the taking of land for public works and giving only Europeans the right of objection and for compensation if successful, is another. The list of legislation passed in breach of the

Treaty is long. In addition, in 1877, the Treaty was ruled a 'simple nullity' by Chief Justice Prendergast in the case of *Wi Parata v The Bishop of Wellington*.

The Protectorate Department was succeeded in 1861 by the Native Department, intended to "manage relationships between Māori and Europeans and to ensure the integration of Māori into the European political structure" (Butterworth 1990 Pg. 5). The Department played a key role in creating the Māori school system and establishing the Māori Members of Parliament.

Assimilation

The establishment of the colonial Government in New Zealand began a long period of policy making 'for Māori, by the State', which continues, more or less intact to this day.

However the underlying basis on which policy for Māori has been made over the years has gradually changed. In this early period and for some time after, the State's overall policy for Māori has been described as one of assimilation. This was based on ethnocentric beliefs about white superiority and the need to 'civilize the natives'. It was hoped that Māori would simply passively give up their distinct identity and defer to the superior culture of the coloniser. The term 'Māori' became the norm for describing iwi collectively during the period and eradicating tribalism became a Government focus. "the first plank of public policy must be to stamp out the beastly communism of the Māori" (Sir Francis Dillon-Bell, distinguished 19th century politician, cited in Pua Te Ata Tu 1988 Appendix Pg. 6).

A range of legislation designed to divest Māori of their land, and to break down the traditional tribal structures, laid the basis of the Crown's 'Māori development' policy of assimilation.

The Māori Response – Seeking Strength in Unity

However, Māori had no intention of sitting passively and succumbing to the forces of assimilation. From the very early contact days, they were organising themselves in response to the changes that were occurring and threats that were being posed to their ongoing development as Māori.

A key Māori development trend to emerge during this early period was the notion of kotahitanga (unity). As Cox portrays in his book of the same name, the search for kotahitanga, has been an ongoing response by Māori to the changes and threats facing them and it has manifested itself in a number of movements throughout the entire history of Māori development. During this early period, there were three key movements formed through the tribal system of rūnanga (councils) and inter tribal meetings.

The first was the 1835 Declaration of Independence which established a united iwi nation. Iwi, recognising some fundamental commonalties with one another, saw an advantage in uniting as an overall nation state to discuss and resolve matters affecting them all. The idea was that a parliament, a type of 'supreme body politic' (Durie 1998 a.)

would meet regularly to discuss and decide matters of importance to iwi as a nation state. Although this never came to pass, it remains significant because it shows that iwi at this early stage of contact with non-Māori, recognised the commonalties that they shared and the benefits that unity could bring.

Cox sees the Declaration, which was devised and promoted by Busby, slightly differently, noting, "The first attempt to unite Iwi to control Māori Affairs at a supra-tribal level was imposed from without; a recurrent theme in Māori-State relations" (Cox 1993 Pg. 42). This is an interesting and important point, because, throughout the entire history of Māori development both Māori and the Crown have developed a range of different structures which each hoped would advance their own respective development goals.

The second significant manifestation of kotahitanga was the Kīngitanga (King) movement. The establishment of a Māori King in 1858 was the result of a growing sense of Māori nationalism amongst a large group of tribes frustrated at their failed attempts to have Māori admitted to the House of Representatives.

But the grievances of the Chiefs were symptoms of a deeper failing on the part of the Governor to fulfil the guarantee of rangatiratanga under the Treaty by the inclusion of the chiefs in the machinery of state. The chiefs had no alternative but to establish their own institutions to protect their land" (Walker 1990 Pg. 112).

Kīngitanga became one of the major Māori political movements of the time. The Kauhanganui (Great Council) met regularly up until the 1920's and continues to operate to this day amongst the Tainui tribes.

The third significant manifestation of kotahitanga during this period was the Pāremata Māori (Māori Parliament). During the 1890's another group of tribes began to think of forming their own parliamentary systems and the first meeting of a Māori parliament was held in June 1892. In 1894, Hone Heke introduced a Native Rights Bill into the House seeking devolution of power of parliamentary governance to the Māori parliament. This was rejected, as it was when it was tabled again in 1896.

Both the Kīngitanga and Kōtatahitanga movements arose from Māori dissatisfaction at the actions and policies that threatened their distinct way of life, and the way in which they were excluded from participating in the Government.

Impact on the language

As the population rapidly declined, land was lost and traditional rangatiratanga of the tribes came under threat, so too did the Māori language begin its decline.

As the number of English speaking settlers arriving in New Zealand rapidly increased, they were able to establish their own communities in which English became the daily

means of communication. They could therefore get by without needing to learn the Māori language. However Māori was used as a tool of power when it was to the advantage of the colonial and settler governments. For example, a Māori language newspaper, 'Te Karere' (The Messenger), was produced monthly between 1842 and 1846 by the Protectorate of Aborigines as a means of informing and influencing tribal opinion. This is an example of how language can be used to assert power and influence.

By 1861 Māori levels of literacy in Māori were high, "literacy was embraced by Māori at an early stage after contact with Pākehā" (Garlick 1998 Pg. 7). Māori also used literacy in their own language for political purposes. The first Māori language newspaper published by Maori, Te Hokioi, E Rere Atu Nā, was printed and used to politicise the Government's interpretation of the Treaty during this period (Cox 1993).

However, because of the population reversal trend, many Māori were now finding it necessary to learn and use more English in their dealings with the settlers. English was slowly being seen as a necessary tool by which they could access the perceived 'goodies' of colonisation', the language of 'power'. This meant not only being able to speak English, but to be able to read and write it as well.

This trend contributed to the ongoing decline of the status of the Māori language, which escalated after the 1867 Native Schools Act was passed. The Act allowed for State support to be provided to schools in Māori communities under certain conditions, one of which that the language of instruction be English. Many missionary schools took this offer up and English soon became the dominant language of the classroom.

Yet, the Māori language remained the dominant language amongst Māori in their own communities and intergenerational transmission remained intact during this period. There would have been little concern amongst most Māori that the language was in any imminent danger, especially in light of the more immediate problems of huge population decrease and loss of land.

The impact of colonisation on Māori was huge. This early period up until the turn of the century saw the settler Government rapidly acquire control of the country with policies and attitudes which showed little interest in preserving Māori cultural identity. In fact, policies were aimed quite openly at assimilating Māori and thereby eradicating any points of differences. The Treaty, instead of establishing the basis of a partnership within which Māori and non-Māori development could proceed, soon proved to be a mere tool in the hands of the colonisers, smoothing the way for the colonisation process to proceed.

However, iwi rose to the huge challenges and very quickly sought ways of resisting the threats to their way of life as iwi. They sought ways of working together to resist and stem the loss of land, and ways of participating in the national Government. When these did not succeed, they developed their own alternative governance structures. Expressions of kotahitanga, such as the Kīngitanga movement, are examples of the resolve amongst Māori to preserve their right to tino rangatiratanga or self-determination, guaranteed to

them under the Treaty of Waitangi. “the continued search for Māori unity, as manifest by a series of political, religious, and social movements, might be referred to as a search for sovereignty: a search for an equal voice in national affairs – a voice distinctively Māori and independent from European aspirations and ambitions” (Cox 1997 Pg. 4).

Because the Māori language remained the dominant language amongst Māori during this period and continued to be transmitted inter-generationally there would have been no cause for alarm. However, the hidden effects of colonisation were impacting on the Māori language and culture from day one. The impact of the introduction of English, coupled with the reversal in population trends was sowing the seeds of the decline of the Māori language, reducing its status from the country’s first language to that of the ‘native minority’. Such has been the nature of colonisation and language shift, that often people did not become aware that their languages were threatened until it was almost too late.

The insidious nature of colonisation and its policies of assimilation during this part of our history can be gleaned from the following quote. In 1875, in reaction to a petition seeking an increase in the Māori membership in parliament, MP Donald McLean said the Government was “thinking that the Māori children might be sent to school and the English language taught to them, when they would be fit to take a position in the Parliament”(cited in Walker 1990 Pg. 153).

Clearly the prevailing attitude of the time was that English was a superior language, and should be taught to and used by all Māori before any consideration could be given to them participating in the Pākehā dominated parliament.

1900-1925 Recovery

Overall Māori Development

By the turn of the century, colonisation, and in particular, introduced diseases, the land and musket wars and the sudden and massive dispossession of land reduced the Māori population to its lowest point of 45,549 (Walker 1990 Pg.10). Moreover, the outcome of colonisation by the turn of the century, “... was impoverishment of the Māori, marginalisation of elders and chiefly authority and a structural relationship of Pākehā (non-Māori – European) dominance and Māori subjection” (Walker 1990 Pg.10).

Yet, Durie has referred to this 25-year period as one of recovery in terms of Māori development (Durie 1999 b.). Contrary to the predications of some, Māori had in fact, survived colonisation, and by the turn of the century the downward spiral was showing some signs of abating. For example, the population slowly began to recover ground in the early stages of the 20th century. Māori began to embark on a long, slow journey of recovery, which in many ways continues to this day. However, the effects of the massive and continued land loss on the traditional tribal structure continued to threaten iwi, as did a range of other social and economic policy legislation aimed at assimilation.

Language During this Period

Unfortunately while a slow recovery was taking place in relation to some aspects of Māori development, the language was continuing its decline towards near demise. As in the previous period, the threat to the Māori language continued to grow, largely unbeknown to the majority of Māori during this period. Although the Māori population began a slow recovery, the pervasive impact of English continued to spread as Māori came more and more into contact with non-Māori and the English language.

In 1900 over 90% of new entrants at primary school spoke Māori as their first language (Walker 1990). In 1905, teachers in the Native Schools were encouraging children to speak only English in school playgrounds. According to Walker this was interpreted as the right to ban Māori and to punish those who used it. Selby's book 'Still Being Punished', shows the enormous negative psychological impact that this had on that generation of Māori, their parents and their descendants and how the consequences are still being felt today. Its message was that the Māori language and, by implication the Māori culture itself were, at the best, low status, and at worst not worth retaining at all. According to Walker this policy marked the steady retreat of the language (Walker 1990).

Although the language may now have been in retreat, Māori and Pākehā at this time still lived largely separate lives and Māori remained the first language in Māori communities. There is also evidence that during this time, some Māori became aware of the cultural erosion and loss of identity, which was beginning to become apparent. In 1903, the editor of the newspaper, *Piwhareroa*, warned against the neglect of the Māori tongue (Walker 1990).

The Māori Response

During this period Māori again sought ways of responding to the ongoing threats to their rangatiratanga and new manifestations of kotahitanga emerged.

The first was a strategy to attempt to work within the Pākehā system and to manipulate it to Māori advantage. This was the approach taken by Ngata, Pomare and Buck, who as members of the Young Māori Party established in 1909, advocated adaptation to western society and law as well as the retention of a strong Māori cultural identity as the keys to Māori well-being. Ngata's *whakataukī* (following), which encapsulates the theory he and his colleagues advocated, is today still one of the most well known and often quoted throughout the country.

E tipu, e rea mō ngā rā o tōu āo. Ko tō ringa ki te rākau a te Pākehā hei oranga mō tō tinana. Ko tō ngākau ki ngā tikanga Māori, hei tikitiki mō tō māhunga. Ko tō wairua ki te Atua, nāna nei ngā mea katoa. (Grow up and thrive for the days destined to you, your hand on the tools of the Pākehā to provide your physical sustenance, your heart to the treasures of your Māori ancestors as a diadem for your brow, your soul to your God to whom all things belong).

The movement did much to promote Māori participation in central Government and many reforms to improve the living standards of Māori were passed because of the influence of the Party. Both the Young Māori Party, which emerged from Te Aute Kōhahitanga (Te Aute College Association) and Te Puea, the revered tribal leader of Waikato, promoted a recovery of culture. Initially this focussed on carving. Later, Ngata promoted Māori literature and a language recovery programme.

However, Cox points out that, while a level of Māori cultural renaissance took place through Ngata and his contemporaries working within the Government, Māori continued to maintain their tribal integrity and did not abdicate their responsibilities to parliament. Walker has described the work of the Young Māori party as “the educated elite attempting accommodation with the Pākehā through mainstream politics” (Walker 1990 Pg. 181).

Walker has also said that, “poverty, alienation and a desire for self-determination impelled the Māori to look again for salvation through charismatic leaders” (Walker 1990, Pg.181). Durie also sees the approach of Ngata and his contemporaries as being in contrast with a movement which believed that Māori survival and development did not necessarily rest on the acceptance of Western values and systems, but rather Māori autonomy for their own affairs based on Māori language and culture. The approach of these Māori ‘sovereignists’ was “to focus Māori energies on building an identity which not only lauded Māori language and culture but also included a sense of ownership and control” (Durie 1999 d. Pg. 2).

One such sovereignist was the prophet Rua Kenana who established his community at Maungapōhatu in the Urewera district, home to the Tūhoe tribe. The community was crushed by armed force in 1916 as this attempt to establish a rival sovereignty to the Crown was not to be tolerated.

The Government of the day, with its staunch belief in its own absolute sovereignty was keen to quash the sort of approach advocated by Rua Kenana, and tried to appease Māori by accommodating the more moderate approach of Ngata within its policies of assimilation. An early concession to Māori calls to retain some control over their own affairs was made when Māori Councils were established to replace tribalism in 1900 under the Māori Councils Act. The main job of the 19 elected Māori councils was to enact and enforce sanitary regulations affecting dwellings, water supplies, and meetings houses (Cox 1993 Pg. 95). However, according to Cox, “while providing Māori with a degree of autonomy and a level of input into local affairs, they fell short of the demands which were being voiced by adherents to both major Kotahitanga movements of the previous period, the Kauhanganui and the Pāremata Māori” (Cox 1993 Pg. 96).

These Councils are another example of what Cox described as Government established structures, ostensibly to give Māori some limited control of their own affairs, but in practice small concessions aimed at placating ongoing Māori demands whilst still maintaining control over Māori development.

This period saw sustained efforts by the Crown to assimilate Māori, while Māori strove for means of maintaining their autonomy and identity as Māori, either working within the mainstream system or without. The colonial Government was still showing no interest in maintaining Māori language and culture. Instead, it took the divide and rule approach by allying itself to the more moderate Ngata ideology and moving quickly to quell the sovereigntists such as Rua Kenana who steadfastly believed that Māori development rested on Māori autonomy for their own affairs based on Māori language and culture (Durie 1999 d.).

Although effectively banned from the schools during this period, the Māori language would not have openly appeared to be in danger, because Māori children were still returning to homes and communities where they could converse in their own language. Yet this schooling policy was clearly designed to stop the use of the language and as suggested by Walker was a significant milestone along the path to decline. Walker suggests that Māori leaders, such as Ngata, originally complied with education policy that banned the Māori language, “before the erosion of the language became evident.....because they did not fully understand the role of an education system in cultural reproduction and its power to implement the official policy of assimilation” (Walker 1990 Pg. 193).

1925- 1950 Rural Development

Overall Māori Development

During the second quarter of the century, 1925 – 1950, Māori development was focussed on the rural sector, in spite of the fact that very little land remained in Māori hands.

Ngata again played a lead role by promoting the development of land consolidation schemes and for a while the promise of flourishing rural economies seemed possible (Durie 1999 d.). However two major events were to intervene and change the direction of Māori development again. The first was the Great Depression of the early 1930s. This had a huge effect on Māori, greatly increasing the number unemployed and living in poverty.

It was during this time, that a new pan-tribal Māori movement, the Ratana Movement became politically motivated. This church based movement, established after the First World War by Tahupotiki Wiremu Ratana which preached “unity through a pan-Māori ideology superceding tribal affiliations” (Walker 1990 Pg. 183), was to become a major political force. According to Walker, Ratana’s followers became members of what was referred to as Te Iwi Mōrehu (The Survivors), and distanced themselves from their tribal identity, presenting another attractive alliance for Government.

When the Labour Government came into power in 1935, Ratana made a compact with the then Prime Minister, Michael Joseph Savage, in which he promised the vote of his 40,000

followers. In return the Prime Minister would 'attend to Māori hurts'. What eventuated was the creation of a welfare state and huge Māori dependence on that State. Up until this time Māori had seemed intent on maintaining their independence from, or on forcing a shared place in the machinery of that State. Now, they were in a situation where they became dependent on the State for their very livelihood. The Māori-Labour bond, formed during this period continues, albeit somewhat less securely, until this day.

The second significant event to occur during this period and which, according to Durie, enforced Māori links with the Crown was the Second World War. Ngata encouraged Māori to enlist, believing that such a contribution and sacrifice would create an obligation on the Government to take some action to address Māori grievances. Māori responded by enlisting in the Māori battalion in large numbers. Others, not eligible for military service, worked in war-related industries and factories. This was coordinated by the Māori War Effort Organisation, a network of tribal committees, coordinated through a parliamentary committee. The Organisation also undertook fund raising, produced goods for the war effort and became involved in matters of social welfare. Cox says that Māori preferred to deal with the War Effort Organisation rather than the Department of Native Affairs and this resulted in tensions within the Parliament (Cox 1993 Pg. 102).

After the war, Māori sought to have the new iwi-based network developed during the war formalised through legislation.

"their vision was to form a national organisation that stood apart from the Department of Native Affairs and was directly responsible to Members representing Māori electorates. This redefinition of administrative responsibility would, it was hoped, provide greater independence for Māori and remove Māori Affairs from the control of Ministers, appointed by the majority government. Theoretically at least, Māori would have a real say in who would establish and implement Māori policy" (Cox 1993 Pg. 102).

What they got, however, was a new Department of Māori Affairs employing Māori managers, many former officers of the Māori Battalion (Durie 1999 d.), and which replaced the Department of Native Affairs), and a 'reconstituted' Māori committee structure based on the 1900 Māori Council model.

Language during this period

Māori remained significantly a rural people during this period and the vast majority could speak Māori, but the majority were also more or less fluent in English at this time, because of the extensive campaign co-ordinated through the State school system. It was during this period, according to Benton, that Māori were beginning to succumb to the powerful influence of English. He believes that the onset of the near demise of the Māori language can be traced to the 1930s. "...it seems fairly clear that before the Second World War the vast majority of Māoris were native-speakers of the Māori language, although during the 1930s a tendency toward the abandonment the language in favour of English had already been noted" (Benton 1986 Pg. 15).

He refers to a widespread 'ambivalence' about the place of Māori language in Māori development, which he says was typified by Ngata who had huge influence as the leading Māori politician of the time. Ngata was one of the most fervent supporters of the English language throughout the 1930s, yet on the other hand spent much of his time putting together Ngā Mōteatea, the most extensive collection of Māori language poetry and song ever produced. This ambivalence, however, seems to have been short lived.

At a conference in 1936 Ngata said that if he were to devise a curriculum for Māori schools, he would make English four out of the five subjects. Three years later Ngata changed his views when he saw the effect schooling had in subverting Maori culture. He believed there was nothing worse than for a person to have Maori features without being able to speak the Maori language" (Walker 1990 Pg. 193)

It was a period in which both The Great Depression and the Second World War brought Māori and Pākehā into closer contact with one another. Benton describes how the 'uncompromisingly assimilationist' policies which had English as the only means of instruction in the Native Schools and then banned the use of Māori altogether in the classroom and playground, were gradually modified during this period, under the significant influence of Ngata.

Māori arts and crafts were introduced into schools and in 1929, Māori language became a University of NZ degree 'unit' for a Bachelor of Arts degree, and also a University Entrance subject. In 1945 Māori language was accepted as a subject for School Certificate. In spite of this progress, Benton points out that during this period the actual teaching of the Māori language was confined to the Māori high schools and Māori church boarding schools (Benton 1989 Pgs. 25-26).

Benton goes on to describe that during the 1930s there was a growing demand for the teaching of Māori in the compulsory education system. Much of the pressure he said came from the academics and scholars of Māori culture. Stewart's 1992 thesis 'Te Mauri o Te Reo' (The Life Force of the Language) refers to the historical process of the re-introduction of the Māori language into the academic curriculum of New Zealand Schools as an enigma (Stewart 1992). Rather than starting naturally at the primary school level and working up to university level as all other subjects, Māori language was first introduced as a university subject, as a "curiosity subject, necessary for the study of anthropology, more a Māori studies subject than Māori language", and worked its way down to the primary and eventually pre-school level (Stewart 1992 Pg. 40).

1950-1975 Urbanisation

The urbanisation which occurred during the third quarter of the century from 1950 to 1975 marked a new stage of Māori development. Needing cheap labour to support the rapid industrialization that was occurring, the State enticed Māori, by the thousands, into the cities. They flocked to the cities rejecting the unemployment and low wages in the rural communities, and seeking work and prosperity instead. They filled the manual and unskilled workforce gap and thus contributed to a period of economic prosperity for the nation.

Integration

However, while the country on the whole prospered, Māori remained largely in the unskilled and manual workforce at the bottom of the socio-economic scale. The effects of the sudden unplanned and uncoordinated displacement of Māori from small close knit rural communities to the urban areas were to be great. 'Integration', replaced assimilation as the Government's Māori development focus during this period and policies designed to 'integrate' Māori into Pākehā society were introduced. Perhaps the most common example is the policy known as 'pepperpotting' whereby Māori families were deliberately interspersed with Pākehā families as a means of integration into Pākehā society. And integration to a large extent did occur. Māori and Pākehā were really brought face to face with one another during this time and intermarriage became common place. Clearly the will to live and work together was strong and even today, New Zealand society is one of the most highly integrated amongst colonised countries.

The Māori Response

While, on the one hand integration was rapidly occurring, Māori, isolated from their traditional links, continued to seek alliances with one another and sought further ways of expressing kotahitanga. From 1965, a number of urban marae (meeting area of whānau, hapū, iwi, focal point of settlement) were established. While some were traditional kin based marae, many others were set up by and for groups of Māori from different iwi, now commonly referred to as 'pan-tribal groups'. Both served the purpose of enabling groups of Māori to retain their cultural points of difference from the mainstream Pākehā society. For example, Walker talks of kin groups setting aside suburban garages to enable the highly important custom of tangihanga (period of mourning for, and farewell to, the dead) to take place in the city when Māori whānau were unable to return to their tribal regions for these events.

Those common Māori links also resulted in the formation of further organisations along the 'pan-tribal' or 'community development' model. This model, unlike iwi development, tended to minimise tribal difference and focused more on Māori as 'one people'. The Māori Women's Welfare league, with its motto, 'tātou, tātou' (working together), which was established to work for the development of all Māori women, is one example of this model. Again, it was a Māori initiative that the Government felt it could

lend support to because it fitted with its policy of integration and the ongoing desire to eradicate tribalism.

in the second theme developed to examine Māori unity, 'He Iwi Tahī Tātou' (we are one people), a noticeable shift in emphasis is observable and State initiative and sponsorship supplants iwi-derived structures. It will be shown that the Crown has imposed upon Māori structures which were designed to give a semblance of autonomy while in fact they have allowed the State to direct and focus activity (Cox 1993 Pg. 8).

The Māori Welfare Act of 1962 abolished tribal committees and replaced them with Māori committees, and created the New Zealand Māori Council. The Government funded Māori Council, according to Walker, advocated on behalf of Māori on a number of issues. However, it differed from other organisations such as the Māori Women's Welfare League, in that Government used it as a sounding board for proposed legislation. It was another structure through which some Māori felt they could progress Māori development. "...the deliberations of the Council were driven by the same Māori agenda that drove the Welfare League, Ratana, Ngata and his colleagues, the Māori Parliament, Kauhanganui and the chiefs - the struggle of Māori leaders for the good of the people against the forces of colonisation" (Walker 1990 Pg. 205).

Towards the later part of this period, conscious of their relatively disadvantaged position in society, Māori began once again to engage in active protest and militancy, which would intensify and continue throughout the 1970s. Various movements calling for the return of land, cultural revival, the honoring of The Treaty of Waitangi and the reinstatement of iwi development began during the late 1960s. Walker refers to the rising political consciousness of the 'modern Māori activists', young urban Māori, for example, members of Ngā Tamatoa (Young Warriors) (Walker 1990). While at one level integration was proceeding, at another level, ongoing Māori grievances were simmering away beneath the surface...

Language During this period

The rapid urbanisation which occurred during this period had a dramatic impact on the Māori language. It contributed directly to the interruption of intergenerational transmission, one of Fishman's prerequisites for a healthy, living language. Many Māori, already isolated from their traditional homeland, were, in the cities, also isolated from other speakers of Māori. They found themselves surrounded by a world in which the English language dominated, including mono-cultural and mono-lingual television and radio, and often with spouses whose English language culture dominated. This seems to have endorsed the lingering association of progress and prosperity with the adoption of things European, including the English language.

Many city based Māori appear to have stopped using their heritage language on a daily basis and passing it on to their children during this time. What Benton referred to as a tendency toward the abandonment of the language in favour of English during the 1930s

(Benton 1986 Pg. 5) became a clear trend. “Māori parents throughout the country seem to have made a collective decision (albeit unconsciously) to use English rather than Māori in bringing up their children” (Biggs, in Benton 1987 Pg. 66).

The bracketed ‘albeit unconsciously’ used by Biggs is an important point. To this day an element of blame for the state of the Māori language today is placed squarely at the feet of Māori themselves, by those who believe that Māori simply abandoned it by choice. However, it is highly unlikely that at any given point of time Māori collectively decided that they would no longer use their native language, so the term ‘abandonment’ seems somewhat inappropriate. It is more likely that the influences of English, magnified by urbanisation, and the ongoing psychological legacy of being punished for speaking their language at school, saw Māori turning to English as a matter of survival for themselves and in the belief that this would lead to a better future for their children.

Some of the testimonies reveal that some Māori parents – always with their children’s best interests in mind – deliberately discouraged their children from speaking Māori at home. There is no evidence however, that Māori at any stage ever sought the demise of the language of their ancestors. Rather, when faced with limited options concerning their children’s futures, they unwittingly made decisions which contributed to the decline of te reo (Simon/Smith 2001 Pg. 172).

Benton offers another viewpoint. He acknowledges what many experts claim to be the two causes of near language death, the physical destruction of a speech community and a decision by its members not to transmit the language to future generations. However, he offers a third contributing cause of near language death, which he believes was a factor in the near death of the Māori language. It is when the dominant speech community whose members will not themselves learn the minority language, decide that the minority language shall not be transmitted, and by

conscious or unconscious pressures transmitted through social institutions like the school and the mass media, encourage children to resist their parents’ efforts to transmit their linguistic heritage. The dominant language is thus perceived by children as far more useful and important than the minority language, even when parents have made a conscious effort to maintain the latter in the home” (Benton 1979 Pgs. 15 – 16).

While this so called ‘abandonment’ of the Māori language was occurring, calls for the retention of the Māori language and culture were central to the protest activity of the late sixties and early seventies. For example, the Māori Organisation on Human Rights (MOOHR) accused the education system of ‘cultural murder’ because Māori language was not available to Māori children in the schools (Walker 1990 Pg. 210).

Ngā Tamatoa organised a petition calling for the inclusion of the Māori language in the education system at the primary as well as at the secondary level and they pushed for the establishment of a one-year teacher training scheme for adult native speakers of the

language. To demonstrate the feasibility of the scheme, they took parties of urban youth to rural marae to learn the language from their elders. Ngā Tamatoa's campaign pressured the third Labour Government to introduce the teaching of Māori at primary and secondary schools in 1974, supported by a one-year teacher training scheme for native speakers.

Ngā Tamatoa were also behind the introduction of 'Māori Language Week'. Originally introduced as 'Māori Language Day' the idea was that one day a year be set aside to celebrate the Māori language with special Māori language activities. The idea was picked up by the education system and eventually extended to one week. 'Māori Language Week' is still celebrated today.

Walker believes that the leaders of Ngā Tamatoa were so relentless in their language campaign because many of them were either unable to speak Māori or had only limited ability in the language. This led to them feeling culturally disadvantaged and cheated by a monocultural education system (Walker 1990).

Summary Chapter One

A number of conclusions can be drawn from this brief overview of Māori development from the pre and early contact days until 1975.

Chapter One has shown Māori consistently striving to retain the control of their tribal, and increasingly pan-tribal mana and rangatiratanga throughout the process of colonisation. In other words Māori have continually sought to determine their own development as Māori, as a distinct cultural group, and have consistently resisted Pākehā attempts at assimilating and integrating iwi/Māori into Pākehā society.

To this end, the Chapter has illustrated how Māori have established and trialed a number of different structures or expressions of kotahitanga in attempts to maintain some control over their own development. These strategies have varied from attempting to work within the political system to establishing parallel or alternative systems of governance.

The Chapter has also discussed how Māori leaders have consistently called for Māori language and culture to be included as a defining aspect of Māori development. While varying from the more moderate approach of Ngata, to the staunchly Māori worldview of those such as Rua Kenana, all have sought to ensure that Māori continue to develop as Māori.

The Crown however, has openly pursued policies designed to break down the traditional Māori development frameworks, and thereby the Māori culture itself, with its policies of assimilation, and then integration. It has set up its own structures for this purpose and has strategically allied itself with those Māori structures that tended away from the traditional tribal structures.

Chapter One has discussed how The Treaty of Waitangi, a document which might have laid the basis for agreed development goals and a solid partnership between two peoples was largely ignored by successive Governments in the period up until 1975. It saw the decision making power transferred from the majority population to the minority and the role of policy making, previously held by individual iwi, shifted to the State.

Clearly the overview has shown Māori and the Crown pursuing different Māori development goals. For Māori, the central goal was to retain control over their development and ensure the survival of their culture, while for the State, up until mid 1970's, it was to assimilate and then integrate the Māori people, including their language and culture.

With regards to the language, this Chapter has discussed how the Māori language moved from being a healthy living language to a threatened language, as a result of the colonisation of New Zealand and culminating in the urbanisation of the 1950s. It has discussed the connection between loss of power and loss of the language and its culture.

Finally, this first Chapter has also shown that the effects of colonisation on the language were not immediately apparent, but that when it became obvious that the language was under threat, Māori rapidly mobilised to call for its retention. It has suggested that Māori did not make a collective conscious decision to 'abandon' their heritage language as has often been portrayed, but that many Māori, living in urban areas reluctantly succumbed to insurmountable pressure to switch to English.

CHAPTER TWO

Māori Development 1975-2000

Introduction

Chapter Two continues the overview of Māori development undertaken in Chapter One. However, it examines the 1975-2000 period in more depth. This period saw New Zealand enter a new 'post-colonial' era and was also a period in which Māori development escalated and the relationship between Māori and the State changed dramatically. Chapter Two looks again at the key events and trends occurring during this period, their impact on overall Māori development and continues to focus on the interface between Māori and the Crown as one of the key factors influencing Māori development.

It also focuses on Māori language issues against the backdrop of overall Māori development. Referred to as a period of "Te Tiriti (the Treaty), Claims, Settlement, Autonomy" (Durie 1999 d. Pg. 4), this Chapter will show that it was also a period of 'Te Reo' (The Language).

As it continues this exploration of Māori development, Chapter Two will again test some of the hypotheses outlined in the introduction. It seeks to provide further evidence that cultural survival, including that of the Māori language, has always been and remains a key Māori development goal. It also continues to seek to prove the second hypothesis, that Māori cultural survival has never been a priority for Government.

While Chapter One was organised in terms of Māori response to Crown action, this Chapter reverses that trend. This twenty-five year period from 1975 to the turn of the century was one in which the Crown was forced to react to a new level of Māori militancy and to rethink its Māori development policies and relationship with Māori. Paul Spoonley has put it this way.

But the increasingly urban location of Māori, the ongoing damage to the reproduction of language and cultural practices and an ever-present economic marginalisation combined to encourage a new set of Māori politics in the 1970s. New strategists and brokers emerged, and while the primary concerns had not altered, the way in which the state and Pakeha were confronted did. (Spoonley 1995 Pg.100).

Overall Māori Development

Protest

Influenced by the success of civil rights movements in the United States, protest action of groups such as Ngā Tamatoa, referred to in the previous Chapter, gained momentum during this period. Māori were encouraged and supported by other indigenous peoples around the world who were also becoming more vocal about their grievances and demanding recognition of what they believed to be their special rights of indigeneity. The 'international indigenous peoples movement' was forming and becoming a formidable political force. Governments, including New Zealand's, were targets for criticism and embarrassment at the predicament of their indigenous peoples. This came as something of a shock for a country which, since World War Two, had prided itself on its egalitarian society.

The 'young radical Māori protest movement' was joined by Māori from all walks of life, including influential elders such as Whina Cooper who led the Land March in 1975. This and other protests of the era such as those over Bastion Point and the Raglan Golf Course, have become part of our history books as some of the most prominent protest events ever staged in this country. With the attention of the international mass media it became impossible for the New Zealand Government to ignore Māori grievances any longer.

This protest action, both in New Zealand and in other countries where the indigenous peoples had been colonised, had the positive effect of contributing to a slow change in general attitudes towards colonisation. The last 50 years has seen an "emerging public consensus on the need to ensure justice to indigenous populations dispossessed of land and often of their culture by land-hungry and paternalistic settler populations" (Coates and Mchugh, 1998 Pg. 20).

Spoonley has said that, "...the 1980's mark a significant watershed in how Pākehā have come to understand their role in the history of Aotearoa. They moved from seeing themselves as 'colonised' (in relation to the British) to a perception of themselves as 'colonisers' in relation to the Māori (Spoonley 1995, Pg. 99).

Certainly there appears to have been a general change in attitude and a new element of public support for Māori grievances during this time. This, coupled with the open acknowledgment on behalf of the Crown of past injustices and a desire to settle claims of grievance, according to Walker "...cast New Zealand firmly into the post-colonial era..." (Walker 1990 Pg. 254).

Māori however, did more than protest during this period. It was a period in which many, to some extent, took their rangatiratanga back into their own hands and there was a surge of both economic and cultural development (Durie 1999 d.). Māori became not only key players in the economic and business world, but also set up world renowned cultural development initiatives. Many examples of 'positive Māori development' emerged during this period. While there was a strengthening of iwi based development, pan-tribal

organisations like the Māori Women's Welfare League were joined by others such as the Urban Māori Authorities (UMAs). Some of the key cultural initiatives established during this period, were those based on the community development or pan-tribal model, for example, the Kōhanga Reo movement (Māori language pre-school movement).

Ongoing Disparities/The Emergence of the New Right

Progress, however, was uneven and the process of radical societal change which New Zealand society as a whole embarked upon from the mid 1980s was to have mixed results for Māori development.

The 'new right' values of open competition, privatisation, de-regulation of the economy, reduced dependence on the State and 'user pays' swept through the country. Some Māori saw these values as being compatible with their Māori development aspirations. For example, some saw advantages in a lesser role for the State, providing an opportunity for iwi/Māori to move away from the dependency mode that had been created in the previous periods. Others saw opportunities to establish a level of autonomy over their own affairs.

On the other hand, many of the new free market policies introduced during this period hit Māori hard. Unemployment rose dramatically in many sectors and it was Māori, disproportionately represented in the unskilled and manual workforce, who suffered the most.

The Crown Response

The scale and intensity of the protest action, bad international press, new emerging attitudes regarding the effects of colonisation and the irrefutable disparities between Māori and non-Māori across the spectrum of social statistics, were to culminate in a new approach by the State to Māori development.

The Waitangi Tribunal and the Settlement of Claims

Durie has referred to this period as being dominated by the Treaty of Waitangi. One of the key Government responses to the persistent calls from Māori for Government to 'honour' the Treaty, was the passing of the Treaty of Waitangi Act of 1975. This Act, passed in the last days of the Rowling Labour Government, upon the advice of the then Minister of Māori Affairs, Matiu Rata, established the Waitangi Tribunal. Temm has described the Act as having been a direct response by Government to the tremendous emotion aroused as a result of the land march of 1975 from North Cape to the steps of Parliament in Wellington" (Temm 1990 Pg. 6).

The Tribunal, a permanent commission of inquiry was empowered to "hear any claim by any Māori or group of Māori people that some action of the Crown had been prejudicial to them and was in conflict with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi" (Temm 1990 Pg. 5).

The Tribunal was empowered to interpret both the Māori and English versions of the Treaty and to make recommendations to the Government in relation to such claims. Initially, the Tribunal was only empowered to consider claims relating to Crown action after the date of the passing of the Act. This severely limited the ability of the Tribunal, which could not therefore consider any historical complaints relating to the colonial administration or successive New Zealand Governments prior to 1975 (Temm 1990 Pg. 5).

With its limited jurisdiction, many Māori saw the Tribunal as a sham and pressed for the extension of its jurisdiction. A national hui held at Turangawaewae to discuss the Treaty of Waitangi passed a resolution recommending to the Government that the Tribunal be given retrospective powers to 1840. The Labour Government again responded by passing the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act of 1985, a highly contentious decision, which gave the tribunal retrospective jurisdiction, allowing it to investigate complaints regarding breaches of the Treaty back to 1840. The establishment of the Tribunal and, in particular, the extension of its jurisdiction to 1840, marked a significant turnaround for the Government. Past injustices could now be openly acknowledged and the settlement of related grievances became the focus of Māori-State relationships and a key Government Māori development policy.

A floodgate was opened with the 1985 amendment to the Act, and claims began to pour in, beginning a new period in Māori development in which the “settlement of claims has become a major national preoccupation” (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 179). There have been some major settlements and many smaller ones, but rarely has the process been smooth...

Major Treaty of Waitangi Cases, Settlements

Case by case, there was an examination of injustices that had never been resolved in the past, nor openly admitted, and again and again it was found that the Crown had failed to meet its obligation under the Treaty. Most New Zealanders were surprised to know that the Crown did have Treaty obligations; and many became anxious lest they be taken seriously (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 175).

In the early 1980s the Tribunal issued four reports, Motunui, Kaituna, Manukau Harbour and Te Reo. Referred to by Temm as the four cornerstone decisions, these reports were all significant in setting the scene for how the Treaty would be interpreted in years to come.

The first three related to the environment. They were significant in giving prominence to the importance of Māori cultural values establishing that the Treaty could no longer be considered a “simple nullity” in law, as proclaimed by Judge Prendergast in 1877, and for publicly declaring past wrongs perpetrated against iwi (Temm 1990).

The fourth, the Māori language claim, which will be discussed in more detail later in this Chapter, has particular significance as being the first claim taken to the Tribunal on behalf of all Māori. It also “explained the importance of the Māori language and culture

not only to Māori New Zealanders but also to the country as a whole” (Temm 1990 Pg. 59).

Thus, claims and settlements came to dominate Māori–Crown relations. By 1995, the Tribunal had written 45 reports (Durie 1998 a. Pg.185). Four years later, in 1989, the number of claims and the extent of litigation relating to the Treaty had become problematic for the Government and a strategy to allow ‘direct negotiation’ of settlements between Government and Māori was introduced. Aimed at turning the Treaty back to the political arena away from the Tribunal and the Courts, the Government established an Office of Treaty Settlements to negotiate the settlement of claims directly and on behalf of Government.

The Fisheries Settlement

What is now commonly known as the ‘Sealords Deal’ refers to the Fisheries Settlement of 1992, embodied in the Treaty of Waitangi (Fisheries Claims) Settlement Act. This was an important case, negotiated and settled directly with the Government, and like the Te Reo claim, on behalf of all Māori. The settlement came after years of lengthy Tribunal and court hearings as Māori challenged the Government about breaches of what they considered to be their Treaty based fishing rights.

The very controversial settlement was rushed through parliament late one night, based on dubious mandate from Māori. The final settlement package, worth approximately half a billion dollars, also contained a clause ending forever Government’s Treaty obligations in relation to commercial fishing.

Subsequent and ongoing disputes between traditional iwi groups and pan-tribal and/or urban Māori about how the dividends should be allocated, have fiercely divided Māori ever since. The latest ruling by the Privy Council, (2001), that the traditional iwi should allocate the settlement money is likely to lead to further action by urban Māori or pan-tribal groups.

Fiscal Envelope 1994

Perhaps realising the enormity of some of the claims and the potential cost of the associated settlements to the Government, such as the Fisheries Settlement, Government looked at how it might contain matters. In 1994, the National Government announced its proposed policy for the settlement of outstanding Treaty claims. The ‘Fiscal Envelope’, like the introduction of direct negotiations, was another attempt by Government to contain and establish some end point to the Treaty settlements process. While the fisheries settlement was for all Maori, the Government’s new proposal, contained in the Fiscal Envelope was to settle claims by direct negotiation on an iwi by iwi basis” (Durie 1998 a.).

Broadly speaking, the Fiscal Envelope policy was intended to settle all outstanding claims over a ten-year period with a proposed budget of one billion dollars. Legislation

would be introduced to ensure that all claims were full and final, and there would be no inclusion of natural resources or the conservation estate in any settlements. The policy proposal met widespread rejection by Māori, unhappy at not having been fully consulted, the plan to exclude the conservation estate and natural resources, the interpretation of the Treaty itself and the one billion dollar 'cap'.

The worst fears, that policy had already been decided and that consultation was merely an exercise in distributing information were subsequently borne out. Before the 1996 general election, three settlements had been negotiated using the framework contained in the fiscal envelope. Policy or not, it had become the practice (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 191).

And in practice, this meant that iwi/Māori were now in a situation where they were having to compete with one another for what they believed would be a fair 'piece of the cake'.

Tainui Settlement

The Tainui Settlement of 1995, negotiated on behalf of Waikato iwi by the late Sir Robert Mahuta, was the first major iwi settlement. The Tainui claim was predominately related to the unlawful confiscation of 486, 502 hectares of land taken under the New Zealand Settlements Act 1863. The settlement included the return of 15, 790 hectares, an apology from the Queen and monetary compensation to the value of \$170 million.

Ngāi Tahu Settlement

Ngāi Tahu first lodged their claim with the Tribunal in 1986. The Ngāi Tahu settlement, negotiated by Sir Tipene O'Regan on behalf of Ngāi Tahu was finally signed, ten years later, in 1996, after long and drawn out negotiations with the Crown including High Court action. Although the monetary value of the settlement was also \$170 million, it related to claims of "dispossession, deceit, broken promises and inflicted poverty" (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 200).

Treaty in Courts and Law

Prior to the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal, Māori had on numerous occasions used the courts to try and address Treaty grievances. However, this had been fraught with difficulty unless the Treaty was referred to in legislation. Since the passing of the Treaty of Waitangi Act, there has been a vast amount of litigation in relation to the Treaty and this has resulted in a growing body of jurisprudence about how it should be interpreted. The result is that, effectively, it is now no longer impossible to ignore the Treaty. It was also during this period that there was a move, by both Māori and Crown to consider the Treaty by its underlying principles as opposed to the various Articles. However, this too had its problems with no common agreement being reached over what the key principles are and which should take precedence.

State Owned Enterprises Act (SOE)1986

Treaty clauses were included in a number of pieces of legislation during this period. Perhaps the most notable case was the action taken by the New Zealand Māori Council against the Government over the introduction of the State Owned Enterprises bill. This resulted in the inclusion of an amendment to the SOE Act, which added the clause ‘Nothing in this act shall permit the Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi’ (SOE Act 1986). The Court of Appeal eventually found that “for Government to transfer assets to a State Owned Enterprise without establishing a system to consider consistency with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi would be unlawful (Durie 1998 a. Pg.183).

The inclusion of the Treaty in legislation has been treated more cautiously since this case. However, although they may be ‘watered down’ versions of the SOE clause they have helped to give the Treaty teeth. Some, like the Resource Management Act of 1991 recognise the right of Māori to exercise control over their own affairs, providing scope for iwi and Māori to participate in the local management of resources. The Conservation Act of 1987, another example, has led to a number of innovative arrangements between Māori and the Crown concerning the management of conservation lands.

Te Whānau o Waipareira Report

Lodged with the Tribunal in 1994, this claim was made by Te Whānau o Waipareira Trust, a non-tribal Māori community based organisation in West Auckland, providing social services to its community. It alleged that the Crown had failed to recognise the Trust’s Article Two rights of rangatiratanga under the Treaty of Waitangi. The report, released in 1998, found that the Crown had failed to recognise the Trust’s special status as a Māori organisation in accordance with its Article Two obligations.

This was a hugely significant case for those Māori who believed that the future of Māori development did not rest on the traditional tribal/iwi structures alone, as it implied that other Māori organisations could also exercise rangatiratanga. This case, along with the Fisheries Settlement Case, was indicative of the rising tension within Māoridom during this time, between those affiliating to the traditional iwi structure, and those affiliating to the pan-tribal community based Māori organisations. The Waipareira Report is also significant because of its implications for how the Treaty might be included in future social policy.

Bi-culturalism

While, as Durie suggests, the Treaty and settlement of claims may have become a national preoccupation during this period, there are other trends and events that were an important part of Māori development during this final quarter of the century.

The term ‘bi-culturalism’ gained wide public acceptance in the early 1980s and many Government departments began to adopt bi-cultural policies. The word ‘partnership’

gained popularity and became perhaps the most often quoted principle of the Treaty. There was a lot of discussion about what partnership meant and how it might be put into practice. The idea of consulting with Māori over the development of Government policy and actively engaging Māori in the delivery of Government services began to be entertained. The catch phrase 'two peoples one nation', as an alternative to Governor Hobson's declaration of 'now we are one people', at the time of the signing of the Treaty, became common. Consideration of ways of enabling Māori some autonomy over their own affairs, at the local level, took place. Puao-te-ata-tu (Day Break), the report released in 1986 as a result of a review into the Department of Social Welfare by a ministerial advisory committee, found the Department guilty of 'institutional racism'. This sent shock waves around the public service as all departments began to examine their policies and practices.

Indigenous Peoples' Rights

Māori continued to be actively involved in the international indigenous peoples movement which was seeking to have the rights of indigenous peoples throughout the world recognised. In 1982, The United Nations Commission on Human Rights established the Working Group on Indigenous Populations. By 1993 it had developed the Draft International Declaration on Indigenous Peoples' Rights. The declaration, which is still undergoing debate prior to ratification, clearly articulates the right of indigenous peoples to self-determination and to maintain and protect their culture heritage.

Hui Taumata 1984

Another example of the new political environment and more conciliatory approach towards Māori was the convening of the Hui Taumata by the fourth Labour Government in 1984. This hui (meeting, gathering) of Māori leaders was called to examine the current position of Māori and to seek direction for a way ahead. It was at this hui that the term 'positive Māori development' was coined, and a decade of Māori development was prescribed. There appeared to be a new optimism amongst Māori who, as stated earlier, found some of the New Right values not incompatible with their own desires for Māori development (Durie 1998 a.). For example, the move towards decreasing the role of the State, fitted with the Māori desire for greater independence and economic self reliance. The hui agreed to six key themes that participants believed were central to positive Māori development. The Treaty of Waitangi, Tino Rangatiratanga, Iwi Development, Economic Self-Reliance, Social Equity and Cultural Advancement.

The Hui Taumata sparked a number of policies and initiatives by both Māori and the State which saw the strengthening of both tribal and pan-Māori groups. Many iwi radio stations were established during this period and Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori (Māori language primary schools) were established. From the early 1990s, many iwi and other Māori organisations entered into contractual relationships with Government agencies, such as the Regional Health Authorities and the Department of Social Welfare to deliver health and social services to their people.

Devolution/Tribal Autonomy

With the release of the Labour Party discussion document, *He Tirohanga Rangapū* (Partnership Perspectives) in 1988 it looked as though the Government had turned towards the tribes and autonomy as a means of advancing Māori development. The document proposed a reduction in the Department of Māori Affairs and devolution of its functions to iwi as means to giving effect to the Treaty principle of partnership. This was followed by a further document, this time a policy statement, that same year. 'Te Urupare Rangapū (Partnership Response) established the Ministry of Māori Affairs in place of the Department of Māori Affairs. The new Ministry was to focus on policy development and an Iwi Transition Agency was also established to prepare iwi for devolution. Under devolution, resources were to be transferred to iwi to deliver programmes and services to their people. In preparation for devolution, the Rūnanga Iwi Act, the first piece of legislation 'to recognise the status of the tribes' (Durie 1998 a. Pg.225) was passed in 1990. It provided for the establishment of Rūnanga-a-Iwi, iwi bodies independent of the Crown.

Disparate opinions exist as to the motives behind the Labour Party's move to recognise and devolve some autonomy to iwi. Parata has described Te Urupare Rangapū as "the only short-lived attempt (to date) of a Government to work with the resilient Māori cultural structures of whānau, hapū, iwi and marae" (Parata 1994 Pg. 136).

Hill and O'Malley however, believe that while on the surface the Labour Government favored Māori autonomy, the policy of devolution was consistent with its market driven policies and withdrawal from social intervention. They believe that the Government's motive in pursuing devolution was not so much one of empowering tribal authorities, but one of divesting to tribes many of the Government's 'welfare state' functions. Iwi were to be charged with solving the many socio-economic problems that its own right-wing economic policies had created (Hill and O'Malley 2000 Pg. 23). This supported concerns that many iwi did not have the capacity for this sudden shift and that without significant support they were merely being set up for failure.

In addition, Hill and O'Malley believe that the Rūnanga Iwi Act, by requiring those tribes opting into the system of devolved power to see their iwi authorities become legally approved in order to receive Government funding for state programmes, as being another example of structures being established by the Government for its own purposes (Hill and O'Malley 2000 Pg. 23)

Mainstreaming

In the end, devolution of authority to iwi was relatively short lived. The National Party moved quickly to repeal the Act soon after it came into power in November of 1991. The new Government 'reverted to central Government control and continued Māori dependence on the state rather than the possibility of self-reliance' (Parata 1994 Pg. 136), with a policy which has become known as mainstreaming.

'Mainstreaming' was heralded in National Party's new Māori policy direction statement, 'Ka Awatea' (It is dawn). Under this policy, each Government department was charged with being responsive to Māori, and resources previously tagged for Māori development and dispersed by the Department for Māori Affairs, were spread across the State Sector.

Ka Awatea placed emphasis on Māori community development initiatives as well as iwi based ones. It proposed tighter monitoring of Government departments, and disestablished the Iwi Transition Agency and the Ministry of Māori Affairs, and replaced them with Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Māori Development. This new Ministry, in addition to its primary policy role was to have a strong role in monitoring other Government departments and agencies performance in relation to Māori. Ka Awatea was never fully implemented, although successive Governments have incorporated many aspects.

Hui Whakapūmau 1994

At the end of the Decade of Māori Development a second Māori development conference, the Hui Whakapūmau (Consolidation Hui) was held. Its aim was to review progress made over the decade and to seek future directions for Māori development. Māori leaders were divided about the effectiveness of the decade and especially which development model was the best for Māori development – the iwi development model or the community or pan-tribal based development model. There was an extreme range of views. For example, Shane Jones, a strong advocate for the Māori community model, in his paper titled 'Development Through Change', said

It is absurd for people to insist that the Treaty requires Māori to divide themselves on the basis of 1840 criteria. A pan iwi Māori vision is of more relevance to Māori development than the on-going proliferation of organisations claiming to be the authoritative tribal voice.

Representing the other extreme, Sir Robert Mahuta, in his paper, 'Iwi Development and the Waikato-Tainui Experience' said:

In my experience, the Iwi vehicle still holds promise as the most efficient way of ensuring interaction between Māori and the State. I accept that for the urban areas particularly, other vehicles might be required. Suffice to say the Iwi has survived, endured and flourished despite the continue onslaughts of the State.

This debate which continues today is reflected in the term, 'Ngā Matatini Māori' (Diverse Māori Realities), coined by Durie. It is a term used to impress the point that Māori are not, and should not be treated, as a homogenous group. For example, Māori today are both young and old, poor and wealthy, urban and rural and hold the full range of views on any given topic.

In relation to identity, diverse realities mean that to identify as being Māori can mean many things today. At one extreme there are those who believe that knowing and acknowledging ones whakapapa (genealogy) and maintaining strong links to one's tribal base and roots is what constitutes being Māori. Those that adhere to this view often see themselves as being of their primary tribe, e.g. 'Ngāti Porou', 'Ngāi Tahu', first and foremost, and 'Māori', or even 'New Zealander', second. At the other end of the scale are those who argue that those uncertain or unaware of their whakapapa and/or alienated from the traditional tribal structures have an equal claim to the rights and responsibilities of being 'Māori'. In between these two extremes, Durie argues that there are many other 'Māori realities'.

Never the less, the range of views and disagreement over the issue of who is and who speaks for iwi/Māori continued to develop throughout this period, and to present itself as a real stumbling block to further attempts at kotahitanga.

New Expressions of kotahitanga - Māori Congress and the New Zealand Māori Council

The growing tensions and divisions between what some were labeling the 'tribal fundamentalists' and 'urban or pan-Māori groups' were reflected in further expressions of, or attempts at kotahitanga during this period.

The New Zealand Māori Congress, an autonomous iwi based and driven forum, was born in 1990 after meetings of iwi who considered the establishment of a national Māori body demanded urgency. It was hoped that it would be able to provide a comprehensive and united view on iwi matters to Government and to avoid any conflicts over the proposed Rūnanga Iwi legislation. In his conclusions to his book 'Kotahitanga', Cox suggested that, in order to succeed the current kotahitanga movement, Congress needed to draw on past kotahitanga movements, to maintain its independence from the State, and to be accountable to iwi alone.

New Zealand Māori Council

The New Zealand Māori Council was also, around this time, exploring options for restructuring itself into a new more inclusive Māori body. This pan-tribal and Government funded structure, like the Māori Congress, met regularly during this period and both were active in representing what they saw as iwi/Māori views and advocating on behalf of those groups.

National Māori Body Politic

One of the goals for future Māori development identified in the concluding remarks to the Hui Whakapūmau in 1994 was the need for an independent and adequately funded Māori body to formulate Māori policy. This time the protagonist was Chief Judge Eddie Durie. This idea was not dissimilar to that of the 'supreme-body politic' proposed under the

Declaration of Independence of 1835, and was about Māori uniting to discuss and resolve matters affecting them all.

A further reference to such a body is made by Durie (M), according to whom, the Māori Congress in 1995, “agreed to promote a Māori body politic which at the very least would play a role in shaping Māori policy at a national level” (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 230).

Durie goes on to say that such a body has long been an aspiration of Māori referring to the Kotahitanga movement leading to the Pāremata Māori and also suggests that “the New Zealand Māori Council and the Māori Women’s Welfare League have also displayed some features of a Māori body politic though without necessarily seeing themselves as a governing body” (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 230).

Māori in Mainstream Politics

From the beginning of this period in the 1970s, Māori became increasingly frustrated at the fact that their participation in the parliamentary system had led to little meaningful change. In 1979, Matiu Rata, the Minister of Māori Affairs left the Labour Party and formed a new party, Mana Motuhake (special power, prestige), dedicated to pursuing autonomy and increased Māori self-reliance. The establishment of this party put pressure on Labour to act on Māori issues and it was influential in the Labour Party’s decision to amend the Treaty of Waitangi Act.

As well as advocating on Māori issues from outside the parliamentary system, Māori interest in mainstream political participation increased significantly during this period. A new system of parliamentary representation, the Mixed Member Proportional System (MMP) was introduced in 1993. This system promised greater scope for small parties and a strong voice in parliament for minority groups. A special Māori option was held in 1994 to enable Māori to either enrol for the first time or to switch rolls, and this resulted in one extra Māori seat from four to five. The first election under this system in 1996 was a significant milestone which Durie says will be remembered as “the dawning of Māori political might”(Durie 1998 a. Pg. 102).

The number of Māori voting on election day was higher than ever before. The election result saw a small and relatively new third party, New Zealand First, which was backed heavily by Māori, hold the balance of power in the resultant Coalition Government. This party captured all five Māori seats and fifteen Māori Members of Parliament (MPs) entered the new parliament. The idea of the Māori MPs forming a united Māori Caucus as a way of pursuing Māori interests was discussed after the election, another attempt at a form of kotahitanga. The failure of a number of smaller Māori parties to do well, such as the Alliance, which included Matiu Rata’s Mana Motuhake party was interpreted by Walker as “A demonstration that Māori wanted to play a part in mainstream politics rather than in ethnic minority politics” (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 103).

Unfortunately New Zealand First failed to deliver for Māori voters and the 1999 election, in which there were six Māori seats, saw Māori return their allegiance to the Labour

Party. At the end of the day the 1996 election was monumental because it showed that the Māori vote could no longer be taken for granted and that MMP and the growing Māori population meant that Maori were now a force in mainstream politics and likely to stay that way.

Māori Language Development During This Period

As stated in the introduction to this Chapter, although described by Durie as a period of “Te Tiriti, Claims, Settlement, Autonomy” it was also a very significant period in Māori language development, as the country experienced a surge of Māori cultural renaissance.

Central to the wave of militancy and protest action of the 1970s were calls for the retention of the language and culture as Māori called on one another to celebrate and insist on their rights to ‘be Māori’. By the 1970s the Māori language was being described as ‘endangered’ and a survey conducted in the mid to late 1970s by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research found that the Māori language was in a perilous state (Te Puni Kōkiri 1999 a. Pg. 6). Groups such as Ngā Tamatoa wasted no time in protesting about this situation and in demanding that the Government take action to restore the language to the people.

At the same time as protesting and calling on the Government for assistance, Māori were doing what they could to prevent the language from dying as some predicted it would, and a large number of initiatives aimed at language and culture revitalisation sprang from within Māori communities.

As commented earlier one of the five goals identified by Māori leaders for Māori development at the Hui Taumata in 1984 was that of cultural advancement. Ten years later, this had not changed with the Hui Whakapūmau again emphasising the centrality of Māori to be Māori as one of the key consensus themes to emerge.

The Waitangi Tribunal’s Te Reo Māori Report of 1986, was one of the first four ‘cornerstone’ Tribunal decisions, and an indication of the importance that the retention of the language and culture had for Māori. The case resulted in an acknowledgement by the Government that it had breached the Treaty in relation to the Māori language, and an acceptance that it had an obligation to help protect and promote the language. The report was to provide Māori with support as it continued to lobby Government throughout the period to take this obligation seriously, in particular with regard to education and broadcasting policy.

This is a period in which Māori worked for the revitalisation of their language on two fronts. Firstly, by constantly protesting and lobbying Government to accept its responsibilities and obligations towards the language, and by developing and implementing their own Māori language revitalisation initiatives.

The Waitangi Tribunal Claim and Te Reo Report - Landmarks for the Language.

The establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975 and the subsequent amendment presented Māori with the opportunity to pressure the Government to consider its obligations to the language and to more actively support the revitalisation process that was taking place in Māori communities. During the early 1980s a claim against the Government was developed and lodged with the Waitangi Tribunal, by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Ngā Kaiwhakapūmau i Te Reo Inc. (Wellington Māori Language Board), on behalf of all Māori. The basis of the claim was that over a century of Government policy or inaction had failed to protect the Māori language and had in fact, caused the tenuous position that it was in. The claimants sought the recognition of the Māori language as an official language of New Zealand. They cited a number of Acts and Government policies as being in breach of the principles of the Treaty. The huge effort and significant cost involved in researching and lodging a claim such as this would reap rewards for those fighting for the survival of the Maori language.

The Waitangi Tribunal's Te Reo Māori Report was released in 1986 and remains one of the most significant events in the history of the language. The Tribunal found that the Crown had clearly been in breach of the Treaty by failing to protect the language, a valued possession or 'taonga' (treasure, prized possession) of the Māori people, as it had undertaken to do in Article Two of the Treaty. The report stated, "The 'guarantee' in the Treaty requires affirmative action to protect and sustain the language, not a passive obligation to tolerate its existence and certainly not the right to deny its use in any place" (Waitangi Tribunal Te Reo Māori Report 1996 Pg.1).

The report went on to make the following five recommendations to the Government:

- *Māori should be a lawful language in all courts of law and in any dealings with Government departments, local authorities, and other public bodies;*
- *A supervising body should be established by statute to supervise and foster the use of the Māori language;*
- *There should be an enquiry into the way Māori children are educated, including the opportunity to learn the Māori language;*
- *Broadcasting policy should recognize that the Treaty obliges the Crown to recognize and protect the Māori language;*
- *Bi-lingualism should be a pre-requisite for some appointments to state services.*

The report had a significant effect on Government's policy making in relation to the language. While not bound by Tribunal recommendations, it would clearly have done little for Māori - Crown relations if Government had simply ignored them.

Māori Language Act 1987

Government appeared to have at least in part, accepted the first and second recommendations of the Tribunal report, and in 1987 passed the Māori Language Act. The Act made the Māori language an official language of the country including the right

to speak Māori in any legal proceedings. The claimants had wanted this extended to dealings with Government departments, local authorities and other public bodies. However, the Act restricted this right to legal proceedings and apart from this reference did not define what an 'official language' would mean in practice.

Under the Act, the Government also established Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori (Te Taura Whiri), the Māori Language Commission. Te Taura Whiri is a Crown Entity whose role is to promote Māori as a living language and to advise and assist Government with related matters. Over the years since its establishment, Te Taura Whiri has played a number of roles, including acting as the 'quality watchdog' for the language, facilitator of immersion courses in the language, and developer of new vocabulary, as well as various promotional activities. The inaugural Māori Language Commissioner, Timoti Karetu, established a high profile for the Commission throughout his term, passionately calling upon both Māori and the Government to save the language from extinction.

The full inquiry into how Māori children are educated recommended by the Tribunal did not take place. However, the Government did begin to pay more attention to Māori language education, and significant developments took place in this area during this period. In fact, Government's Māori language policy seemed set squarely on the education sector. Although the first bilingual class had been established in 1978, these, along with immersion classes dramatically increased over subsequent years. Māori language courses became more common at polytechnics and universities. In 1989, the Government introduced Māori Language Factor Funding which provided funds to schools to assist with the learning of Māori and for the development Māori language resources. Additional resources were dedicated to the training of teachers of Māori. A large number of Government funded Private Training Establishments began to offer Māori language courses and community education courses in the Māori language were subsidised by Government. These are but some examples of the increased support that Government provided via the education system for Māori language education.

The Tribunal's fifth recommendation regarding public sector positions being made bilingual was taken up by a number of Government departments. In 1994, Te Taura Whiri published a document entitled 'Blueprint for a Languages Policy: New Zealand Public Service', and promoted it amongst Government departments. Although it suggested that Government departments develop their own 'languages' policy as opposed to a specifically Māori language policy, it was an attempt to encourage Government departments to accord the Māori language an enhanced status and to plan for an increase in its use in the Government sector.

In 1987 Te Puni Kōkiri (Ministry of Māori Development), conducted a study into the effectiveness of the Blueprint. "Te Reo Māori: Policies and Practices in Selected Public Sector Agencies", found that while most departments involved in the study had developed a range of policies, plans or practices relating to the Māori language, few were based on Te Taura Whiri's Blueprint, nor did many departments have coherent Māori language plans which impacted on the culture of their organisation or the way in which services were delivered.

In the mid 1980s Te Taura Whiri, the State Services Commission and the Public Service Association introduced the 'Government Sector Māori Language Allowance Scheme'. This scheme enabled public servants to sit a test administered by Te Taura Whiri and to be graded on their level of Māori language proficiency. The established proficiency level corresponded to a scaled allowance payable, at the discretion of departments, to those individuals. The scheme was aimed at encouraging public servants to improve and use their Māori language skills and transfer them to their dealings with Māori in the course of their work.

Māori Led Language Initiatives

Māori did much more during this period than take their language case to the Waitangi Tribunal and pressure Government to act on its recommendations. Even before the Tribunal report was released, Māori were busy implementing their own initiatives designed to retain their language and culture.

The first important initiative to have been developed at the Māori community level, was Te Ataarangi movement. Began in 1979, Te Ataarangi is a community based Māori language method for teaching Māori to adults in the community. It is based on Caleb Gatengo's 'Silent Way' methodology for second language teaching. The movement grew rapidly and was networked around the country. It has largely survived on the efforts of voluntary work and donations, avoiding Government funding and thereby fiercely guarding its independence.

Perhaps the most well known of the Māori developed language initiatives is the world renowned Kōhanga Reo movement, in which children are immersed in the Māori language and culture at pre-school centres known as 'kōhanga reo' (language nests). This initiative sprang from within the Māori community and the first was opened at Wainuiomata, Wellington, in 1981. Government responded by providing establishment grants for new kōhanga and this was boosted by donations from kōhanga parents. The Kōhanga Reo National Trust was established and was able to apply for state funding. The movement grew rapidly until 1990 when there was a leveling off in the growth. By 1998 there were 646 kōhanga reo operating across the country (Te Puni Kōkiri 2000 d.).

As a logical extension of the Kōhanga Reo movement, the first Kura Kaupapa Māori was established in 1985, again by a Māori community using its own limited resources. The kura enabled kōhanga graduates to continue their primary school education using the same approach as the kohanga movement. Again, Government began to provide establishment funding for further kura if local communities could prove a demand for such a school in a particular area. This led inevitably to the introduction of the country's first wharekura. Wharekura are composite schools providing Māori immersion education at the primary and secondary school levels. Finally, the first Whare Wānanga, or Māori university, Te Wānanga o Raukawa, was established at Otaki in 1981. The Whare Wānanga o Aotearoa was established in 1993 and Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangi followed in 1997. "Of central concern to each wānanga are mātauranga Māori (Māori

knowledge) and te reo Māori, and the maintenance, development and dissemination of each at the tertiary level” (Te Puni Kōkiri 1999 a. Pg.7).

The reason behind the establishment of the first wānanga at Otaki was a decision by three iwi, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toa Rangātira, and Te Ātiawa in 1975 that some urgent measures needed to be taken to ensure the long-term survival of those iwi. They developed a plan, ‘Whakatipuranga Rua Mano’ (Generation 2000), which aimed, amongst other things, at increasing the number of fluent speakers belonging to the three iwi before the turn of the century. Other iwi started or continued to run their own traditional wānanga where the language and cultural traditions were passed on.

Finally, this was a period in which a number of iwi and regional radio stations went to air. The first, Wellington’s, Te Ūpoko o Te Ika, went live in 1993, initiated by Māori and funded through donations.

Broadcasting

While both Māori and the Government were putting a lot of effort and focus on education as a means of contributing to the revitalisation of the Māori language, Māori had also identified the important role of the broadcasting sector in this process. However, in spite of continuous lobbying by Māori in this area as in education, Government has been more reluctant to ‘take affirmative action to protect and sustain the Māori language through broadcasting policy’ as recommended by the Waitangi Tribunal.

While the Waitangi Tribunal was unable to make any significant recommendations regarding broadcasting in its Te Reo Report because a Royal Commission and a Broadcasting Tribunal were meeting at the same time as the Māori language claim was being heard (Durie 1988 a.), it did state, “It is consistent with the principles of the Treaty that the language and matters of Māori interest should have a secure place in broadcasting”(Waitangi Tribunal Te Reo Māori Report 1986, Pg.41).

The broadcasting sector was fraught with conflict during this period. There were numerous court actions, further claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and persistent protest over issues such as access to the radio frequencies, the transfer of state broadcasting assets to State Owned Enterprises, and the establishment of a Māori television channel.

The ‘Broadcasting Assets Case’ arose in 1988 when the Government announced a restructuring of the broadcasting sector. Māori were concerned about the proposed tendering process for radio frequencies and the transfer of state assets to two new state owned enterprises, Radio New Zealand and Television New Zealand and took the cases to the courts.

The Waitangi Tribunal found in 1990 that Māori should have access to the airwave spectrum and recommended that the tendering process be suspended and that FM frequencies be allocated to Māori. When this didn’t happen, the New Zealand Māori

Council went to the High Court, which ordered a six week delay in the sale of the frequencies by tender while the Waitangi Tribunal completed its investigations.

The High Court finally heard the case regarding the transfer of broadcasting assets in 1991 and found that there had not been a breach of the Treaty. Māori pursued this to the Court of Appeal in 1992. Although the appeal was dismissed, Robin Cooke, the president of the Court of Appeal declared, “the Treaty [of Waitangi] principles of partnership and protection of taonga, past neglect of them at times, and New Zealand’s international obligations can be argued to combine to make it incumbent on the Crown to take reasonable steps to enable Māori language and culture to be protected by broadcasting”

Māori then took the case to the Privy Council in 1993, but it did not support the appeal, finding that the protective mechanisms arranged by the Crown were adequate. The Privy Council did however, go some way to supporting Māori views and endorsed the opinion of the Waitangi Tribunal that language was indeed a taonga, that it had been neglected by the Crown in the past and that the Crown did have an obligation to ensure that the Māori language had a place in broadcasting (Durie 1998 a.).

Te Māngai Pāho (Māori Broadcasting Funding Agency), another Crown Entity, was established as part of these ‘protective mechanisms’. Its main function is to promote Māori language and culture by making funds available for radio and television broadcasting and the production of programmes to be broadcast. Initially funded by a proportion of the public broadcasting fee, it resulted positively in an increase in the number of new iwi radio stations and the percentage of airtime being dedicated to broadcasting in the Māori language on radio frequencies reserved by the Crown for the promotion of Māori language and culture. Before that there had only been Te Ūpoko o Te Ika and Radio Aotearoa. In 1996 Ruia Mai was awarded a contract to run a National Māori radio service which broadcasts daily.

Māori Television

During this period Māori also embarked on a long and ongoing battle to have a dedicated Māori television channel established and litigation has been pursued to this end. The difficulty in progressing this seems to have been in reconciling the two extreme positions, with Māori wanting to control its own television channel and Government favoring mainstream television as a vehicle for Māori language television programmes.

The introduction of programmes such as Te Karere and Marae have provided little more than a token presence of Māori on the television screen. In 1996, a first Māori television channel pilot called the Aotearoa Television network began broadcasting. The network was able to broadcast “a mix of news, commentaries, cultural performances, and comedy reflecting the indigenous population of NZ”(Durie 1998 a. Pg.72). However, the channel was grossly under funded, its management surrounded by controversy and it was wound up approximately one year after it had been established.

This episode left Māori again concerned about their rights to have their language and culture represented by broadcasting, and Māori returned to the Tribunal in 1997 asking it to oversee Broadcasting policy development. By the turn of the century a Māori television channel was still not a reality.

A national hui held in 1990 debated the significance of broadcasting for Māori language development against the background of the restructuring of the Broadcasting Corporation, the allocation of the radio frequencies, and the possibility of additional television channels. The hui concluded that Māori broadcasting required sufficient and independent funding to maintain a television channel, a Māori radio network, a full Māori news service, and a strong Māori presence in mainstream media. It was also agreed that bilingual and bicultural policies should be vigorously pursued in the programming and management of Māori broadcasting bodies and that a Māori Broadcasting Commission should be established” (Durie 1988 a. Pg. 69).

Language – A Right of Indigeneity as well as a Treaty Right

As mentioned earlier, Māori were actively involved during this period in seeking to have their indigeneity recognised internationally. The Draft declaration made a clear statement about the right of indigenous peoples to control and secure their language and culture.

“Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalise, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions,.....States shall take effective measures, when ever any right of indigenous peoples may be threatened, to ensure this right is protected and also to ensure that they can understand and be understood in political, legal and administrative proceedings, where necessary though the provision of interpretation or by other appropriate means” (United Nations Draft International Declaration on Indigenous Peoples’ Rights, Article 14).

National Māori Language Survey 1995

In spite of all of this development, the National Māori Language Survey report of 1995 confirmed earlier findings that the Māori language remained under threat of becoming a language of ritual and symbol only. It concluded that the language remained in an endangered state, and that little change had occurred since the previous national survey conducted by NZCER in the 1970s at which time it was feared that the language might not survive beyond the present generation.

Hui Taumata Reo Māori 1995

In 1995 Te Taura Whiri held Te Hui Taumata Reo Māori, (Māori Language Summit Conference) which brought together key Māori language stakeholders both from within Māoridom and Government. A large number of papers were presented on a whole raft of topics relating to the revitalisation of the language. While no recommendations were

made, concern at the state of the language and the desire to do more to ensure its revitalisation was common to all. Of particular note, were the call by the Minister of Māori Affairs and Te Taura Whiri for a strategic plan for language development, the recognition of an unrealistic reliance on Māori language education to save the language, and the call for Māori to do more for the language and to provide a consistent united lobby to Government.

Summary Chapter Two

During the final twenty-five years of the twenty first century there has been a continuation of Māori struggle to achieve and maintain some level of control over their development as Māori. Ongoing attempts at kotahitanga have taken place against a backdrop of growing tension between those supporting the traditional tribal structures and those supporting the pan-tribal models as the basis for future development.

The notion of a national Māori body politic is a theme that has recurred throughout this period. The period also witnessed Māori choosing to participate more widely in mainstream politics and, with a recovering population base, exerting new influence in this area.

The Chapter has shown how, backed by an international indigenous peoples movement, Māori were prepared to resort to levels of extreme militancy to fight for the recognition of their rights. This resulted successfully in the Treaty of Waitangi Act and the establishment of the Waitangi Tribunal to hear and make recommendations on claims relating to breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Tribunal and, in particular, the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act of 1985, has resulted in a Māori development focus on grievances and settlements during this period. Unlike the previous period, in which the Treaty was largely ignored, in this period it became the focus of the relationship between Māori and the State.

Chapter Two also described a period of significant 'positive Māori development' and new levels of economic success and local autonomy for many Māori, as opposed to the dependency so rife in the previous period. On the other hand, ongoing socio-economic gaps indicate that Māori development during this time was uneven.

Chapter Two has also illustrated a continuation of the call from Māori leaders that the language and culture must form the basis of Māori development and not be sacrificed to economic development. From the Hui Taumata 1984 to the Māori language claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, to the Hui Whakapūmau in 1994, to Te Hui Taumata Reo in 1995, this message has come through. For example, "our economic renaissance must not be at the price of our soul. We should not accept any proposition that is at odds with our express desire to be Māori" (Jackson 1984 D3). Also,

"Both Wetere and Durie (E.T.) were sounding the same cautionary note. Māori self-determination and positive Māori development amounted to little if, in the

establishment of a strong economic base, no room were left for the strengthening of a Māori identity and the continuing expression of Māori culture – the advancement of Māori peoples as Māori” (Durie, 1998 a. Pgs. 50-51).

While there has been a measure of constancy about Māori goals for development, the State on the other hand made a significant turnaround during this period. The recognition and acknowledgment of past injustices toward Māori by the Crown and an acceptance that Māori had rejected policies of assimilation and integration saw it take a whole new conciliatory approach towards Māori development. The State has made some real attempts since the 1980s in order to allow positive Māori development to occur within the mainstream framework. The Treaty of Waitangi Claims Settlement process, and moves to allow iwi/Māori organisations a level of autonomy over their affairs at the community level, are two examples which resulted in positive Māori development. However, the notion of rangatiratanga or self-determination at the national level was never seriously entertained, and the control of Māori resources has largely remained with the Crown.

This Chapter has shown the period to have been as much about language and cultural survival as about ‘Te Tiriti, Claims, Settlement, Autonomy’. It has done this by illustrating Māori constantly lobbying the Government to accept some responsibility for the language and at the same time establishing initiatives designed to revitalise the language. It has described how the Government was pushed into some action by the Te Reo Māori Waitangi Tribunal report and how it subsequently focussed its support for the Māori language predominately on the education sector.

CHAPTER THREE

Māori Development at the Beginning of the Third Millennium

Introduction

As discussed in the introduction to this thesis, the years leading up to the turn of the 21st century saw Māori and the Crown undertaking a stock-take of the rapid increase in Māori development activity since 1975. Commentators on indigenous peoples' development saw new trends emerging around the world and some predicted a new period of Māori development for the new millennium. They recommended a move away from confrontational, grievance-based relationships between indigenous peoples and their Governments. In place they recommended new mature partnerships based on agreed development goals as the basis for future development.

In New Zealand, many began to consider what really had been achieved over the last twenty-five year period, and what was missing. While some iwi and many Māori groups and individuals were now prospering economically, far too many were still disadvantaged. Had Māori in fact been achieving their development goals, or had some positive Māori development merely been the spin-off of the more conciliatory Government approach to Māori development? "that there has been a considerable amount of activity in what is commonly termed Māori 'development' is irrefutable. However, the extent to which such activity can be said to represent real progress towards Māori self-determination is, in my view, debatable"(Mikaere 2000 Pg. 5)

This Chapter considers this discourse on indigenous peoples' development in relation to the New Zealand situation. It discusses whether there are any signs of a new phase of Māori development emerging in New Zealand in the early years of this century. It looks at the Government's current Māori development goals, and at those of Māori. It asks whether the lack of agreed development goals is responsible for the persistent adversarial Māori-Crown relationship and is hindering real progress. It also discusses other factors hindering Māori development.

Chapter Three will continue to argue the hypothesis that cultural survival, including linguistic survival remains a key Māori goal for development. It will also continue to argue that this has not been a feature of the New Zealand Government's objectives for Māori development. It will also attempt to show that the current Māori-State relationship is based on a structuralist model, in which the Government deals with Māori as individual iwi, hapū or Māori organisations, rather than collectively, as the indigenous people of New Zealand.

Finally, it will also attempt to show how Governments, including New Zealand's, are generally reluctant to become involved in the cultural heritage sector. It will illustrate this, using as an example the Government's difficult institutional arrangements in this area.

International Trends in Indigenous Peoples' Development

In 1998, 'Living Relationships Kōkiri Ngatahi: The Treaty of Waitangi in the New Millennium' was published. Recognising that "relationships between indigenous peoples and Governments were in motion in many parts of the world", (Coates and McHugh 1998 Pg. 9) the book was commissioned by the Ministry of Justice to enable it to "do some fresh thinking about the relationship between the Crown and Māori" (Pg.9). The book contains essays considering indigenous peoples' development outside of New Zealand. The two essays, written by experts in the field, Paul McHugh and Dr Ken Coates, are followed by a series of commentaries from a range of prominent Māori and non-Māori with an interest in Māori development.

There are many similarities in the essays presented by both Coates and McHugh. They both believe that the settlement of past grievances is necessary and important for indigenous peoples and their Governments. Yet both see limitations in focussing solely on the settling of past grievances. McHugh argues that a claims settlement process locks both sides in adversarial struggles for domination in which one side must win and the other lose. He also argues against the structuralist approach in which "an individual's identity and relationships are constituted through membership of structures such as nation, state, tribe, family" (Coates and McHugh 1998 Pg. 111). He claims that this leads to adversarial relationships, and believes that in future relationships between indigenous people and their Governments will be based on ethnicity rather than their tribal identity.

Coates argues that the greatest barrier to development is that indigenous peoples and their Governments have different development goals and are therefore often 'talking past one another'. He describes indigenous peoples' goals as being "cultural survival (often including linguistic survival), self-determination within the confines of an established nation-state, and partnership with the non-indigenous populations....". Governments, on the other hand, he says, "tend to want to acknowledge past injustices, conclude a settlement consistent with national resources and political constraints, and thus settle grievances once and for all" (Coates/McHugh 1998 Pg. 10).

Both Coates and McHugh see a trend emerging in countries such as Canada and North America where there is progress beyond the focus on redress for past grievances, to mature nation to nation agreements based on agreed development goals. Both suggest that Governments will inevitably have to start talking earnestly with, instead of about, indigenous peoples and about the issues that in the long term will continue to matter the most – self determination for social, economic and cultural wellbeing. The Treaty negotiated between the Nisga'a Nation and the Government of Canada is perhaps one example of a new mature nation to nation agreement.

Coates also refers to an emerging backlash amongst non-indigenous peoples against indigenous peoples' development.

The Coates/McHugh book seemed to synthesis the new wave of thinking about indigenous peoples' development as the new millennium approached, and its relevance to the New Zealand situation.

Beyond Treaty Settlements

However, many years before this publication was released, New Zealand's Treaty Settlement process was receiving criticism from many quarters for its focus on the past rather than the future, for causing adversarial Māori-Crown relationships and because it is a process controlled by the Crown.

Three years earlier in 1995, the concept of talking past one another arose in another book, 'Treaty Settlements: The Unfinished Business', a compilation of the proceedings of a conference held that year to discuss the claims settlement process and the Government's Fiscal Envelope proposals. In the introduction to this book, Bill Wilson says, "In considering Treaty issues, there is a tendency for Māori and non-Māori to talk past each other rather than to each other" (McClay 1995 Pg.1).

The Chief Judge of the Waitangi Tribunal, Eddie Durie, in his welcoming address at the same conference, compared the use of the term 'settlement' as used in Australia and New Zealand. He commented that in Australia a 'settlement' refers to a process for settling arrangements for the future, while in New Zealand it is seen solely as a pay out for the past (McLay, 1995 Pg. 4).

Approaching the new millennium, many other publications expressed concern about the focus on the Treaty Settlements process as Māori development policy. In 'Recalling Aotearoa', Fleras and Spoonley considered new directions for New Zealand as a nation. They too, saw the need for a new relationship between Māori and non-Māori based on a shared sovereignty. They had this to say of the New Zealand Government's current Māori development policy focus.

In particular, the current approach is built around a claims-making process in which the state is still the main arbiter of which Crown-approved Māori authorities will gain support. There is a reliance on a grievance mode that encourages an escalation of claims and counter-claims, often radically voiced, and an adversarial mentality, which arises as often among Māori as it does between Māori and the Crown. The alternative would be, in our words, to explore the option of constructive engagement. The process would involve dialogue, cooperation, and power-sharing, thus reflecting a post-colonising mind-set. The outcome would be to confirm an indigenous sovereignty in which Māori would be seen as a partner and a neighbor with autonomy over and self-determination of various jurisdictions (Fleras/Spoonley 1999 Pg. xii)

In August 1999, Durie's paper 'Māori Development: Reflections and Strategic Directions' predicted three key challenges for future Māori development. The first was the need to move Māori-Crown relationships beyond the current adversarial relationship focused on Treaty of Waitangi claims and settlements to a relationship where "there is

trust and respect as equals and premised on the future rather than the past” (Durie 1999 b.). Durie suggested that such a relationship would be characterised by the acknowledgement of the Māori right to control matters Māori, or Māori self-determination at community, tribal and national levels.

The Government Response

In spite of the international trends and predictions, one of the central planks of the New Zealand Government’s Māori development policy in this early stage of the new millennium appears to remain the settlement of past grievances against the Crown. Certainly, it was a key focus of the Shipley led National/New Zealand First coalition Government. The then Minister of Māori Affairs, Tau Henare, at one stage during the Government’s term hinted that settlements would not be an end in themselves, when he stated, “but New Zealanders need not get too hung up on the Treaty Settlement issue. It is a bit of house-keeping we have to get out of the way, before we can get onto the fun bit, the important bit, which is Māori development” (Te Oru Rangahau Conference Proceedings 1998 Pg. 6). The fact remained however that one of his Government’s key goals and priorities included the following:

Recognising the importance of the Treaty of Waitangi, we will ensure that through Government’s policies and actions we continue in good faith to build new relationships between the Crown and Māori. In order to achieve this, we are committed to continuing the significant progress already made in negotiating and implementing fair, durable and affordable Treaty settlements. We are committed to improving the education, health and housing outcomes for Māori (Government’s Goals and Priorities December 1998).

Continuing the Treaty Settlement process also seems to be a central plank of the current Government’s Māori development policy. ‘He Pūtahitanga Hou: Labour on Māori Development’, the Labour Party’s Māori development manifesto, reiterated the Party’s commitment to continue to settle claims, through a “proper process that is fair to all”. The document also indicated the Party’s rejection of the ‘fiscal cap’ policy pursued by the former Government. It promised to ensure that the Tribunal is fairly resourced, to improve provisions relating to funding for the preparation of claims, and to review the Treaty of Waitangi Act to ensure its provisions continue to effectively facilitate settlements.

Currently two thirds of the way into its term, the Government has been noticeably quiet in this area. It has largely been business as usual for the Waitangi Tribunal and the Office of Treaty Settlements, although in September (2001), the Treaty Negotiations Minister, Margaret Wilson, announced a review of the Treaty Settlement process “in a bid to avoid High Court action threatened by senior Māori groups” (Berry 2001a.).

The recent settlement made with Ngāti Ruanui, which comprises of \$41 million of land and cash was the first major settlement made under the current Government. This slowing of pace might not necessarily be a bad thing. According to Coates, there is a trend for economically right wing administrations to make more settlements and

agreements than liberal/left wing Governments. However, he suggests that this might be due to a desire to resolve outstanding grievances and set right past injustices, in order to obtain 'closure' on indigenous issues altogether. They tend, he says, to be less concerned about addressing the underlying problems of cultural relations or establishing relationships for the future. (Coates and McHugh 1998 Pg. 29).

It is important to note that most commentators agree in principal that it is important to settle past grievances. But they warn against unsound processes that lack clear principles and goals, result in a focus on the past rather than the future, and a winners and losers situation, rather than forward looking partnerships.

The Treaty Settlements process in New Zealand is flawed. Firstly, it is fully controlled by the Government. All members of the Waitangi Tribunal are appointed by the Governor General on the recommendation of the Minister of Māori Affairs. Treaty settlement policy is developed almost exclusively by the Government. Consultation with Māori takes place when Government deems it 'appropriate'. The consultation is often either negligible or after the policy direction has been set, as happened with the Fiscal Envelope consultation. As occurred in that case, this can lead to disputes and confrontation between Māori and the State. Many iwi/Māori have expressed dissatisfaction at the lack of real negotiation, claiming that the Crown often merely makes an offer which iwi can accept or reject. The current policy seems to be about making full and final settlements in order to absolve the Government from its Treaty obligations forever.

Secondly, the claims administration process appears to be cumbersome, and the Tribunal inadequately resourced. There have been a few major settlements and many smaller ones, and these have provided some iwi and Māori as a basis for their future development. However, the process can be long and arduous, with costs beyond the purely economic. Many smaller and more disadvantaged iwi have yet to make it past the first base. It is not unusual for claims to lead to counter claims and litigation all the way to the Privy Council. To give an indication of the magnitude of the process, in its 25 years to 2000, the Waitangi Tribunal has heard and reported on some 160 claims, and it currently has approximately 900 claims on its books. By June 2,000, the Waitangi Tribunal had produced approximately 70 reports, which ranged from one page statement to the 1200 page, three volume Ngāi Tahu report (www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz).

Thirdly, other problems with the process relate to Māori-Māori politics and these are discussed more fully later in this Chapter. Issues of mandate and who should benefit from Treaty settlements have both added to long drawn out settlement processes with huge costs to both sides. As mentioned earlier, the latest Privy Council ruling that the fishing assets should be allocated to traditional iwi could mean further delays in this ongoing saga at the cost of many millions of dollars. The cost to Māoridom from a process that has a non-Māori institution, the Privy Council, ruling on an issue that is clearly one that should be settled by Māori, is likely to have on-going repercussions for Māori development.

The Treaty Settlements Minister recently said she believed that the Government was as anxious and frustrated as the claimants to try and settle claims and that litigation, mandating problems and cross claims over land were the key matters slowing the process (Berry 2001 a.)

To summarise, in its current form, the Treaty Settlements process has resulted in both Māori-State, and Māori–Māori conflicts, adversarial relationships, and a winner-loser mentality. It looks set to continue as one of the Government’s key Māori development policies at the beginning of the new millennium.

Closing the Gaps

The other consistent Government Māori development policy in recent times has been the focus on achieving social equity between Māori and non-Māori. The ‘Closing the Gaps 1998’ report by Te Puni Kōkiri, showed that gaps between Maori and non-Māori continued to exist across a number of key social indicators. The notion that these gaps should be closed was pursued by the Shipley National Government. It was then adopted and became known officially as Government’s ‘Closing the Gaps’ policy by the current Clark led Labour/Alliance coalition when it gained power in November 1999. The subsequent ‘Closing the Gaps 2000’ report showed that, while in some areas the gaps had narrowed, in other areas the gaps had widened. The ‘Gaps’ policy continued to be accorded high priority and a cabinet committee, chaired by the Prime Minister, was established specifically to oversee the state sector wide implementation of the policy.

Towards the end of 2000 however, a blaze of publicity led to the sudden dropping of the term ‘Closing the Gaps’ for this policy approach, and the Cabinet committee was disbanded. These moves came in face of Opposition Party criticism and general public outrage that Māori were not the only disadvantaged in society and that Government should be concerned with reducing disadvantage amongst all New Zealanders.

Now referred to as ‘reducing disparities’ the push by Government to improve Māori outcomes across health, housing, education, continues to be another focus of Government’s Māori development policy.

The policy has been criticised by many as being a ‘deficit model’, in which Māori are seen to have the problem and must be assisted to reach the same level as their non-Māori counterparts. It has also been criticised as being simply a continuation of assimilation.

It can be argued that a core function of Closing the Gaps was to encourage social cohesion by helping more Māori and Pacific peoples become more like well-off Pākehā. In the 21st century it might be ‘assimilation in slow motion’, but assimilation it remains..... (Humpage and Fleras 2001 Pg. 49.)

The problem is not the underlying premise that the living standards for many Māori need to be raised, but the approach that is taken to achieving this. ‘Closing the Gaps’ and even ‘Reducing Disparities’ are policies based on notions of social justice and

Article Three Rights of equality for all citizens rather than the Treaty Article Two right, or the indigeneity based right of self-determination.

Capacity Building

The current Government has also been promoting, as part of its wider 'Reducing Disparities' or 'Closing the Gaps' policy, another policy known as, 'Capacity Building'. Under this policy, additional budget has been spread across key state sector agencies in a "process which seeks to strengthen the ability of whānau, hapū, iwi Māori organisations and Māori communities to build the strategies, systems, structures and skills that they need to control their own development and achieve their own objectives' (Te Puni Kōkiri 2000 a.).

Under this scheme, Māori whānau, hapū, iwi, organisations and communities can apply for funds and assistance to undergo 'Capacity Assessments' and 'Capacity Building' aimed at building their capacity to control their own development. Priority is given to those groups that have had little access to development funding in the past. On the surface, this looks like a policy that is helping to create or build Māori self-determination over their local affairs. Unfortunately, it is too early for any evaluation of the results of this policy to be available.

However, Capacity Building has already been criticised as being off the mark in relation to indigenous peoples' development goals. Loomis, in his paper, 'Government's Role in Māori Development: Charting a New Direction?' criticised Capacity Building as being in direct conflict with the 'Closing the Gaps' policy. He reasons that while Closing the Gaps is about improving Government services to Māori and targeting funding to Māori providers, Capacity Building emphasizes indigenous autonomy and self-determination. His comparative studies of recent development experience among tribal populations in Canada, Australia United States and New Zealand into the key factors that facilitate development is that 'the first and probably most crucial factor for effective self determined development is sovereignty' (Loomis 2000 Pg. 9). He doubts that, what he refers to as a curious mix of policies, is in fact charting a new direction, unless Capacity Building concentrates on indigenous self-governance. He concludes, "the coalition Government's announced policies may have bits and pieces of a new approach, but there is a lack of a coherent philosophy and a strategic framework" (Loomis, 2000 Pg. 5).

Local Level Solutions/Direct Resourcing /Māori Provider Development Fund/Economic Development

A number of other funds/programmes have been introduced by the current Government as part of the overall Capacity Building Strategy. It is funding and supporting a number of 'Local Level Solutions'. These are a package of proposals that have come from whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori to provide a range of social services to their communities. The intention of this process is that they are Māori led, supported with assistance from Te Puni Kōkiri and other key Government agencies. One example is Puaote-Atatu-a-Tūhoe, whereby Tūhoe have established five centres within their tribal district, each

concentrating on one aspect of social service development to their people. This is a new approach for Government and consistent with He Pūtahitanga Hou which argues that successful solutions to Māori needs will stem from Māori communities working in conjunction with Government departments. The 'Māori Provider Development Fund is in its second year of operation and is intended to strengthen already established Māori providers of social services. The 2000-01 budget also announced a \$15 million Direct Resourcing package. This Direct Resourcing fund will enable some iwi and Māori organisations to be funded directly for their development programmes, rather than through a Government department.

The current Government is also continuing to focus on Māori economic development and has a number of schemes in place to assist Māori in business. This Government launched the Māori Business Facilitation Service designed to provide free, practical support for entrepreneurial Māori business owners and thereby boost Maori economic development (Te Puni Kōkiri 2000 b.).

The 2000-01 budget saw an expanded role for Te Puni Kōkiri and significant new budget spread across the State sector to finance the Government's Māori development policy package. All of the above – Treaty Settlements, Reducing Disparity, Capacity Building, Local Level Solutions and Economic Development seems to form the basis of the Government's Māori development policy. How do these compare with what Māori see as their fundamental development goals?

Māori Development Goals

The first two Chapters of this thesis provided much evidence that Māori are striving for: cultural survival (including linguistic survival), self determination within the confines of the New Zealand nation-state, and partnership with non-Māori, consistent with what Coates says indigenous people worldwide want to achieve. Yet these are the very areas that the New Zealand Government appears to be, at the best paying lip service to, and at the worse, simply avoiding altogether.

Self-Determination

The numerous attempts at kotahitanga expressed by Māori since the early contact days provide evidence that self-determination, or the power to control their own development, is a central goal for Māori. While for Māori, the settling of historical grievances is important, it will not by itself, resolve this more fundamental goal of self-determination.

The Crown, driven by its new right ideology, seems to think returning a few pieces of land and paying a few dollars resolves colonisation. It does not. It offers a long overdue recompense to our people, which those people deserve. But it is not the only issue that needs to be addressed, because colonisation was not just about the Crown being a bad landlord and Māori being an abused tenant. There is much more involved.... Colonisation is really about the denial of the self-

determination of our people, of rangatiratanga in terms of sovereignty. None of the agreements so far have dealt with that. (Moana Jackson, 1997)

Aroha Mead, world expert on the rights of indigenous peoples, speaking on the right of indigenous peoples to self-determination says, “for some, their rights to self-determination means a renegotiation of the system of governance to enable greater autonomy of them in political, economic, social and cultural decision making” (Mead 1997 Pg.22).

Māori have continuously called for recognition of their ongoing right to self-determination or tino rangatiratanga guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi. This right has also been identified as part of international declarations. The ‘Draft Declaration on International Indigenous Rights’, to which Māori were active contributors, has helped to articulate indigenous peoples’ views on self-determination.

Indigenous peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development (Article 3).

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development. In particular, indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop all health, housing, and other economic and social programmes affecting them and, as far as possible, to administer such programmes through their own institutions (Article 23).

The Mataatua Declaration of 1993 also affirmed indigenous peoples’ right to self-determination, “We declare the Indigenous Peoples of the world have the right to self-determination: and in exercising that right must be recognised as the exclusive owners of their cultural and intellectual property”.

There has always been a wide range of views on what self-determination means in practice in New Zealand. However, it seems to imply a measure of power sharing between Māori and the Government so that Māori are able to control Māori affairs at both the local and national level. More simply, local and national ‘self governance’. The Māori Congress, and calls for a national Māori body politic as described in Chapter Two are some of the more recent examples of Māori endeavors in this area. As discussed, while the Government has gone some way to facilitate Māori self-governance at the local, iwi and Māori organisational level, it does not entertain it at the national level.

While some Māori groups may still want to see a new Māori nation state, according to Durie, “given the size of the total New Zealand population, the mobility within the country, the characteristics of the land mass, the love of New Zealanders for freedom and independence, and the economic realities, anything other than a single independent nation state is unlikely” (Durie 2000 a. Pg. 420).

While he predicts an accommodation for Māori self-determination within a single nation state, exactly what form this will take is yet unknown. It might mean the formation of national Māori body politic in the first instance to enable Māori to contribute to policy making concerned with Māori resources. This might evolve into a Māori parliament along the lines of the Scottish or Saami models. Māori have yet to reach a united view on the issue and the Government appears reluctant to make any moves in this direction.

There are some indications that New Zealand may be slowly moving towards constitutional reform where we will cut our allegiances to the British Crown and become a republic. Some, like Durie, believe that this may be the opportunity for Māori to have the Treaty entrenched in a new constitution and for some means of self-determination at the national level to become reality.

At the Waitangi Day celebrations in February 1999, then Prime Minister Jenny Shipley, stated on national television that constitutional change was perhaps something that Māori and non-Māori might begin to talk about over the next ten to fifteen years. A highly contentious 'Building the Constitution' conference was held during April 2000. This conference brought together a range of influential Māori and non-Māori, and while it did not result in any clear path ahead, it has opened the debate.

In February 2000 Helen Clark stated that it was "inevitable" that New Zealand would become a republic, though that might be 20 or 30 years away". This reluctance to upset the national governance arrangements currently in place seems to be inconsistent with the following statement in He Pūtahitanga Hou, "Labour is committed to fulfilling its obligations as a treaty partner to support self-determination for whānau hapū and iwi". It appears that self-determination is being used here to mean some local level autonomy within Māori communities rather than any meaningful power sharing at the national level.

It is highly unlikely that a new period of Maori development is going to occur until the national debate about Māori self-determination begins in earnest. While the Government is happy to talk about reducing disparities, to spend years working through a grievance settlement with an iwi, or to fund and promote Māori economic development initiatives, talk about self-determination at the national level, albeit within the single nation state, remains off the Crown's agenda.

Cultural/Linguistic Survival

The first two Chapters provided significant proof that cultural survival including that of the language is a key Māori development goal. "Māori leaders have insisted that Māori knowledge, and Māori heritage generally, belong to Māori and must form the seed from which positive Māori development can grow" (Durie, 1998 a. Pg. 79).

While Coates describes "cultural survival (often including linguistic survival)" as being a fundamental goal of indigenous peoples, he does not discuss progress being made towards meeting this goal in any detail. Internationally renowned sociolinguist, Joshua Fishman, however, took the opportunity of the new millennium to review progress being

made to save threatened languages since 1991. In his seminal work of 1991 'Reversing Language Shift', Fishman had researched the efforts being undertaken to save ten threatened languages, including a number of indigenous languages, of which the Māori language was one. That book described the significant work being undertaken by indigenous and immigrant communities to save their languages. This clearly lends further support to Coates' view that cultural, including linguistic survival, is a key goal of indigenous peoples.

Fishman's 2000 book, "Can Threatened Languages Be Saved? attempts to answer that very question. After revisiting those ten countries that were the subject of Reversing Language Shift, his qualified answer is that, yes, threatened languages can be saved. However, he points out that "actual RLS prospects and attainments have improved very little, if at all, during the past decade, and seem even to have deteriorated somewhat in some surprising cases" (Fishman 2000 Pg. 480). Fishman describes the enormous odds against successful language revitalisation, which he sums up as the battle between "globalisation and ethnonationalism". He believes that, while this battle might not be won, neither will it be lost, due to the ongoing determination of ethnic groups to retain their cultural integrity (Fishman 2000). The previous Chapter discussed the Māori battle for linguistic survival during the period 1975-2000 and Chapters Four and Five explores it in more detail.

So while cultural and linguistic survival is clearly a Māori development goal, evidence has been provided to show that this has traditionally been far from the minds of successive Governments. As it is reluctant to discuss Māori self-determination in any meaningful manner beyond local Māori autonomy, so too is Government reluctant to become too involved in Māori cultural survival.

Governments rarely negotiate culture, nor does cultural survival fit easily within the administrative toolbox. It is easier to talk about rights to land and 'resources', special exemptions from national laws, and the delegation of administrative responsibilities, than it is to conceptualize the long-term preserving of indigenous culture (Coates/McHugh 1998 Pg. 88).

The cumulative response by Government has not largely been one to support the desire of Māori to nurture and develop their language and cultural identity, nor has this understanding often been reflected in policy and legislation. It is likely that the value of cultural identity to social and economic well-being has not been appreciated. (Walker, 1985 Pg. 79).

As the previous Chapters also showed, when Government has become involved in Māori cultural development it has been largely in a reactive manner, in response to Māori militancy, international pressures and/or to avoid litigation.

The Government's difficult institutional arrangements in the culture and heritage sector, including its arrangements for Māori cultural heritage are further evidence of the difficulty that it has governing this sector. It currently has no coherent strategy for the

protection and preservation of the nation's cultural heritage, including Māori cultural heritage. Government's involvement in the cultural heritage sector, "seems to have developed rather haphazardly over several decades so that today it is spread across a number of government agencies all of which have other non-cultural priorities" (Ministry of Culture and Heritage 1998 Pg. 6).

There are currently a plethora of Government agencies responsible for various aspects of cultural heritage management. These include the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, the Department of Conservation, the Ministry for the Environment, the Historic Places Trust, the Department of Internal Affairs, Te Puni Kōkiri, Te Taura Whiri, and Te Māngai Pāho. However, no single Government department has responsibility for cultural heritage development, and only since 2000 has any single Government department had overall responsibility for Māori language development.

A number of recent reviews have seen the Government grappling to come to terms with what its role and responsibilities in the area of cultural heritage are, and the best institutional arrangements for meeting them. The establishment of a Māori cultural heritage body of some sort was recently proposed by Te Puni Kōkiri as part of the Taonga Māori review.

In addition, the 'Heart of the Nation: A Cultural Strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand' report which was prepared for the Prime Minister and Minister of Arts Cultural Heritage during 2000, also recommended change to the current institutional arrangements in the sector. It suggested a Ministry of Māori Arts, Culture and Heritage, which would mirror the mainstream Ministry of Arts, Culture and Heritage. Yet, the report was shelved by the Prime Minister who has expressed no desire for major institutional change.

Perhaps the reason that the institutional arrangements for the sector are so jumbled is that it is simply not an appropriate area for the Government to govern. Yet, the Government is faced with the difficulty of not knowing whom to consult with on behalf of iwi/Māori on matters relating to Māori cultural heritage. The lack of a unified body representing Māori views, means that the Government, almost by default, continues to stumble along making decisions about Māori culture and the allocation of resources.

Other Factors Hindering Māori Development

While different development agendas are without a doubt slowing Māori development progress, there are a number of other factors also proving problematic to positive Māori development, which will now briefly be discussed.

A Backlash in New Zealand?

In Kōkiri Ngatahi, McHugh noted a further trend emerging as the new millennium approached, which he says is particularly observable amongst the world's liberal democracies, the countries that have been most active in addressing their indigenous population's aspirations. He uses the term 'backlash' to broadly cover the growing and

more openly expressed opposition to indigenous aspirations, which are putting constraints on Governments from acting “too quickly or generously” (Coates and Mchugh 1998 Pg. 80).

There is evidence that this trend has emerged and is gaining momentum in New Zealand. There are many examples. One is the huge popularity of the book, ‘The Travesty of Waitangi’ which dismisses the Treaty of Waitangi. Another is the recent proposal by the right wing Act party to scrape the Treaty settlements process altogether. The objection to Government pursuing the ‘Closing the Gaps’ policy and the outrage at the comparison of the colonisation of New Zealand to the second world war holocaust, by the Associate Minister of Māori Affairs, Hon Tariana Turia, earlier this year, are other symptoms that a backlash is indeed occurring in this country.

It appears that the patience of Pākehā New Zealanders with the unresolved and ongoing differences between the Crown and Māori is wearing thin. In addition, a commonly held view by New Zealanders seems to be that Treaty settlements are only to be tolerated if they are full and final and resolve all Māori-Crown issues once and for all. Coates expresses some understanding for this point of view given that “Lengthy treaty negotiations, expensive court hearings, difficult tribunal deliberations, extensive programme revision and repeated community consultations have not, in the main brought about much improvement in the condition of indigenous peoples” (Coates 1998 Pg. 80).

A Victoria University study conducted in 1999 quite startlingly, found that nearly 70% of all New Zealanders feel that Treaty of Waitangi grievances should not be settled and that many are angry about Treaty settlements. The researcher, Kirsten Carlson found there was a general misconception that the claims process was merely giving away assets to undeserving Māori (Carlson, 1999).

Carlson also suggested that the Government needs to ensure that New Zealanders are better informed about their history and of the reasons behind the claims settlement process. She suggested that ignorance about these matters is partly responsible for this backlash, which, if it gains momentum, will pose an increasing barrier to positive Māori development. It is a political reality that Governments are unlikely to pursue measures that will be unpopular with the majority of their voters.

If the general public is finding it difficult to tolerate the Treaty Settlements process, one wonders how much hope Māori have of securing self-determination in the near future. The mere words often lead to accusations of separatism, and apartheid.

Equality, The Treaty and Indigeneity

Another reason for the backlash and lack of progress with Māori development issues is what Durie has referred to as the general unwillingness on behalf of non-Māori New Zealanders to accept that Māori have ‘special’ rights or rights based on indigeneity (Durie 2001 a.). New Zealand Governments continue to be more comfortable with policies and practices that support the notion that all New Zealanders are equal and/or

have equal rights. There is obviously some acknowledgment that gross injustices were suffered by Māori through actions of the Government last century, and that there should be some compensation and redress for this through Treaty settlements. However, the Government tends to balk at the idea of the Treaty Article Two right of self-determination or Māori rights based on their indigeneity. Durie sees this current disregard for rights based on indigeneity as problematic. “Increasingly the State will need to be concerned about indigeneity as an issue that is related but not identical to the Treaty of Waitangi; and the language of indigeneity will need to be heard alongside the Treaty dialogue” (Durie 2001 a. Pg. 8). Also, “New Zealand society must grapple more directly with the principle of indigeneity, not because of a desire to close gaps, but because, unlike other groups in society, Māori can lay claim to a set of indigenous rights

Intra-Māori Obstacles

Living Relationships/Kōkiri Ngatahi concentrated on trends emerging between indigenous peoples and Governments and Māori–State relationships. However, it did not focus on significant issues that need to be resolved by indigenous peoples themselves. These were given significant attention by leading Māori development commentators as the country entered the new millennium.

Durie called for Māori to ready themselves for the inevitable constitutional debate and move towards a republic which has slowly begun. His second challenge for positive development from 2000-2025 is the need to improve ‘Māori–Māori relations (Durie 1999 b.). He called for an end to the divisiveness which sometimes slows progress with Māori development and for new co-operation and collaboration amongst Māori. At the ‘Building the Constitution’ conference in early 2000 he had this to say.

A first step for Māori is not necessarily to debate the issues with the Crown or with other New Zealanders, but to identify the key components of modern Māori society and the nature of the relationships between them. The dissension between tribes and urban Māori, or between iwi and iwi, or between hapū and iwi, or between tangata whenua and tangata kāinga, arise because structures are afforded greater importance than relationships. It is part of the colonial legacy that effectively divided Māori society by recognising one group at the expense of another. There is now abundant empirical evidence that Māori have multiple affiliations and belong to several groups at the same time.

And,

A relational approach seeks to realise the collective strength of Māori society so that future planning goes beyond outdated arguments of inclusion and exclusion. Māori need to debate constitutional issues themselves so that a measure of agreement about the parameters of self-governance and the way in which it should be expressed can be established” (Durie 2000 a. Pg. 422).

Judge Michael Brown has referred simply to the Māori “capacity for self-mutilation”. (Brown 1998 Pg. 393). They are both referring to the sometimes incessant bickering that appears to go on within Maoridom, and which is perhaps reflected in the inability of Māori to date to develop a stable expression of kotahitanga.

The previous Chapter described the focus and tensions within Maoridom arising from the so-called ‘urban-rural’ or ‘iwi-pan-tribal’ debate and some of the problems this is causing. Unfortunately, this apparent inability of Māori to focus on similarities instead of differences, allows what McHugh has described as a ‘structural approach’ to Māori development to continue. This approach is where the Government deals selectively with either pan-tribal or traditional structures such as iwi, hapū, or Māori organisations, instead of with Māori as the collective indigenous population. What Coates, McHugh, Durie and others believe is required, is a move to a ‘relational’ approach where the Crown would develop a relationship with Māori as an ethnic group. However, some iwi, such as Ngāi Tahu, remain staunchly opposed to anything but the traditional tribal structures, fearing that a united expression of kotahitanga at the national level will in some way undermine the mana of the tribal groups. “Ngāi Tahu are less convinced and reject any suggestion of a national Māori body in favour of ‘a series of Māori nations subsisting in a wider society’ (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 231).

While Māori continue to seek to define themselves, the Crown can easily avoid any real discussion of Māori self-determination or power sharing at the national level. However, it has also often been frustrated by Māori politics when it has made genuine attempts to move forward on Māori development issues. The lack of any truly representative Māori body can make consultation with and participation by Māori very difficult and the issue of mandate has often slowed progress.

Active in the 1980s, both the Māori Council and Māori Congress have maintained much lower profiles in recent years and this may well be caused by the significant and ongoing debate over who speaks for Māori. With regards the Congress on which much hope had been set as a united tribal body, Walker believes its popularity was reduced when it was marginalised in the Sealords negotiations by the Government who preferred to negotiate with its own mandated negotiators from established, Government aligned Māori authorities. He also says that it lost members because of the levy and because some executive members became involved in Government consultancies over the sale of railway lands. (Walker in Havemann 1999 Pg. 117). Congress unfortunately seems to be another failed attempt at kotahitanga. However, its lack of longevity might owe more to the intense debate between the iwi/pan tribal factions, and the fact that it is an iwi only based body.

People Based Development

The third and final challenge identified by Durie is the need to shift the focus of Māori development from a commodity based economic development focus to a people based focus (Durie 1999 b.). He has suggested that too much time and effort has been expended by Māori, and perhaps the Government too, on resources that provide a

relatively low return such as land and fisheries. He describes the Māori capital base as largely undeveloped and called for a focus on knowledge based industries and economies. Yet the ongoing focus on Treaty settlements seems to be locking Māori into concern about physical resources and the past rather than the future.

Summary Chapter Three

Chapter three has reviewed some of the key trends of indigenous peoples' development and the predications for a new period of Māori development into the first quarter of the 21st century. It has indeed shown that the Crown and Māori, in spite of many positive developments over the period 1975-2000 are still, at the fundamental level, talking at cross-purposes. The basic development goals, sometimes in spite of the rhetoric, are different and this is severely limiting positive Māori development.

The present Government with its dual focus on Treaty Settlements and 'Closing the Gaps', or 'Reducing Disparities' (via Capacity Building et al), has largely opted to turn a blind eye to what Māori leaders maintain to be their 'special' rights. These are those Treaty rights, and increasingly their rights of indigeneity, in particular, the right to determine their future and ensure their cultural survival within a single nation state. It has shown how Governments prefer to focus on policies and practices based on equality or the Treaty Article Three citizen rights, which remain more comfortable to the country at large.

There is little evidence that Māori and the Government are moving to establishing a new mature relationship based on agreed development goals. The Chapter has shown that the Māori-Crown relationship today is based on what McHugh refers to as a structuralist approach in which the State deals with Māori based on their tribal identity or membership of Māori organisations, rather than their ethnicity. Its policies, particularly its Treaty Settlement policy, has had the effect of pitting Māori against one another and maintaining a winner/loser relationship with the Crown, as settlements are negotiated and concluded.

Chapter three has also used Government's muddled institutional arrangements in the cultural heritage sector to show that it is an area that New Zealand Governments are not comfortable with. This could possibly present an opportunity for Māori to have more direct input, at the national level, into an area fundamental to Māori development. The Chapter has suggested that this is an area in which the Government needs direct Māori input, but that the lack of a unified Māori voice severely restricts this happening. The lack of a unified Māori body politic of some form has allowed the Government to control Māori development, including the Treaty Settlements process.

A glimmer of hope for Māori to realise some form of self-determination at the national level has presented itself as the country moves on an inevitable course towards Republicanism and the constitutional debate, which that must entail. However, this may depend on Māori ability to resolve a number of intra-Māori issues, and to prepare themselves for the debate ahead.

CHAPTER FOUR

Māori Language Development into the 21st Century - A 'Home' Within Government?

Introduction

Within the context of overall Māori development described in the preceding chapters, this thesis now returns to focus on Māori language development.

This thesis has argued that cultural survival, including that of the language, is related to politics and power. The near demise of the Māori language did not happen solely because a second language, English, was introduced into New Zealand. It occurred as Māori lost power and control, and the ability to determine their own development. Conversely, it has also shown how ongoing attempts by Māori to regain that power and control has gone hand in hand with the goal of cultural survival.

The previous Chapter demonstrated how, just one year into the new millennium, despite considerable goodwill on both sides and significant positive development, on the whole, Māori development is hindered because Māori and the Crown have different goals and agendas.

Given this situation, and the improbability that the key Māori goal of self-determination at the national level is likely to be realised in the immediate future, Chapter Four looks at the Government's current role in Māori language development. It will attempt to show that its involvement in this area is largely a reflection of the Government's position in overall Māori development, that it is more concerned with avoiding further litigation and in promoting 'equality' policies, than in supporting the Maori goals of self-determination and cultural survival.

It will also use the issue of language revitalisation to further demonstrate how the absence of an effective kotahitanga forum, a national Māori body politic of some form, is hindering progress with both language development and overall Māori development, and helps to maintain a structural rather than relational approach to Māori development.

The Chapter revolves around a case study of the Government's language policy direction for the new millennium, 'Government's Māori Language Strategy', in order to demonstrate how the Government is largely working in isolation from Māori in developing Māori language policy. The Strategy will be assessed against both a set of Māori development policy criteria devised by Durie, and those priorities determined by socio-linguistic experts for successful minority language revitalisation.

But first it is important to briefly review the health of the Māori language today and to consider what is required for successful revitalisation.

Māori Language Today

One of the problems in discussing the Māori language is that there have been few attempts to accurately measure its health over time. The best data available is that obtained from a number of unrelated surveys conducted over the years. In the mid 1970s, the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (NZCER) found that the Māori language had become 'endangered' and there were fears that the language might not survive beyond the present generation. These findings contributed to the huge surge of support by Māori for the language to be saved and led to the Waitangi Tribunal claim.

Almost twenty years later, in 1995, the National Māori Language Survey was conducted by Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. This survey of 2,441 Māori adults over 16 years of age, found that only 8% of Māori adults had a high level of fluency in the language, 8% a medium fluency, 43% low fluency and 41% of Māori adults were unable to speak any Māori. The report confirmed earlier findings that the Māori language remained under threat of becoming a language of ritual and symbol only, and concluded that the language remained in an endangered state. On the surface the survey results appeared to indicate that little change in the state of the language had occurred over the twenty odd years that had lapsed between the two surveys in spite of a great deal of language activity, especially within the education system.

Yet during this time many of the fluent kaumātua (elders) who were exemplary native speakers of the language had died and of those fluent speakers (8%) remaining, 73% were over 45 years of age. While the fluent native speakers were passing away, they were being replaced by a new wave of second language learners.

It is also important to note that the survey was conducted only with the adult population so it was unable to measure the full impact that the introduction of bilingual and immersion language education was having on language revitalisation. The survey did find that 8% of adults who had medium fluency were most likely to have attended immersion language education of some form.

Notwithstanding its shortcomings, the survey provided an indication of the continuing poor health of the language and "confirmed that the Māori language remains in a critical state" (Te Puni Kōkiri 1995).

During 1996, the year after the National Māori Language Survey was conducted, the census of New Zealand households included for the first time the following question about language: "In which language could you have a conversation about a lot of everyday things?" Analysis of the responses to that question revealed that almost 25% of the population of Māori ancestry could have a conversation about a lot of everyday things in Māori and that about half of these were under the age of 25 years. According to the

Bentons, this result represented “a spectacular reversal of language shift in the space of a year” with a huge increase in younger speakers of the language. However, they believe that the actual situation is more realistically somewhere between the 1995 survey, and the 1996 census (Fishman 2001 Pgs. 423-424).

The same question was asked in the 2001 census and results of that will be used to identify and measure any changes since 1996.

A post censal survey on the health of the Māori language was also conducted this year (2001) by Statistics New Zealand, under contract to Te Puni Kōkiri. The findings of the survey will create a much needed up to date profile of the health of the Māori language and if the survey is repeated at regular intervals, as planned, overall trends in Māori language revitalisation will emerge and inform Government’s policy development in this area. Unfortunately this thesis was completed just prior to the initial results of the survey becoming available.

While the various surveys described above are useful in providing a very general picture of overall language trends, the results and findings need to be interpreted with caution and take into consideration the methodologies used to capture the information. It is extremely difficult to measure the state of health of a language with accuracy. In particular, the three completed surveys described above were based on individual self-assessment of language ability, and focussed on conversational ability as the determining factor in language proficiency. These two factors alone immediately open the survey results up to scrutiny because of problems of ‘over or under reporting’ of proficiency and the lack of common understanding about what proficiency in Māori means (see Christensen 2000 Pg.3).

Keeping these factors in mind, the surveys undertaken to date do provide evidence to suggest that the Māori language is far from being a healthy living language and remains in an endangered state. In June this year the World Watch report ‘Last Words’ included Māori in its list of the world’s endangered languages. The report, which discussed how the world’s speech is becoming increasingly homogenised and threatening thousands of minority languages, went on to refer to Māori as one of the few that “is slowly making a come back” (Sampat 2001 Pg. 40).

Achieving Language Revitalisation

Language revitalisation is not easy to achieve. In fact, there are very few countries where a language can be said to have been successfully revitalised. However, as referred to in the introduction to this thesis, according to the world’s leading socio-linguists, there are a number of crucial components which must exist for language revitalisation to proceed.

Fishman argues that it is essential that any language revitalisation process is controlled by those people whose language it is, rather than by the Government. This factor relates to the politics of language development and the place of languages within the wider politics and power relationships between the State and language communities. When people are

in control of the process, they own the problem and take responsibility for it, rather than allowing the Government, through its institutions, to control the way and means in which revitalisation occurs.

In countries such as Wales, language revitalisation has enjoyed some success. The process has proceeded more easily and smoothly in comparison with other countries, and this is probably, at least in part, because the Welsh form the majority of the population in Wales. The Government therefore has been behind the people's desire to revive their language and they have not had to face the problems of majoritarianism politics. In Wales, the challenge is to ensure that the Government does not usurp individual responsibility for the language.

In contrast, in New Zealand, Māori are the minority indigenous population (15% approximately), and the Government is monopolised by the majority non-Māori population who do not see the goal of Māori cultural and linguistic survival as being a priority. The Government must contend with a backlash from the majority of its voters if it is seen to be favoring any sector of society over another. This means that the Government usually implements policy that is acceptable to the majority, and makes Government's contribution to supporting the Māori language to a certain extent, dependent on the goodwill of non-Māori New Zealanders.

A 'Survey of Attitudes Towards, and Beliefs and Values About, the Māori language', was undertaken by Te Puni Kōkiri during December 2000 (the survey was held to establish a benchmark to enable it to monitor the fifth objective of the Māori Language Strategy (see Pg.78). The survey was conducted by phone with nationally representative samples of Māori (615) and non-Māori (725). The summary report for non-Māori results showed that nearly half (49%) of all non-Māori can be described as being 'passive supporters' of the Māori language, that is, they are supportive of the greater use of the language and culture but are not actively engaged in it. A further 39% are described as being 'disinterested', that is, 'tolerant of the Māori language and culture as long as it doesn't impinge on their lives'. The remaining 12% were described as 'extremists', who are very negative towards the Māori language and culture. This 12% represents the 'red neck' section of non-Māori society who continue to criticise any attempts to revitalise the language claiming it as a worthless and dead language (see for example, Frank Haden column, NZ Sunday Star Times "Te Reo Māori starved by its owners"). Overall, the result indicates that non-Māori are not particularly interested in the Māori language and culture. This result largely mirrors the smaller scale attitudes survey undertaken by Nicholson and Garland in 1991.

The results of these 'attitudes' surveys, like the 'proficiency level' surveys, also need to be interpreted with care. In particular, the correlation between attitude on the one hand and behaviour and practice on the other, needs to be considered. For example, while a person might report having a very positive attitude towards the language, is he or she actively involved in learning and using the language on a daily basis? Keeping this in mind, the survey results do provide a useful indication of the overall attitudes of Māori and non-Māori to the language.

It is also generally accepted that Governments do have a role to play in supporting language revitalisation efforts, but that it must be a facilitatory not a controlling one. Governments should ensure that the necessary language infrastructure is developed and resourced. However, they should be mindful never to lead or control the process which must remain with the people. “For its survival much will depend on continued Māori enthusiasm for revitalising te reo Māori as well as on the state’s performance of its obligations to ensure that the legal and funding frameworks are properly supportive” (Durie 1998 a. Pg. 79).

The second key to language revitalisation according to Fishman, is the ‘reversal of language shift (RLS)’. As shown in Chapter One, languages become endangered or die, when the process of inter-generational transmission of that language is interrupted, and conversely, inter-generational transmission must be reinstated for a language to be revitalised. Fishman claims that the restoration of inter-generational transmission can only occur in the home and close communities of those whose language it is. He argues that all the money and time in the world spent on other language initiatives, will not lead to the revitalisation of the language if it is not being transferred from one generation to the next in the home and close community. “Reversing language shift cannot be accomplished at all if it is not accomplished at the intimate family and local community levels” (Fishman, 1991. Pg. 20).

He also says that whatever is accomplished in other sectors is merely ‘buying time’ until home and community use has been firmly established (Fishman 1991, Pg. 161). In New Zealand the experience to date has been one of reliance on the education sector to eventually create, through its provision of bi-lingual and immersion education, a sufficient pool of fluent adults, who will then be able to pass the language on to their children. This reliance on the education sector, has largely resulted in a neglect of the home and community, with some notable exceptions, such as Te Ataarangi (See Chapter Two, Pg. 47).

Experts also agree that language revitalisation is not something that simply occurs when a people decide that that is what they want. Nor is it something that happens overnight. It requires careful long term planning, and language planning is now a recognised field of study and practice. “Reversing language shift depends on the proper actions at the proper time and in the optimal sequence...” (Fishman 1991 Pg. 236). And, “...the main lesson to be learnt from Reversing Language Shift is that language revitalisation requires tackling problems on many fronts, yet in an orderly fashion, lest a lopsided order of priorities result in a waste of effort” (Grin & Vaillancourt 1998 Pg. 12).

Many theorists also argue that for a minority language to survive it must have an economic function, warning against relying too heavily on the emotional/symbolic function of the language. Baker has said that the economic status of a minority language is likely to be a key element in language vitality (Baker 1996). In other words there is a need to view language as a resource alongside other physical resources such as land,

forestry and fisheries. Language can be a resource to be developed as well as a ‘right’, something ‘fundamental to cultural awareness and identity’ or a ‘Treaty obligation’.

Baker talks about the need for minority populations to undertake ‘economic language planning’ alongside their economic development so that the languages grow as their economic status grows. (Baker 1996 Pgs. 60-61).

Government Involvement in Māori Language Development Today

In Chapter Two, the review of Māori language development during the period 1975-2000 showed the New Zealand Government taking a generally reactive role vis-à-vis Māori language development. Its actions were primarily in response to Māori activism, and to the Waitangi Tribunal findings and recommendations. To recap, the Tribunal found that the Government did have responsibilities towards protecting the Māori language, that it had failed to meet those responsibilities in the past and had, in fact, contributed to the demise of the language. Chapter Two also showed both Māori and the Government focussing their language revitalisation efforts largely on the education and broadcasting sectors.

However the 1995 National Māori Language Survey report and 1996 Census results seemed to suggest that much more was required to support language revitalisation and move the language from its seemingly entrenched endangered status. The idea of language planning was gaining currency, and as the new millennium drew nearer, the Government began to consider a new strategy for meeting its obligations to the Māori language. It seemed logical that some long-term language planning should be undertaken.

At the 1995 Hui Taumata Reo Māori, there was talk of the need for a strategic plan for the Māori language. In his opening address, Doug Graham, speaking on behalf of the Minister of Māori Affairs, Hon John Luxton, referred to a ‘Māori Language Strategic Plan’ being developed by Te Taura Whiri on contract to Te Puni Kōkiri. Also involved in its development were officials from Te Puni Kōkiri, The Treasury, the State Services Commission, the Ministries of Education and Commerce and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. Luxton said,

the strategy will provide a framework for the continuing partnership between Māori and the Government, with other parties, working together in a consistent approach for the revitalisation of the language. This partnership is necessary because both Māori and Government have key roles to play in the revitalisation process. We must both move in the same direction to achieve the same goal – retaining Māori language and culture (Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori 1995 Pg. 49).

Tipene Chrisp of Te Taura Whiri also spoke about this strategic planning at the conference. He said the Māori Language Strategic Plan was “to provide a framework for the coordinated development of the Māori language over the next 15 years” (Hui Taumata Reo 1995 Pg. 54). He went on to say that the plan would identify a common

goal, and would suggest some ways in which that goal might be met. His paper referred to consultation with the Māori community which was planned for 1996.

After the contract with Te Taura Whiri to develop this strategic plan had expired in May 1996, Te Puni Kōkiri continued the work, and developed what is currently referred to as the 'Government's Māori Language Strategy'. Somewhere along the way, what was to have been a plan that would see Māori and the Crown working together in partnership towards a common language revitalisation goal, had become the 'Government's Māori Language Strategy'

Does this Strategy represent a new more proactive stance by Government in discharging its obligations to the Māori language, as opposed to its hitherto, reactive stance? Or is it merely a Strategy concerned with avoiding any risk of further Waitangi Tribunal litigation? Can this Strategy be said to reflect a desire by Government to work in a new relational partnership with Māori based on mutual development goals?

A Case Study: Government's Māori Language Strategy

The first significant step towards the development of this Strategy was the gaining of Cabinet agreement in September 1997 that, "the Crown and Māori are under a duty derived from the Treaty of Waitangi to take all reasonable steps to actively enable the survival of Māori as a living language" (Te Puni Kōkiri 1999 a. Pg. 11).

This agreement is significant because it could potentially open the Crown up to further litigation based on different interpretations of what might be considered 'reasonable' action, particularly if Māori feel that the Government has again fallen short in meeting its responsibilities towards the language.

Two months after this Cabinet decision in December 1997, Cabinet agreed to five overarching Māori language policy objectives to form the basis of the Strategy. The five policy objectives are:

1. To increase the number of people who know the Māori language by increasing their opportunities to learn Māori
2. To increase the opportunities to use Māori by increasing the number of situations where Māori can be used
3. To improve the proficiency levels of people in speaking Māori, listening to Māori, reading Māori and writing Māori
4. To increase the rate at which the Māori language develops so that it can be used for the full range of modern activities
5. To foster among Māori and non-Māori positive attitude towards, and accurate beliefs and positive values about, the Māori language, so that Māori-English bilingualism becomes a valued part of New Zealand society.

(Te Puni Kōkiri 1999 a. Pg. 12)

Mātātupu

One of the first initiatives announced under the Strategy was the launch, in 1999, of the publication 'Mātātupu Māori Language Policies and Plans: Guidelines to Assist Public Service Departments'. This was a result of another Cabinet directive making it mandatory for all Government departments to develop and implement their own Māori language policies, plans, and processes. (A companion document was also published 'Mātātupu: How to Develop Your Māori language Policies and Plans', for other Crown entities and organisations who were also encouraged to undertake Māori language planning).

Mātātupu was informed by the results of a number of surveys into the language planning being undertaken by Government departments. These ranged from the 'Blueprint for a Languages Policy: New Zealand Public Service', developed by Te Taura Whiri in 1994, to the most recent survey conducted for Te Puni Kōkiri by Chris Szekely in 1998.

The expectation contained in Mātātupu is that all Government agencies will become more proactive in their Māori language planning activities and contribute to an environment that is supportive of the language and that shows respect for the status of the language as an official language. Departments are required to increase their capacity to be able to deliver their products and services in Māori when requested. It is a relatively inexpensive initiative as Government departments do not receive funds to cover the implementation of the policy, but are expected to comply from within their current baselines.

The idea for Mātātupu was influenced by a scheme in Wales where a similar directive was introduced and implemented, and where today public service delivery in the Welsh language is readily available. However, as already discussed, there are fundamental differences between the situations in Wales and New Zealand. Language revitalisation is more advanced in Wales, where there is much greater widespread support for the language. In addition, a much greater pool of fluent speakers is available for the uptake and delivery of such services than in New Zealand.

The extent to which this Cabinet directive is heeded by individual agencies has yet to be determined, as Te Puni Kōkiri has yet to begin monitoring this part of the Strategy.

Te Tūāoma: Te Reo Māori: The Māori Language: The Steps That Have Been Taken

The Strategy was presented to the public in a discussion document, 'Te Tūāoma The Māori Language: The Steps That Have Been Taken early in 2000'. The Strategy is described as being "Government's key vehicle for coordinating, across the State Sector, Government's contribution to Māori language revitalisation". As diagrammatically represented in Te Tūāoma (see Pg.78), all Government departments must develop and implement their own Māori language policies, plans and practices, which contribute to the five policy objectives previously listed (see Pg. 74). Te Taura Whiri is responsible for the corpus development of the language, and the following three monitoring and evaluation objectives are listed.

- To monitor over time the health of the Māori language in order to measure progress in the achievement of the Government's five Māori language policy objectives
- To evaluate over time the effectiveness of the mix of policy interventions in order to measure progress in the achievement of the Government's five Māori language policy objectives
- To document over time Government's contribution, across sectors, to changes in the health of the Māori language.

Finally, Te Tūāoma outlines the following set of nine proposed Māori language policy indicators.

1. The number of people who know Māori
2. Opportunities to learn Māori
3. Proficiency in Māori
4. The visibility of the Māori language
5. The availability of the Māori language
6. The use of the Māori language
7. The production of Māori language material
8. Behaviors towards the Māori language
9. The attitudes toward, and beliefs and values about, the Māori language.

The document states that Māori language evaluation criteria are “yet to be developed”. While the Strategy is presented as an evolving strategy with further work yet to be done, it is clearly a policy direction which focuses on Government and its agencies rather than directly on Māori homes and communities.

MĀORI LANGUAGE STRATEGY

MĀORI LANGUAGE POLICY OBJECTIVES

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. to increase the number of people who know the Māori language by increasing their opportunities to learn Māori | 2. to improve the proficiency levels of people speaking Māori, listening to Māori, reading Māori and writing Māori |
| 3. to increase the opportunities to use Māori by increasing the number of situations where Māori can be used | 4. to increase the rate at which the Māori language develops so that it can be used for the full range of modern activities |
| 5. to foster amongst Māori and non-Māori positive attitudes towards and accurate beliefs and positive values about the Māori language so that Māori-English bilingualism becomes a valued part of New Zealand society | |

MINISTRY OF EDUCATION

Resource development

Māori language assessment instruments

Teacher supply

Parental and community involvement

School management

MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND TE MĀNGAI PĀHO

Television

Radio

MINISTRIES, DEPARTMENTS AND OTHER AGENCIES

“Māori language policies, plans and practices: Guidelines to assist public service departments”

Bilingual traffic signs and road markings (this matter is being investigated)

TE TAURA WHIRI I TE REO MĀORI

SUMMARY OF MĀORI LANGUAGE CORPUS DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Researching and developing changes in the Māori language | 4. Working with providers about the changes in the Māori language |
| 2. Producing materials | 5. Testing language skills |
| 3. Disseminating information | 6. Certifying language skills |

MĀORI LANGUAGE MONITORING AND EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

MĀORI LANGUAGE MONITORING AND EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

- to monitor over time the health of the Māori language in order to measure progress in the achievement of the Government's five Māori language policy objectives
- to evaluate over time the effectiveness of the mix of policy interventions in order to measure progress in the achievement of the Government's five Māori language policy objectives
- to document over time Government's contribution, across sectors, to changes in the health of the Māori language

PROPOSED MĀORI LANGUAGE POLICY INDICATORS

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. the number of people who know Māori | 2. opportunities to learn Māori |
| 3. proficiency in Māori | 4. the visibility of the Māori language |
| 5. the availability of the Māori language | 6. the use of the Māori language |
| 7. the production of Māori language material | 8. behaviour towards the Māori language |
| 9. the attitudes towards and beliefs and values about, the Māori language | |

MĀORI LANGUAGE EVALUATION CRITERIA

These are yet to be developed

Bilingual road signs

The diagram of the Government's Māori language Strategy in Te Tūāoma also refers to bilingual traffic signs and road markings as being a responsibility of Government that is under investigation. There does not appear to have been any further progress in this area to date.

The Strategy Analysed

The Strategy as it has emerged and as outlined in Te Tūāoma, will now be analysed in two ways. Firstly, it is analysed against a set of Māori policy criteria and secondly, it is assessed in light of those key factors (previously discussed) for minority language revitalisation according to socio-linguistic experts,

Durie has suggested a Māori development framework be used to assess policies that are directly linked to kaupapa Māori, that is, targeted at Māori (Massey University 1999). The genesis of this Strategy was clearly kaupapa Māori, as it was to 'provide a framework for the continuing partnership between Māori and the Government aimed at the revitalisation of the Māori language'. As it eventuated, the Strategy is more about Government managing its own contribution to the Māori language. Never the less, as it is primarily concerned with a Māori resource it must be a kaupapa Maori policy and it would be reasonable to expect Māori to have a high level of involvement and interest in it.

Durie's framework is in line with principles of positive Māori development, including the shift towards Māori delivery mechanisms and Māori control and management. He lists a number of criteria, which he says require careful consideration in the development of such policy. The development of the Māori Language Strategy is now considered against each of those criteria.

- ***Māori input into policy formulation – reactive, proactive***

Māori input into the formulation of this policy was negligible. It came from those Māori public servants from the four key agencies, Te Puni Kōkiri, Te Taura Whiri, Te Māngai Pāho and the Ministry of Education that had a hand in its development. However, involvement of those Ministries and Crown Entities directly involved in the area with which the policy is concerned, is standard practice in Government's policy development process and cannot be considered input by Māori.

As for consultation with Māori, Dr Phil Matthews, a senior analyst employed by Te Puni Kōkiri and closely involved with the development process, said that the Minister of Māori Affairs at the time that the policy was developed, the Hon Tau Henare, was of the opinion that Māori "had been consulted to death, were sick of consultation and wanted action" (personal communication).

While one might think that a comprehensive consultation process with Māori would have been an essential part of the development of any major Strategy concerning a Māori

resource, this did not occur with the Māori Language Strategy. There was no attempt to bring Māori on board or to work in a partnership approach in the development of this Strategy. One can only question a language revitalisation strategy that does not have the buy in from the key stakeholders.

In order to inform the general public about the Strategy, copies of Te Tūāoma were simply mailed to all education providers, iwi radio stations, the main public libraries and all Members of Parliament. In addition, Te Puni Kōkiri's network of regional offices was asked to distribute and make Te Tūāoma available to all iwi and key Māori organisations within their regions. There was no 'kanohi ki te kanohi' (face to face) approach to Māori regarding either the development or the communication of the Strategy.

The 'discussion document', which was produced bilingually, invited Māori to enter into discussion by providing feedback on the document. Very little was received. This is not entirely surprising given that Māori were being asked to react after the event rather than included in the process from the start.

Once the broad strategy direction had been decided, a very small scale consultation round was undertaken, in order to inform Māori about the Government's Māori Language Strategy and to seek Māori input into its further development in particular areas. For example, some workshops were held with the teacher unions (NZEI, Te Riu Roa, PPTA, Te Huarahi) and both Kia Ngākau Nui (a Māori Consultancy firm) and Te Ataarangi Incorporated were asked to provide policy advice on community language revitalisation. Nga Kaiwhakapūmau i Te Reo declined to meet with Te Puni Kōkiri officials. However, this process appears to have been very ad hoc. There was no attempt to even bring together key Māori stakeholder groups such as Te Kōhanga Reo National Trust, Te Rūnanganui o Ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori, Te Ataarangi Inc, as well as representatives from the national Māori organisations such as the Māori Congress and the Māori Women's Welfare League.

The Step by Step Guide to the Cabinet and Cabinet Committee Processes which outlines the policy development process required by Cabinet, indicates that "it may be appropriate to consult outside interest groups when developing policy" (www.dpms.govt.nz/cabinet/guide/3.html). It seems that in the case of the Strategy, a policy direction where there were potentially significant implications for Māori, meaningful consultation was not deemed 'appropriate'.

- ***Treaty of Waitangi recognition***

The development of this Strategy is clearly based on the Crown's acceptance that it has responsibilities towards the Māori language under the Treaty of Waitangi. However, whether the development and implementation of this Strategy represents Government taking ".....all reasonable steps to actively enable the survival of Māori as a living language" or merely its efforts to avoid any further litigation, is debatable and will be determined in future years.

Government appears to have ignored, in spite of the rhetoric in Te Tūāoma, the basic underlying Treaty principle of partnership, by overlooking direct Māori participation, a key component of a working Treaty of Waitangi relationship.

In addition, the Strategy shows the Government tendency to focus on Article One, governance, and Article Three, equality rights for all New Zealanders, rather than the Article Two right of self-determination or tino rangatiratanga. This is an example of the basic clash in State-Māori development goals, and also the tension the Government faces in balancing its responsibilities to the language with its responsibility to recognise tino rangatiratanga.

- ***Tino rangatiratanga (autonomy, self determination)***

No mention of tino rangatiratanga, autonomy or self-determination are made in Te Tūāoma. Apart from recognition that both Māori and the Government have a part to play in the revitalisation of the language, there is no acknowledgement in Te Tūāoma that language revitalisation is an activity that must be owned and led by those whose language it is. The Strategy was developed largely in isolation of Māori, and it appears that no thought was given as to how Māori might be involved, at the national level in the development and implementation of this Strategy. In fact, Te Tūāoma clearly signals that Māori involvement in the revitalisation process belongs at the local level. In the foreword to Te Tūāoma, the former Minister of Māori Affairs, Hon Tau Henare, talking about the challenge of Māori language revitalisation into the new millennium says that

“Revitalising the Māori language is a gigantic challenge for both Māori and Government:

- for Māori, because revitalisation will depend ultimately on the policies, plans and practices that Māori themselves develop and use at iwi, hapū, whānau and other organisational levels, and on the extent to which Māori learn and use Māori
- for Government because, through its Māori Language Strategy, it can help create an environment that encourages the use of Māori, provides assistance to revitalisation activities, and provide funds for revitalisation activities.

(Te Puni Kōkiri, 1999 a. Pg.18)”.

- ***Positive focus/funding/long-term planning***

The policy has a very positive focus at face value – Government’s contribution to the revitalisation of the Maori language. Yet the Strategy as presented in Te Tūāoma does not show any real long-term planning. It does not state what the goal of revitalisation is, and does not have the targets or milestones that one normally would expect to fall out of a comprehensive strategic planning document. Areas such as the role of the print media, potentially an important component of a sound Strategy, scarcely rate a mention.

The development and release of the Strategy was not accompanied by any additional funding for the Strategy as such, although there have been a significant increases in the amount of funds set aside by Government for Māori language education, broadcasting and Māori community revitalisation efforts.

- ***Māori participation – policy or programme level***

A core group of both Māori and non-Māori public service officials were involved in developing the Strategy, as part of the standard Government policy making process.

As the Strategy is currently focused on the Government sector, other Māori and non-Māori public servants will continue to be involved at the policy and programme level. The Māori language products and services which are provided by the Government sector, and which now form part of the Strategy, are available for both Māori and non-Māori, although one would expect the uptake to be mostly by Māori (for example, Māori language education, Māori radio and television).

- ***Integrated development (as opposed to narrow sectoral development)***

The Strategy is positive in that, in theory at least, it can be said to be taking an integrated, cross sectoral approach. It calls on all Government departments to contribute to the revitalisation process, rather than resting the responsibility for language with the education and broadcasting sectors. This is in keeping with the emerging trend by Government to try and take a more holistic approach to Māori development issues. In this case the language is identified as being not only an identity or cultural issue, but also one that impacts on the health and socio-economic status of individuals, whānau, hapū, iwi or Māori communities. Unfortunately, in practice, the education and broadcasting sectors continue to be the foci for Government involvement in Māori language activities.

At perhaps a more fundamental level, can the Strategy really be referred to as an example of integrated development when Māori, the key stakeholder group, were virtually invisible during the development process?

Targets (e.g. iwi/hapu or Māori or all)

The Strategy, as it is outlined in Te Tūāoma, lacks specific targets. Language revitalisation is presented as being for all New Zealanders, without any prioritisation.

For example, the first objective is ‘to increase the number of people who know the Māori language by increasing their opportunities to learn Māori’ as opposed to ‘to increase the number of Māori who know the Māori language by increasing their opportunities to learn Māori.’

This indicates that the long-term goal of language revitalisation has not been clearly thought through. It also indicates that Government is not comfortable in singling Māori out as the benefactors of Māori language policy. The Strategy is being sold as of being not for Māori, but for all New Zealanders. The foreword to Te Tūāoma also says, “There is still much to be done before we can realise our desire to create a country where all people of New Zealand can freely converse in either Māori or English whether at work home, school, on the sports field, marae, or church” (Te Puni Kōkiri 1999 a. Pg. 4).

This statement seems to be suggesting that the Government sees the goal of Māori language revitalisation being a country in which everyone can and does speak both Māori and English. Yet this is a decision that should be taken by Māori.

Beyond the basic question of whether Māori or all New Zealanders should be the initial focus of language revitalisation, more specific targets are lacking from the Strategy. These might include targeting kaumātua, parents and their children, particular geographical areas, or types of activity (resource development or performing arts for example). These types of targets are not mentioned in Te Tūāoma, as an integral part of the Strategy.

- ***High or low priority for Māori***

This thesis has already provided significant evidence that the revitalisation of the language is a priority goal for Māori. However, as Māori were not involved in the development of this Strategy, it is debatable whether Māori would agree that Government should be focussing its contribution on the Government sector as a priority for language revitalisation at this stage.

- ***Outcomes in terms of Māori well-being***

Recent research is showing a clear correlation between secure cultural identity, including language, and well-being. This in turn suggests that the revitalisation of the Māori language will contribute to overall Maori well-being. However, the Strategy, in its current form, with its focus on Government agencies, is unlikely to have any great impact on Māori well-being, although it might help to raise the status of the language.

- ***Opportunity for monitoring by Māori***

Government agreed in 1999 that Te Puni Kōkiri should be responsible for monitoring the Strategy, and increased its funding for this purpose. All Government Departments are required to monitor their own Māori language policies, plans and processes against the policy objectives and indicators of the Strategy, and Te Puni Kōkiri is required to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Maori Language Strategy as a whole. Some might question the validity of a Government department, in effect monitoring its own policy.

There is no explicit opportunity for Māori to be involved in the monitoring and evaluation, although it is reasonable to expect the processes to include feedback from the Māori language community.

- ***Māori role in the implementation of policy***

In its current form, the Government sector as a whole is required to implement this Strategy, through language planning and the purchase and delivery of Māori language products and services to the public. It is reasonable to assume that many of those public servants charged with discharging individual department's responsibility in this area will be Māori, as new opportunities for Māori speakers in the public service are opened up. Fishman has however, warned about the loss of fluent speakers from where they are needed most – in Māori communities (Fishman, 1991).

- *Alternate options to achieve similar goals*

Language revitalisation experts agree that the revitalisation of any minority language does need to be planned. However, unless Māori lead and control the process any benefits are likely to be minimal. A more detailed and comprehensive strategy developed in conjunction with Māori and focussing on priority areas for language revitalisation would have been preferable. Instead we seem to have a narrowly focussed Strategy developed by the Government for the Government.

Assessed against Durie's Māori development policy framework, the Strategy does not rate well. How does it fare when assessed against the priorities identified by socio-linguistic experts for minority language revitalisation?

Firstly, the Strategy shows little recognition that Māori must control the language revitalisation process. Te Tūāoma acknowledges that both Māori and the Crown have roles to play. However, it seems to see the Māori role as being confined to activities at the local level - whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori organisational level. It maintains for itself, the role of Māori language policy making at the national level and for controlling the distribution of resources. In other words, Government through the Strategy, maintains the appearance of leading the revitalisation process. Its control is demonstrated by its ability to develop policy such as the Strategy in isolation from Māori and then to inform Māori of it. In keeping with majoritarianism politics, it presents the Strategy in a way that will be most palatable to the majority, as being for all New Zealanders, rather than a policy that might be seen to be serving Māori alone in the first instance.

As presented in Te Tūāoma, the Strategy does not, at least at this stage, appear to allocate any priority to the reinstatement of the intergenerational transmission of the Māori language in Māori homes and communities. The importance of this is mentioned towards the end of Te Tūāoma, amongst a list of other questions that will need to be addressed in revitalisation efforts. RLS and the part that Government might play in it, is not explicitly expressed as a priority for the Government.

In 'Reversing Language Shift', Fishman outlined what he called the GIDS (Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale). The GIDS outlines on a scale of 1-8 the stages of 'threatened-ness' (Grin and Vaillancourt Pg. 11) that can beset a language and the priorities for language revitalisation at each level of disruption. In the Chapter of that book which discusses the position of the Māori language, he had this to say:

Māori is still dying year by year and effective first aid and major surgery are needed urgently, rather than stressing such elective non-essentials as token mass media programs, the token use of Māori in Government offices, signs and letterheads, wildly luxuriant corpus planning for 'Māori in the modern sector', literary prizes for writers, and Māori –speaking telephone operators and clerks at government agencies. All of the above mentioned are merely symbolic flourishes given the lack of substance with respect to the societal co-management which they imply, or even any substantially self-regulatory intergenerational Māori home-

family-neighborhood life on which such efforts must be firmly based if they are to contribute to RLS per se (rather than merely to jobs for a few dozen disaffected intellectuals). What would be fine goals once stages 6 to 4 are fully nailed down would merely be hollow victories, masked defeats and hopeless distractions otherwise. Even were they to be granted (who knows, another Waitangi Tribunal might make more explicit recommendations with respect to them), they would not stop the arterial bleeding of Māori any more than they have of Irish or even of Basque (Fishman 1999 Pg. 245).

In spite of this, the Government seems to have developed a Strategy that concentrates on those areas that are considered to be least useful to language revitalisation, and even possibly damaging. Fishman believes that initiatives such as outlined in Mātātupu are little more than a waste of time and money, rating them low on the GIDS scale. In addition, he warns against the potential that such activity has to poach fluent speakers from where they are most needed, in Māori communities.

The Strategy does not appear to be a sound strategic language planning document. While it has five objectives which are pretty innocuous, the long-term goal/s of language revitalisation within New Zealand are unclear. Without such goals, it is virtually impossible to develop detailed targets or to measure progress effectively. The term 'strategy' becomes a misnomer.

For example, is revitalisation about ultimately turning New Zealand into a fully bilingual country in which all New Zealanders, Māori and non-Māori can and do converse on a daily basis in Māori? There are some that advocate this position, and indeed Te Tūāoma suggests that this is the case. Is the Māori language for Māori alone and is the aim of revitalisation efforts to ensure all iwi become fluent speakers of their own tribal dialect and are able to use it on a daily basis in a number of agreed domains? There are also those that believe this is so. The 2000 'Survey of Attitudes Towards, and Beliefs and Values About, the Māori Language' found that 20% of Māori fell into the 'By Māori, for Māori' category, that is, those Māori who embrace all things Māori, but believe that Māori culture/language is exclusive to Māori'. (Te Puni Kōkiri 2001 a. unpublished).

Finally, the Strategy does not appear to directly address the economic function of the language, although the proposed increase in Māori language planning and use by the public service, will undoubtedly require more Māori language speakers.

The Chapter on RLS in Aotearoa/New Zealand, in Benton's 'Can Threatened Languages be Saved', which was written by Richard and Nena Benton, had this to say of the Government's Māori Language Strategy. "This strategy once more seems to concentrate on the frills, which look good and are easily counted, than on the substance which can only be achieved through hard work with and by communities" (Fishman 2001 Pg. 444).

The Strategy then, does not rate well when assessed against either socio-linguistic criteria for successful language revitalisation, or against Māori development criteria for policy development. It is a prime example of how, in the absence of any mechanism for Māori

input into policy making at the national level, Government can develop policies on Māori resources in isolation from Māori.

The Strategy or Status Quo?

As illustrated, the Strategy is fundamentally flawed. The Government however, continues purchasing and providing a range of Māori language products and services on the basis of the Strategy. Yet it is difficult to determine whether/where they fit within the Strategy or whether they are activities that it would be undertaking had the Strategy not been developed. The key players and activities being undertaken are now reviewed.

Institutional arrangements - Finding a 'home' for the language within Government.

The previous Chapter talked briefly about Government's reluctance to become involved in cultural heritage generally. It showed its difficulty in coming to terms with what its responsibilities in the sector are, what its priorities should be, and how to rationalise its muddled institutional arrangements. What is true on the broader level across Government in terms of cultural heritage is also true for its arrangements for Māori language.

The roles of those Government Departments with key Māori language responsibilities have never been clearly defined and this has resulted in fragmented and uncoordinated activity which has not been monitored or evaluated overall. For example, "resources in broadcasting are considered apart from the policies of Te Taura Whiri" (Durie 2000 b. Pg. 46).

Before 1997, no single Public Service Department was responsible for Māori language development, including Māori broadcasting policy. The Ministry of Education developed policy relating to Māori language education, the Ministry of Commerce policy relating to Māori broadcasting, and Te Taura Whiri was responsible for providing advice on the implementation of the declaration of Māori as an official language of New Zealand, for promoting the use of the Māori language as a living language and as an ordinary means of communication.

Yet, quite amazingly, no single Government agency was responsible for leading and coordinating, across the state sector, Government's contribution to the development of the language. As part of the Strategy, the Government has for some time been looking at rationalising its institutional arrangements. Recent moves have included giving Te Puni Kōkiri a provisional lead role for Māori language policy advice and shifting the responsibility for Māori broadcasting from the Ministry of Commerce to Te Puni Kōkiri (as of 1 July 2000).

However, even within Te Puni Kōkiri, Māori language development does not appear to have a secure home. Historically, responsibility for Māori language issues fell upon those teams working on education issues. In recent years it was placed in the 'Māori

Potential' team which was charged with supporting Māori developed initiatives. For a short time language was shifted to the Treaty Compliance Unit. Relocated back in the Social Policy Branch at the beginning of 2001, a stand-alone Māori language team which incorporated both the policy and monitoring and evaluation components, was established for the first time. However, this was short lived and the appointment of a new Chief Executive in 2001 has led again to the split between the two key functions. The policy function has joined the 'Māori Cultural Heritage and Indigenous Issues Unit, and the monitoring and evaluation function has become part of the State Sector Responsiveness team.

The Māori language function has generally been seen as something of an aberration within Te Puni Kōkiri's structure, and many attempts have been made to find it a 'home' within the organisation. Te Puni Kōkiri's lead role on language policy partly explains the difficulty in recent times. In most other areas, such as education or health for example, its role is one of reacting to policy developed by other departments. However, because it leads Māori policy development, the nature of the work carried out by those working on language is quite different.

This inability to find a secure 'home' for the language within the Ministry of Māori Development also reflects the uneasy relation between Governments and culture, indicating that Governments are more comfortable focusing on social and economic development. It also reflects the ongoing tendency to equate Māori language revitalisation with Māori language education and reflects a failure to recognise that language and cultural development should underpin all Māori development. The recent move to finally locate language, as part of a broader Cultural Heritage and Indigenous Issues Unit seems long overdue and logical.

Government's Key Language Players

While Te Puni Kōkiri now has the lead role for Māori language policy and for monitoring and evaluation the Strategy, there are currently three other key Government players in language activities. These are the Ministry of Education, Te Taura Whiri and Te Māngai Pāho. While the intention of the Strategy is to broaden the participation to an 'all-of-Government' approach, at the current time, focus continues to be on these three.

Te Taura Whiri

Since its establishment under the Māori Language Act 1987, Te Taura Whiri has played an important part in supporting the Māori language. Its functions as described in the Act are:

- To initiate, develop, co-ordinate, review, advise upon, and assist in the implementation of policies, procedures, measures, and practices designed to give effect to the declaration of the Māori language as an official language of New Zealand

- To generally promote the Māori language, and, in particular, its use as a living language and as an ordinary means of communication
- To grant certificates of competency in translation and interpreting
- To consider and report to the Minister upon any matter relating to the Māori language that the Minister may from time to time refer to the Commission for its advice and
- Such other functions as may be conferred upon the Commission by any other enactment.

As previously stated, Te Taura Whiri is a Crown Agency, which, while at a greater arms length from the Government than a Department, remains accountable to the Government. The Government provides its funding and determines its activities on an annual basis. The Māori Language Commissioner and other members of the Board are appointed by the Minister of Māori Affairs on the advice of Te Puni Kōkiri. Te Puni Kōkiri is responsible for monitoring the performance of Te Taura Whiri, on behalf of the Minister. Te Taura Whiri, while able to provide policy advice to the Minister of Māori Affairs, is not, as of right, part of the formal policy making process, and is involved on invitation by other Government Departments.

There has been considerable tension between Te Taura Whiri and Te Puni Kōkiri over recent years. The current Minister of Māori Affairs, the Hon Parekura Horomia, has publicly called for better relationships between the two organisations (Milne 2001). It appears that much of the tension has resulted over confusion over the role of the former and constrictions placed on it by the latter. In addition, Te Taura Whiri often seems to see itself not so much as an agent of the Crown but as representing the Māori people. This has occurred partly because the Commissioner and board members have tended to come from the Māori language community as opposed to their being ‘career public servants’.

Quite possibly because the Act does not specify what an ‘Official Language’ means in practice, beyond the right to use it when giving evidence in Courts, Te Taura Whiri has not been very active in fulfilling this first function. Instead, it has tended to take on the role of quality watch-dog for the language, similar to that of the Alliance Francaise. It has also become involved in providing Māori language products and services itself. This has included the running of immersion language courses for teachers of Māori and others, and publishing two volumes of ‘Matatiki’, a publication which contain new Māori words created to ensure the language keeps up with modern day activity.

As part of an ongoing review of its institutional arrangements for the Māori language, Te Puni Kōkiri conducted a review of Te Taura Whiri in 1998. The review was an adverse one, which found that,

the current functions and disposition of Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori are not sustainable. Fundamental change is required to keep abreast of the changes, especially the need to respond to the new Māori Language Strategy” (Te Puni Kōkiri 1998 a. Pg. 10).

The review recommended a split between the governance and management functions of the Commission, improved representation by stakeholders on the Commission's Board, an improved mix of skills on the Board, including policy skills, as well as improved competition in Māori language products and services. The aftermath of the review was the resignation of the inaugural Commissioner, Timoti Karetu, and all but one longstanding member of the Commission.

Since the review, some changes have been instituted, but the Commission has largely continued with its activities, pending any decisions from the broader review of Government's institutional arrangements. The Commission exists on a small budget. However in 1999, it was successful in having its baseline increased to enable it to develop the first Māori-Māori dictionary and to develop Māori language proficiency tests for adults.

The dictionary project, Te Mātāpuna, has led to the establishment of three Puna Reo in Ngāi Tahu, Te Tai Tokerau and Te Arawa. Originally funded and contracted by Te Taura Whiri to provide words for inclusion in the dictionary, the hope is now that they will grow to become the language hubs of Māori communities, able to assist with language planning at the local level. Te Taura Whiri is also regularly publishing booklets and newsletters designed to encourage the use of Māori by parents to their children in their homes, such as 'Ko Te Whānau'. Another initiative that Te Taura Whiri is currently leading is an investigation into the viability of establishing a national Māori language institute.

Overall, the activities that Te Taura Whiri is currently engaged in would appear to rate at different levels on Fishman's GIDS scale. In addition, while Te Taura Whiri's 2000-01 purchase agreement states that the work of Te Taura Whiri will contribute to each of the objectives and indicators of the Strategy, there is no further link between its activities and the strategy and how it measures their effectiveness.

Some of its activities are demonstrating an awareness of the importance of focusing on the home and community and intergenerational transmission. However Fishman, warns that community language development must be bottom-up, i.e. Government-led community initiatives often "seem foreign, imposed and at cross-purposes to the local population" (Fishman 1991 Pg. 126).

At the end of the day, Te Taura Whiri is a Government agency, accountable to the Government not the Māori language community. This lends weight to the argument that Government is currently in control of the language revitalisation process. "While Māori may be represented among the gatekeepers for a particular resource such as land, and in some cases, such as the Māori language Commission, constitute the entire governing body, it does not follow that Māori are in control"(Durie 2000 b. Pg. 46).

Unfortunately, widespread confusion over Te Taura Whiri's role leads to confusion and lack of coordination of activities. Te Taura Whiri is perhaps, a further example of a

Government structure, established ostensibly to give Māori some limited ability to administer their own affairs, but in practice lacking much real control.

The Māori Language Education Plan

Like Te Taura Whiri, the Ministry of Education is another key player in Government's institutional arrangements for the Māori language. It plays a central role in assisting the Government to meet its obligations to the Māori language through the provision of Māori language education. The development and implementation of its 'Māori Language Education Plan (MIEP)' is the Ministry's key contribution to the Government's overall language strategy. However, once again, there does not appear to be any clear linkages between its activities and how they are contributing to the Strategy's objectives and indicators.

Intended to form an overarching framework for the Māori language education activity that it funds, like the Government's overall Strategy, it lacks specificity. The plan sets out what activities are required to support the provision of Māori medium education. Its five key elements are:

- 1 Teacher supply – building an adequate supply of appropriately skilled teachers to support all forms of Māori language education
- 2 Teaching and learning materials – increasing the quantity and quality of materials in each of the Māori curriculum areas and for early childhood education
- 3 Assessment tools – developing assessment tools to determine if language education and education outcomes are being achieved
- 4 School management – emphasising the need for good school management and providing information to schools on the need for and benefits of Māori language education
- 5 Community Support – raising community support and demand for Māori language education.

(Ministry of Education 2001).

A great deal of activity is continuing across all of the five areas above. The Ministry has for the last two years provided TeachNZ Scholarships to attract Māori into teaching and especially Maori medium teaching. It purchases a range of professional development courses aimed at improving the quality of both teachers of Māori and Māori medium teachers who are already in the system.

Substantial new budget is going into the production of Māori language teaching and learning resources and some attempts are now being made to monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of what is being produced. Proposed legislative change will see the registration requirement for teachers extended to early childhood and kura kaupapa Māori. A new process for the establishment of kura has been introduced whereby Kura Teina are established and mentored by already established kura until they are ready to go it alone.

The Government recently allocated \$1.4 million to the Ministry annually to fund locally developed Māori language projects that:

- support community based language initiatives
- help revitalise the Māori language
- help promote local dialect and tikanga, and
- foster and enhance closer links between schools and the Māori community

In its first year of implementation, the scheme has concentrated on working with those iwi with which it has already established iwi partnerships. They are Ngāi Tahu, Tūhoe, Ngāti Porou, the three iwi represented by Te Rūnanga o Tūrangānui-a-Kiwa (Te Aitanga-ā-Māhaki, Rongowhakaata and Ngāi Tāmanuhiri) and the four iwi represented by Te Tai Tokerau (Te Aupōuri, Te Rarawa, Ngāti Kahu and Ngāpuhi). The Ministry is also currently funding Te Ataarangi to improve the language skills of parents and care-givers to help them support their children's learning in Māori, and work is underway on a parent Māori language literacy pilot which will provide further support for Māori language learning in the community.

It seems, that the Ministry of Education, like Te Taura Whiri, is beginning to support activities that focus on Māori homes and communities and the reinstatement of inter-generation transmission. Yet, also like Te Taura Whiri, this activity does not clearly link to the Government's Māori Language Strategy.

Like Te Taura Whiri, the Ministry is funded by the Government and it is accountable to the Government, not to Māori for its activities. There is no argument that Māori language education is an important part of Māori language revitalisation, but as the New Zealand experience to date perhaps shows, there is a danger in placing too much emphasis on it. Māori language education needs to be seen as supporting the language learning in the home, and needs to be controlled, as much as possible by Māori parents and communities. In 'Reversing Language Shift', Fishman rated kohanga reo at Level 6 on the GIDs with kura kaupapa Māori at Level 4, both featuring at what he believes is the crucial 4a –6 Levels, but stresses that they should remain as free as possible from government interference. As the Bentons point out, "...New Zealand schools, despite the ultimately external regulation to which they are subjected, are in fact often key community and neighborhood institutions, subject to a fair degree of community influence and control" (Fishman 2001 Pg. 429).

Māori continue to lobby for more control over education. The idea of establishing a Māori Education Authority of some form, is one that continues to be widely debated. Hollings has argued that the rise of Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori is as much to do with language revitalisation as it is with self-determination. "The emphasis on te reo Māori has become an important focal marker in efforts to regain power and authority in the sphere of education" (Hollings 1991 Pg. 27). So while these types of institution might rely on Government for funding as other schools do, they are unlikely to compromise their ability to deliver Māori language education their way.

The immersion education phenomenon also needs to be kept in perspective by remembering that 80% of Māori children today are educated outside of this, in the so-called 'mainstream'. The 20% of Māori children in total immersion education may correlate with the 20% of Māori who fell into the 'By Māori, for Māori' category of the attitudes survey, believing that Māori language and culture is exclusive to Māori. A huge task of Māori language revitalisation is, perhaps, to ensure that greater numbers are involved in the revitalisation kaupapa.

Te Māngai Pāho

Te Māngai Pāho, is the fourth key Government agency, along with Te Puni Kōkiri, Te Taura Whiri and the Ministry of Education with a significant role in relation to the Māori language. Under section 53b of the Broadcasting Act 1989, Te Māngai Pāho's statutory function is "to promote the Māori language and Māori culture by making funds available, on such terms and conditions, as it thinks fit, for broadcasting and the production of programmes to be broadcast" (Te Māngai Pāho 2000). In practice this means that its key role is to purchase, on behalf of the Government, Māori television and radio programming. Its policy in recent times has been to prioritise funding of Māori language programming. For example, an iwi radio station's funding will be tied to the number of hours it broadcasts daily in the Māori language.

Te Māngai Pāho's 2000-2001 Statement of Intent, said that it will be guided by the Government's Māori language objectives in making purchase decisions, yet this is as far as the Strategy is mentioned.

Te Puni Kōkiri is today the lead agency with responsibility for Māori broadcasting policy, although it is usual for Te Māngai Pāho to be consulted when such policy is under development. Responsibility for Māori language broadcasting, like Māori language policy, has recently been placed with the Cultural Heritage and Indigenous Issues Unit within Te Puni Kōkiri.

Broadcasting has continued to be a vexed area as Māori and the Crown have continued to battle it out over what is a fair share for Māori in the sector and particularly around the establishment of a Māori television channel, which is now discussed.

Other Recent Language Developments

The present Government has recently announced that a Māori television channel will go to air from June 2002, proclaiming that it "will help to enrich New Zealand's society, culture and heritage" (Revington 2001 Pg. 33). This announcement is without a doubt thanks to the persistent lobbying by some Māori broadcasters and language supporters for their own television channel and the unrelenting pressure put on the Government in this respect.

Yet, the establishment of the television channel may have more to do with the Government's desire to avoid any further litigation in regards to its broadcasting policy,

and a vote retaining ploy, rather than one planned step in an overall plan for the revitalisation of the language. In *The Press*, of 25 July 2001, Māori Council chairman Sir Graham Latimer, “said he had asked his lawyers to file another case with the Privy Council (over the delays), but called it off when he got a call from a government official a few days later promising actions”. Te Āwhiorangi, the Māori television Trust that was set up by the previous Government to establish the television channel had also made threats to the Government of legal action.

It is generally accepted that television and radio are hugely influential factors in people’s lives and that the Māori language needs to be heard on both these mediums. However, whether Māori television is sustainable and should be a priority at this time is perhaps debatable. Some argue that such a channel is essential in providing a Māori face on television, aiding the status of the language and perhaps assisting with the learning of the language. On the other hand experts such as Fishman believe,

The ‘fundamental process’ (intergenerational transmission) is exactly where an intelligent concentration of scarce resources belongs, if only because Māori TV, should it ever come into being on a ‘demographically proportionate’ basis, would hardly be able to compete successfully (as an RLS thrust) with the mammoth English programming with which it obviously be compared” (Fishman 1991 Pg. 244).

The sum required for the successful running of the channel has steadily risen. Te Āwhiorangi continued to claim the amount the Government had set aside was insufficient and that it would be setting up another failure. The final figures allocated to the channel are \$33 million to set the channel up, \$40 million in the following year, and \$55 million the year after that. However, *Nga Kaiwhakapūmau i Te Reo Māori* believes that the service needs \$100 million a year to be effective (Berry 2001 d.). There are fears that the channel will not be able to compete with the mainstream stations. Welsh television in comparison receives approximately \$240 million (&80 million) annually.

Unlike with the development of the ‘Māori Language Strategy’, the Government did attempt to work closely with key Māori language stakeholders and key Māori organisations over the establishment of the television channel. The governance and ownership arrangements for the channel have proven to be particularly problematic. The new television channel will be a statutory corporation with four Māori-appointed and three Government-appointed directors. The four Māori representatives will be appointed by the same Electoral College that elected members of Te Āwhiorangi. Revisions to that Electoral College have been made.

The idea of this type of governance arrangement is that it removes the Minister, and therefore the Government, from directly appointing the directors. The onus is shifted to the members of the Electoral College, made up of key Māori language and representative Māori organisations. This may well be an improvement on past arrangements where the Minister directly appoints people to such boards. Yet it remains an example of the structuralist model or approach, in which the Government deals with Māori through a

number of structures and organisations instead of as a united indigenous people. This process removes the Minister one step further from the appointments, yet it is still the Crown that sets up the Electoral College in the first instance.

The Government has also had to navigate diverse opinion within Maoridom over the purpose of the channel. In particular, there has been disagreement between those that believe that the channel should broadcast Māori language programmes only, and those that believe that the channel must also cater for non-Māori speaking Māori by broadcasting in English. It appears that a compromise has been made, with the new television channel to screen both Maori language and English language programming. However, the Alliance Party's broadcasting spokesperson, MP Willie Jackson, has already said that he will not be happy with less than 40% programming in English (Berry 2001 c).

As a result of this, Te Māngai Pāho has already signaled that it may have to change its Māori programming only funding policy.

This television channel saga presents further examples of how the lack of a united Māori voice enables the Government to muddle along making dubious policy decisions related to Māori resources. Māori were unable to articulate an agreed stance to the Government regarding the establishment of a television channel. The decision appears to be an emotionally charged political one, rather than one that is based on a coherent long term plan for Māori radio, television and print, which forms part of an overall plan for the revitalisation of the language.

Asked if he was supportive of the decision to finally go ahead and establish Māori television Māori MP Willie Jackson replied:

“Absolutely. But I worry that the government will see it as an easy fix, because the whole question of supporting the language and culture is something governments find extremely hard to deal with” (Revington 2001 Pg. 34).

If there were some mechanism for Māoridom to formulate its views regarding Māori resources and present them in a united way to Government to adopt as policy, Māori resource development might proceed much more smoothly than it currently is.

A very recent development has been the resignation of Board member Hekia Parata, citing concerns over the funding arrangements. Coming within weeks of the Board having been established, this may indicate further controversy as the television channel develops.

Monitoring and Evaluation

Cabinet agreed in 1999 that Te Puni Kōkiri should monitor and evaluate the Māori Language Strategy, and a small Te Puni Kōkiri team has established a long term program to undertake the following three objectives as outlined in Te Tūāoma:

- To monitor over time the health of the Māori language in order to measure progress in the achievement of the Government's five Māori language policy objectives
- To evaluate over time the effectiveness of the mix of policy interventions in order to measure progress in the achievement of the Government's five Māori language policy objectives
- To document over time Government's contribution, across sectors, to changes in the health of the Māori language.

It has been involved in a range of projects that are intended to meet the above objectives. As mentioned earlier, it conducted a post censal survey on the health of the Māori language in 2001. Results of the survey are intended to provide the basis for the targeted and systematic allocation of available resources to achieve the objectives of the Māori Language Strategy. It is hoped that the analysis will also provide some high level information about the impact of existing initiatives and Māori satisfaction with these. If the survey is repeated at regular intervals, as planned, overall trends in Māori language revitalisation will emerge and inform policy development in this area.

During 2001 Te Puni Kōkiri also had a number of projects underway concerned with monitoring at a national level, the effectiveness of Government's policies in relation to the language, in other words, the overall effectiveness everywhere and with everyone of the Māori language Strategy.

Referred to earlier, a 'Survey of Attitudes Towards, and Values and Beliefs About, the Māori Language' was conducted. It is intended that the results of this survey be used to inform policies and programmes designed to further the fifth objective of the Māori Language Strategy, 'to foster amongst Māori and non-Māori positive attitudes towards, and accurate beliefs and positive values about, the Māori language so that Māori-English bilingualism becomes a valued part of New Zealand society'. In addition, it is hoped that it will assist Te Taura Whiri to match the messages of their promotional activities to the characteristics and needs of specific areas and populations.

Another project 'Participation in Te Reo Māori' involved research into the factors that support or hinder the intergenerational transmission of the Māori language within Māori families. It is interesting that this important research is taking place, although there is no explicit reference to intergenerational transmission in the Strategy itself.

The 'Effectiveness of the Mix of Māori Language Policies' project is concerned with developing and trialing a methodological approach for assessing the effectiveness of the range and mix of Māori language policy interventions at the community level.

Te Puni Kōkiri is also currently assisting Te Ataarangi to develop an up-to-date structural profile of their organisation with a view to eventually determining the impact of their activities on Māori language revitalisation .

It is clear that the Government is currently undertaking some valuable monitoring and evaluation activity. Lack of information about the health of the language has been problematic in the past, and Te Puni Kōkiri seems to be making a concerted effort to gather information regularly on the health of the language and the impact that Government's policies are having.

Yet without a clear revitalisation goal indicating at what point will be able to say that the Māori language is revitalised, any monitoring and evaluating framework will inevitably be weak.

Uia Ngā Whetū - Māori Language Conference 2001

In June 2001, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori held a Māori Language Conference to which it invited key personnel from the Government sector working on Māori language as well as from the wider Maori language community. Named 'Uia Ngā Whetū' or 'Ask the Stars', the conference dates were set to coincide with the rise of Matariki, (Pleides) the group of stars which signal the start of the Māori New Year. However, the name of the conference might also be interpreted as a plaintive cry for help – ask the stars because nobody else seems to know what they're doing!

The conference tended to focus on the Government sector, with key note speakers from Government's four key Māori language players, Te Puni Kōkiri, the Ministry of Education, Te Māngai Pāho, Te Taura Whiri. It provided an opportunity for the Government to show case some of the Māori language initiatives it is currently funding, such as video conferencing for wharekura and the dictionary project. Te Taura Whiri also took the opportunity to consult with some key Māori language stakeholders on the plan to establish a Māori Language Institute. Unfortunately, there was very little input from whānau, hapu iwi or Māori organisations about their local language initiatives or about how they see Government being able to assist them in their efforts.

Perhaps the most significant words spoken at the conference were those that came in the concluding speeches delivered by the Minister of Māori Affairs, Parekura Horomia and the then newly appointed Chief Executive of Te Puni Kōkiri, Leith Comer. Looking ahead, Comer said that Te Puni Kōkiri will be:

- Looking to Māori for some decisions about what revitalisation should achieve
- Working to develop a Māori community focus to the Māori Language Strategy
- Looking for ways to work more closely with whānau, hapū, iwi and Māori to accelerate revitalisation (Te Puni Kōkiri 2001 b.)

In his speech, the Minister said that progress was being made, but the lack of a "unified Māori voice" was thwarting the development of a clear strategic direction, and this had to be resolved. Earlier in the year, the Minister was quoted as saying of difficult issues such as Māori language and broadcasting, "The synergy is not there..." and "The difficulty of things like the (Māori) language strategy, (is that) its off in half a dozen different silos (Berry 2001 e.).

These statements imply recognition by the Government that the Strategy is lacking and needs major work to make it a worthwhile Māori language-planning document. Most significantly these words acknowledge the need for Māori to be involved not only as the focus of the Strategy but as key players in its development and implementation.

\$15 Million for Māori Community Language Initiatives

Just a matter of weeks after the Māori television channel was announced the Minister of Māori Affairs announced a further Māori language initiative. It is the proposed allocation of \$15 million to Māori communities for Māori language initiatives. The pool of money was secured by the previous Minister of Māori Affairs, Hon Tau Henare, but had been waiting for decisions regarding its use and management since. The funds will be administered by Te Taura Whiri. However the fund will be managed by a fund management committee consisting equally of Māori and Government representatives.

This move is further evidence of the growing recognition by the Government that it needs to focus its Strategy more on language revitalisation in Māori homes and communities.

Summary Chapter Four

Through both a case study of the Government's Māori Language Strategy and a review of Government's overall involvement in Māori language development, Chapter Four has provided clear evidence in support of Durie, that "the current approach to the governance of Māori resources at national levels is piecemeal and fragmented" (Durie, 2000 b. Pg.46).

In keeping with its overall Māori development policy, the Government continues to appear generally more concerned with being seen to be meeting its Treaty obligations and avoiding further litigation, than in working in partnership with Māori over the development of policy in relation to Māori resources.

The Strategy itself is an example of how the Government takes a reluctant lead role in Māori language and culture, preferring to market its policies in these areas as being policy for all New Zealanders rather than policies that recognise special rights, either Treaty based or of indigeneity.

As well as, or in spite of the Strategy, the Government is supporting a good deal of language development activity. While this continues to be largely focussed on Māori language education and on broadcasting, it is also beginning to support Māori language initiatives at the local level, and a number of Māori/Government partnerships, focussing on language in homes and communities are emerging. The Government has also recently recognised that its Strategy has weaknesses and that it will be looking to Māori for guidance and decisions about how to accelerate the revitalisation of the language.

This presents another opportunity for Māori, at the national level, to be involved in decision making concerned with a fundamental Māori resource, the language. At the current time the Government can only talk to Māori at a structuralist level as it did with key Māori language and broadcasting stakeholders over the Māori television channel. What really is required is a united and representative Māori voice, which can put the Māori position regarding the language to the Government, and can guide the Government in how it can best support Māori development through supporting language revitalisation. Without this direction, poor policy, such as that presented in the Māori Language Strategy will continue to be developed.

CHAPTER FIVE

Māori Language Development into the 21st Century – A ‘Home’ Within Maoridom?

Introduction

Chapter Five focuses on Māori involvement in Māori language activities. Thus far considerable evidence has been presented to support the assertion that cultural survival (including that of the language) and self-determination are key Māori development goals. Yet does the Māori language really have a secure home within Māoridom and are these goals reflected in behaviour and practice?

Māori have been criticised for focussing too much on economic resource development at the expense of social and cultural development, and have also often been criticised for either simply not caring enough about the language, or for relying too heavily on the Government to care for the language. This Chapter looks at the priority being given to the Māori language by Māori today.

In particular, it looks at the type and range of language planning that various iwi/Māori are involved in. It attempts to show how there is much to be optimistic about in this respect, and that many Māori/iwi are determining their own language development at the local level.

However, it also attempts to show, as the previous Chapter did, that for Māori language revitalisation to be successful, Māori need to take responsibility for and control the process at the macro, as well as local levels. To do so, there must be some mechanism for Māori, rather than the Government, to lead Māori language policy and the related resource distribution. In order for this to happen, a number of difficult Māori-Māori relationships discussed in Chapter Three need to be resolved.

The Māori language – a priority for Māori

As illustrated so far, Māori leaders have repeatedly called for Māori to develop as Māori, or in other words, secure in their cultural identity, of which the language forms an integral part. Early in last century, both Ngata and Kenana for example, preached essentially the same message, the need to retain the Māori culture and language. Since then, there has been no shortage of other Māori leaders who have continued to lay down the challenge, both throughout the last century and into the new one.

Māori self-determination is a shallow goal if a Māori identity is not part of the equation. Two factors stand out in the struggle to retain and develop a positive identity and a strong cultural base. First, despite overwhelming odds and state

opposition, Māori language, tribal identity, and Māori values and beliefs have survived. Second, survival alone has become less important than the sense of authenticity that comes through ownership and control (Durie, 1998 Pg. 79).

The fact that the language has survived, is testimony to the will of Māori for it to do so. Yet from time to time Māori have been criticised by both Māori and non-Māori for not giving the language sufficient priority.

At Te Hui Taumata Reo in 1995, Tauehe Jeffries pulled no punches in calling on Māori to do more for the language. This was the same year that the National Māori Language Survey found that the language was still an endangered state in spite of the lapse of 10-15 years since Te Ataarangī, Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori were established by Māori.

He warned against what he saw as an unrealistic reliance being put on formal education programmes which he said were operating in a 'language vacuum' with little support from wider society. He commented that the various Māori language bodies, such as kōhanga, kura, wānanga, iwi radio stations, teacher education providers, and so on, tended to be acting in isolation of one another, rather than working together in the holistic approach required for language development. Jeffries also said that not enough was happening at the community level to encourage greater use of the Maori language in a wider range of domains. He warned of what he saw as a growing complacency amongst Māori to the survival of the language. "I still don't believe that Māori people feel strongly enough about the language for it to survive" (Jeffries 1995 Pg. 134).

Referring to his time working at Te Puni Kōkiri he said,

.. it became very apparent that te reo Māori is not a major issue for Māori at this time. The number of people who made representation to the Ministry and our Minister on issues relating to the language were miniscule in relation to other issues – particularly land claims (Jeffries 1995 Pg. 133).

Jeffries bemoaned the lack of lobbying and protest action by Māori in recent times, comparing the Māori situation to that in Wales, where protesters had ripped up English language road signs and a Welsh parliamentarian had gone on a hunger strike in support of the establishment of a Welsh television channel. He asked where the Māori language protestors had gone.

Jeffries conceded that what he saw as complacency was possibly due to a lack of informed debate and discussion, and proposed that a National Māori Language Association be established. Such an Association, he believed, would be able to better inform people about the ongoing state of the language and be a forum for all people to express their concerns. Most importantly, it could become a powerful lobby group representing Māori language issues.

In 1998, more criticism about the priority being given the language came from language consultant, Hineihaea Murphy, who had this to say,

While as Māori we claim that the language is a vital part of our cultural well-being, clearly for most of us, Māori language does not have the same value as other things that we hold dear, such as land and fisheries. Accordingly, we do not fight for Māori language in the same way that we struggle for land. Moreover, we have been happy, to some extent, to relinquish the primary responsibility for maintaining or reclaiming our language to the government, which we have definitely not been prepared to do for our other taonga.

And,

“My despondency of late has been based on a realisation that for New Zealand society at large – including the Māori population – the Māori language issue does not have a very high priority” (Murphy 1998 Pg. 103)

Murphy, not only supported Jeffries concern at the lack of Māori protest action, but also agreed that Māori had tended to support the Government’s focus on the education system as the main vehicle for supporting the revitalisation of the Māori language. She believed that there had been a tendency to see Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori as the saviours of the language. She also commented on the need for Māori linguists who would be able to assist with language revitalisation.

The former Māori language Commissioner, Timoti Karetu, was also renowned during his term in office for his frequent wake up calls to Māoridom to get behind the language. He continues to make these calls in his current role with the Kōhanga Reo National Trust. At the recent 2001 Māori Language Conference, ‘Uia Ngā Whetū’, he said he believed there was a will among Māori to maintain the language, but it needed to be greater.

Certainly the language protest lobby groups of the 1970s do not appear to be as active now as they once were. Perhaps they are working more behind the scenes rather than as an active protest or lobby group advocating on behalf of the language. For instance, little is heard publicly today from Nga Kaiwhakapūmau i Te Reo Inc. The organisation was silent at the lack of consultation over and the substance of, the Government’s Māori Language Strategy. However, it did watch closely over the events surrounding the establishment of the Māori television channel. Spokesperson Huirangi Waikerepuru said “the organisation kept to the side to keep the process honest but will now let those with the expertise run the new channel.”, and “...when it comes to management and budget issues certain things Ngā Kaiwhakapūmau wanted will not be achieved yet” (Arotahi News Service July 2001 Edition 18). What those issues are have not been made public.

In general, there has been continuing lobbying to have the Māori television channel established, but this has tended to come more from Māori broadcasting interest groups than from Māori language lobbyists. As Jeffries said, there is no unified Māori language lobby group and the various sectoral groups such as Kōhanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa

Māori seem to work in isolation of one another and from iwi overall. Yet potentially, if all the Māori language interest groups and iwi were to come together, they would form a powerful group. This lack of a unified Māori voice is perhaps why Te Taura Whiri has adopted for itself a guardianship role of the language, one that perhaps, rightfully belongs to iwi/Māori. It also often takes on the lobbying role itself, risking the ire of the Government that it serves and is accountable to. Iwi/Māori politics and problems as discussed in Chapter Three complicate the Government's ability to work with Māori on Māori language issues, and the Government is often frustrated in its attempts to do this when there is no mandated Māori body politic with whom to talk. Chapter Four, in its brief discussion of the circumstances surrounding the long-awaited establishment of a Māori television channel, demonstrated how difficult it can be for the Government to work with Māori on Māori resource related issues.

However, the lack of a militant voice does not necessarily mean that significant support for revitalisation of the language does not exist. Sometimes other avenues are pursued. For example, Māori worked to ensure that the Draft Declaration of Indigenous Rights clearly articulated the right of indigenous peoples to maintain and control their languages and cultures.

There may be some validity in the criticism that the language is not enough of a priority, or that there is too much complacency and reliance on formal education programmes to save the language. Yet as Durie reminds us, "Nor should it be forgotten that, for many Māori, cultural identity is a sophistication: it is more than enough simply to get through each day" (Durie 2000 b. Pg. 215). This is a salient reminder of the disadvantaged position that many Māori are in and that for many, reclaiming the language simply cannot be a priority. Statistics such as the fact that in 1996, about 43% of Māori women with dependent children were sole parents (Te Puni Kōkiri 1999 d.) lend support to Durie's suggestion that cultural identity, for many, can only be an undreamed of luxury. Such statistics also demonstrate the need for cultural development to be advanced alongside social and economic development.

Durie's statement is also a reminder that those fervently reclaiming the language and culture tend to be middle class, politicised Māori. They are likely to correlate to those 20% or so, who in the 2000 'Survey of Attitudes Towards, and Beliefs and Values About, the Māori Language', said they promote the self-determination call of "by Māori for Māori". It is also highly likely that it is this group that have been the instigators and promoters of systems which reflect this, such as Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori.

Yet in spite of a many mitigating factors and massive disadvantage in society, Māori have ensured that the language has survived. Māori communities established Te Ataarangi, Kōhanga Reo, and Kura Kaupapa Māori. The Ministry of Education is today unable to adequately resource the demand for total immersion Māori language education whether within the Kura Kaupapa Māori system or within mainstream schools.

There is some evidence that many iwi have found it necessary to focus on the establishment of a secure economic base, through the settling of their historical

grievances with the Crown, as a precursor to moving on to cultural considerations. This is evidence of the widely held view that the Māori language has a cultural/identity function, but does not have an economic function.

In general, the language does not appear to have been considered (by Government as well as by Māori) as a resource to be developed in the same way that other more tangible resources such as forestry, land and fisheries have. The language has often taken a back seat in face of the focus on physical resources from which the most immediate economic gains are foreseen. The language has often been left in the hands of the Government and the education and broadcasting sectors or in the hands of the women at the local kohanga or kura.

There can be no denying that the settlement of outstanding historical grievances through compensation payments being made by Government, is providing some iwi with the land and cash resources to enable them to start building up a much needed economic basis as a platform for further development. For instance, "The Tainui settlement, which includes sizeable cash and land settlements has thrust Tainui into the forefront of regional economic development" (Coates and McHugh 1998 Pg. 25).

However, there has been some criticism of the belief held by some iwi/Māori groups that by focussing purely on economic development, the current Māori woes can be addressed. For instance, Tainui have been criticised for focussing on economic resource development at the expense of the significant social and cultural needs of its people. Some urban Māori leaders have criticised the traditional Maori leadership for not ensuring a flow on of benefits to the iwi who need it and for not giving social and cultural development equal consideration. John Tamihere and Merepeka Raukawa-Tait both criticised this approach on national television, saying that iwi/Māori have a responsibility to provide for the social and cultural needs of their people and that a focus on investments and profit is not a good basis for advancement. " the general trend however, has been to join the global economy and put financial dividends and the development of managerial and entrepreneurial skills first (while assuming that necessary or desirable linguistic and cultural investments can be supported through these later)" (Fishman 2001, Pg. 444).

Yet, the language is also a valuable resource, not only in the cultural sense but in the fiscal sense, with potentially a considerable economic value, like land, fisheries and forests. For example, tourism provides a rapidly expanding and lucrative market in New Zealand and one in which iwi/Māori are increasingly involved. One of the attractions of New Zealand for tourists visiting this country is the cultural experience, of which the language is an integral part. Apart from tourism, many other sectors have the potential for expansion through the revitalisation of the language. The broadcasting, education, communications media, marketing, and the public service are just a few of these sectors.

The development of the Māori language as a resource has the potential to provide economic wealth, to Māori and to the country as a whole, aside from the intrinsic value of the language as part of the nations cultural heritage. Yet this type of opportunity through the language seems to be largely ignored by both Government and Māori.

For other iwi, the experience perhaps has been quite different. For example, Tūhoe, the country's sixth biggest iwi, has remained economically disadvantaged and has not made any major settlements with the Government. Yet, it is one of the strongest areas in terms of language.

It is clear that the revitalisation of the Māori language will ultimately depend on Māori will. While it is important that the wider public and Government support the process, ultimately, it is Māori who will determine its fate. Fishman has referred to the considerable work needed to persuade thousands of Māori people to make the commitment to learn Māori and to speak it as the everyday language in the home, in the neighborhood and, in the community (Fishman, 1990).

Ten years on, the findings of the 2000 'Survey of Attitudes Towards, and Beliefs and Values about, the Māori Language' for Māori are positive. Almost a third of Māori (31%) claimed they could already speak conversational Māori. Almost two thirds (63%) agreed that "All Māori should make an effort to speak Māori themselves". The survey segmented Māori into three discreet groups based on the importance they place on the Māori language. Those who value the Māori culture and language and are willing to share and progress it with the wider public made up 68%. Those Māori who embrace all things Māori but believe that the culture and language is exclusive to Māori made up 20%. By far the smallest group, those Māori who in comparison to the first two groups, place relatively little importance on the Māori language, made up just 12% (Te Puni Kōkiri 2001 a.).

These results are positive and indicate that there is significant support for the language within Maoridom. The Māori language came dangerously close to death, and returning it to health is a long and difficult process, but there are clear signs that Māori want this to happen.

However turning favourable attitudes into sustained practice is no simple task and the reinstatement of inter-generational transmission is not easy to achieve. The lack of a solid economic base for the language and the low socio-economic status of many Māori, have already been touched on as barriers, yet there are many more. It is easy to say that Māori should simply learn the language and pass it on to their children and grandchildren, yet, many other barriers are present. These include: the lack of a significant pool of fluent speakers, the dispersed nature of the Māori population (making Māori language communities difficult to establish or maintain), the ongoing psychological impact of having been punished for speaking Maori in the past, the fear of using what little language is known for fear of criticism, the lack of quality language teachers and resources, the attitudes of the wider society and peer pressure against the use of Māori, the forces of globalisation and the overwhelming intrusion of the English language. This list is not by any means exhaustive, but the point is that learning and using a second language, on a sustained basis, is extremely hard work, and that sound language planning at the national level is required to support (not usurp) the efforts being made by iwi, Māori communities and individuals at the local level.

This thesis argues that one of the key barriers to Māori language revitalisation is that Māori are not in control, in fact, hardly get a say, in the process by which macro level Māori language policy is developed and resources distributed. This means that there is currently no overall effective language planning occurring in New Zealand.

Iwi/Māori Language Planning

While Jeffries criticised Māori complacency regarding the language, he also recognised that the lack of informed debate and discussion could be a contributing factor to this complacency. The field of language planning is relatively new and concepts such as inter-generational transmission are part of the field of linguistics, rather than terms of any meaning to the lay person. It is perhaps easy to see why many may have come to rely on and to equate Māori language revitalisation with formal Māori language education, and why this would be the focus of iwi planning.

Two Case Studies – Ngāti Manawa/Ngāi Tahu

There is limited information publicly available on individual iwi language planning. In order to gain an overview of the range and extent of iwi language planning, two case studies were conducted as part of this thesis. Two quite different iwi were selected. The first, Ngāi Tahu, was chosen because it is one of the most high profile iwi and is one of the largest iwi in terms of its geographical spread. It is also perhaps one of the most economically secure iwi, and one least dependant on the Government, with a legal structure that ensures accountability to the Ngāi Tahu people, not to the Government. On the other hand the Māori language is under most threat in the South Island. It was also selected because the iwi has been promoting its Māori language plan and has made some information publicly available.

The second iwi, Ngāti Manawa, centered in Murupara in the Western Bay of Plenty, was selected because, unlike Ngāi Tahu, it is a much smaller iwi both in terms of its membership and geographical spread. It is also an iwi about which little is heard publicly. Also, in contrast with Ngāi Tahu, the Bay of Plenty is an area in which the Māori language is relatively strong.

Two different methods were used to conduct these case studies. The Ngāi Tahu case study is based purely on a literature search. Because of the lack of information available on Ngāti Manawa, primary research was conducted. Ngāti Manawa agreed to participate in a discussion about their language revitalisation activities and a trip was made to Murupara where an interview/discussions took place. The methodology and framework for the second case study is discussed in more detail later.

*Kotahi Mano Kāika, Kotahi Mano Wawata – A Thousand Homes Achieving a
Thousand Aspirations*

Ngāi Tahu is the Māori tribe with rangatiratanga or tribal authority over 80% of the South Island of New Zealand. In 1991, 20,304 claimed affiliation to the iwi (Census 1991). This represented 3.97% of the Māori population. In 1996, this had climbed to 29,133, representing just over 5% of the total Māori population (Census 1996).

Ngāi Tahu, like all iwi, suffered hugely from the process of colonisation last century. Massive tracks of land and other resources were lost through Government legislation, confiscation and crooked deals leading to Ngāi Tahu becoming an impoverished and dispossessed people. However, as discussed in Chapter Two, this iwi was one of the first to conclude a major Treaty Settlement with the Crown. Negotiated over the ten years from 1986-1996, the settlement has enabled Ngāi Tahu to turn from the past to the future, to the extent that the iwi is currently contemplating what it has described as a “Golden Age” (Berry 2001 b.).

The iwi appears to have invested their settlement money wisely and now have major investments in healthcare, fishing, tourism, property and finance. However, Ngāi Tahu’s investment plans do not appear to be designed simply to turn Ngāi Tahu into successful entrepreneurs. The iwi has recently developed a broad strategy ‘Vision 20/25’. The aim of this strategy is to secure quality of life for Ngāi Tahu over the next 25 years, by reinvesting 50% of all profits and investing the rest in programs to promote health, education, economic security and culture and identity.

In 1996, the Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act created a new governing body for the iwi, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. Unlike the tribal Trust Boards, whose members are appointed by the Minister of Māori Affairs, and who are therefore accountable to the Government not to their iwi, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu with its 18 participating Papatipu Rūnanga is a structure that is accountable to Ngāi Tahu alone. No other iwi has a similar governance arrangement in place.

Ngāi Tahu, while the most advanced iwi economically, and in terms of self-determination through its governance arrangements, is also the iwi that is the most at-risk in terms of its language. In response to the 1996 language question, ‘In which language(s) could you have a conversation about a lot of everyday things? English, Māori, Samoan, NZ Sign Language, other language(s)’, of the 29,133 who claimed affiliation to Ngāi Tahu, only, 3,411 said that they could have a conversation in Māori. This represents approximately 11.75%, a percentage less than half the national average of 25% (Census 1996) of Māori speakers.

Recognising this dire situation, Ngāi Tahu has recently embarked on a long-term language planning exercise specially aimed at revitalising the language. ‘Kotahi Mano Kaika’ (A Thousand Homes Achieving a Thousand Aspirations) is a 25-year strategy developed by tribal members and funded through tribal business and economic interests.

It has established a Ngāi Tahu Language Planning Committee and has employed two staff to implement the strategy, which plans to have a thousand Ngāi Tahu households speaking Māori in the next 25 years.

The Committee recently sought the advice of Joshua Fishman. It applied his GIDs scale to the Ngāi Tahu language situation as one method of informing their language planning. It has determined that it has some characteristics of Stages 4-8 of the scale and that less than 1% of Ngāi Tahu are native or near native speakers. Furthermore, only a few Ngāi Tahu households conduct intergenerational transfer of the language. Lynne Te Aika, the former Te Reo Māori manager for the Ngāi Tahu Development Corporation, said in The Press this year, “We’re going to prioritise te reo, especially in the home. We need to have schemes, which promote an inter-generational transfer” (Hewson 2001).

Te Aika also says that Ngāi Tahu’s current crop of Māori language speakers are mostly young people, who, by and large have had to build their language skills in the absence of fluent Māori speaking elders within their whānau and hapu. She says that these young people need to be supported so that, in turn, they can nurture a passion for te reo in their own children, “Rakatahi (young people, youth) will lead language revival” (Te Karere 15 May 2001).

The iwi has entered into strategic relationships with Te Taura Whiri and with the Ministry of Education in order to support the objectives of their plan. An iwi partnership has been established with the Ministry of Education, and it is accessing funding from the Ministry specifically for community language revitalisation initiatives. A number of projects have been planned including many levels of wānanga, promotional campaigns within the rohe, resource production and research and maintenance of the dialect. It has also established joint ventures with tertiary institutions within the rohe. For example, Te Huanui, is a joint venture with the Christchurch Polytechnic Institute of Technology to run weekend long wānanga or immersion hui.

The Ngāi Tahu Puna Reo was the first Puna Reo to be established. As discussed in Chapter Four, Puna Reo are joint ventures between the Māori Language Commission and iwi. Initially the Puna Reo was established with the sole purpose of providing Ngāi Tahu words for Te Mātāpuna, the Māori only dictionary project initiated by Te Taura Whiri. However, it is hoped that the Puna Reo will become the hub for Ngāi Tahu language revitalisation and initiatives in the South Island. It will strengthen Ngāi Tahu capacity to research their dialects, idiom and the language of their tipuna. “It is important that we reconstruct our language, as it is an integral part of our identity as Ngāi Tahu” (Mark Solomon, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, Kaiwhakahaere).

Nōu te Pō, Mōku te Awatea – The Night Belongs to You, The Dawn is For Me.

As stated earlier, with the exception of Ngāi Tahu, there is very little information publicly available on language planning and other revitalisation activity being undertaken by iwi. Ngāti Manawa was selected as the subject of the second case study because the author

had contacts into that iwi. More importantly, however, because it presented a direct contrast to the subject of the first case study, Ngāi Tahu, in a number of ways already outlined.

The first step towards undertaking this research was gaining the consent of the Ethics Committee at Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, School of Māori Studies, Massey University. This involved outlining the objectives of the intended research, the proposed methodology, and procedures for dealing with any ethical concerns.

The key ethical concern was the need to be aware of issues surrounding non-Māori research of Māori. It was essential that Ngāti Manawa were fully informed of the research, and happy to participate through a mandated representative. A koha was given as a small token of appreciation to Ngāti Manawa for participating. It was also explained to Ngāti Manawa that it was hoped the research would benefit not only the researcher but that the research findings might also benefit the iwi as it pursues further development. A copy of the research findings will be made available to the iwi who, through the key informant, has shown significant interest in the research kaupapa.

Once Ethics Committee approval had been obtained, a member of Ngāti Manawa known to be actively involved in Ngāti Manawa affairs was contacted. After the initial discussion, an information sheet and consent form were sent to that person seeking the signature of a mandated Ngāti Manawa representative agreeing to participate in the research (see Appendix 1). Once the consent form was returned, a time to meet, suitable to the mandated representative was arranged. A *kanohi ki te kanohi* (face to face) meeting was agreed to as the most appropriate method for the interview/discussions. These took place at Murupara during the period 21/8/01 – 1/9/01. Notes were taken and these were written up and returned to the key informant for any changes and confirmation as an accurate record of the discussions.

The research framework was developed around the following three key objectives.

- To gather evidence to support the hypothesis that the power to ensure cultural survival (the right to develop as Māori), including the survival of the Māori language, has always been, and remains a key Māori development goal;
- To determine the different stages iwi are at and the different approaches being taken to language development
- To gather evidence to support the hypothesis that while many iwi/Māori communities are leading language revitalisation initiatives at the local level, these suffer from the lack of overall planning and control by Māori at the national level.

A discussion guide was prepared prior to the trip to Murupura as a means of focussing the discussions. Because of the broad nature of the three objectives it was necessary to discuss a range of matters, not only those specific to language development. The first part of the discussions focussed on Ngāti Manawa history, including social, cultural and

economic development, and its current development issues, including matters such as its governance arrangements and views on self-determination. The second part of the discussion focussed on Ngāti Manawa's current involvement in language planning and revitalisation activities. The third part of the discussion concerned Ngāti Manawa's knowledge of and involvement in the Government's language policy and activity.

Ngāti Manawa is a small Western Bay of Plenty Tribe (Mataatua/Tūhoe iwi). Linked through genealogy to Tūhoe, it is the mana whenua in Murupara. Like Ngāti Whare with which it is coupled on the Census forms, it has often been mistakenly thought of as being a hapū of Tūhoe. In 1991, 873 people claimed affiliation to Ngāti Manawa/Ngāti Whare (Census 1991). This represented 0.17% of the Māori population. By 1996, this had risen to 1,314 representing just over 0.23% of the total Māori population (Census 1996). However, Ngāti Manawa believe that there are in fact many more Ngāti Manawa than this, and that because of the close genealogical association with Tūhoe, many would have ticked that iwi on the census forms. Those identifying as Tūhoe climbed from 24,522 to 25,917 in 1996. Tūhoe is the 6th largest iwi population wise.

Ngāti Manawa suffered considerably as a result of colonisation. It was dispossessed of much of its lucrative forestry land. The Kāingaoroa Plan, an area of 320,000 acres was sold for a pittance to the Government, while other land was taken illegally under the Public Works Act (Bird Pg. 44). Te Ika Whenua, a body representing three Bay of Plenty iwi currently has a claim before the Waitangi Tribunal. Ngāti Manawa are hopeful that this claim will result in the iwi being resourced to develop the infrastructure to ensure that it can control its future development and "live as Ngāti Manawa forever". In the interim, Murupara is an economically disadvantaged Māori community. It is a small, isolated, and economically depressed town, and its residents suffer from high levels of unemployment and low socio-economic status.

Ngāti Manawa fiercely guards its status as an iwi and rejects any further encroachment by Tūhoe. For example, Ngāti Manawa was recently asked to join the Tūhoe Education Authority but declined, preferring to set up its own alternative structures. Ngāti Manawa does not currently have one overarching governance body. There are four marae in Murupara, each of which is governed by a committee that has autonomy over its own affairs. There are also two Trusts, which are responsible for administering Ngāti Manawa land. However, there are plans underway to investigate and establish an appropriate governance body and legal entity to oversee Ngāti Manawa affairs.

Ngāti Manawa, while an economically impoverished iwi in comparison to Ngāi Tahu, is situated in the region in which the language is the strongest. In response to the 1996 language question, 'In which language(s) could you have a conversation about a lot of everyday things? English, Māori, Samoan, NZ Sign Language, other language(s)', of the 1,314 who said they were affiliated to Ngāti Manawa/Ngāti Whare, 546 said they could have a conversation about a lot of everyday things in Māori. This represents approximately 42%, a percentage well above the national average of 25% (Census 1996) of Māori speakers. This is largely attributable to the density of the Māori population of

Murupara and its physical isolation as well as the historical reluctance of the iwi to surrender rangatiratanga.

Ngāti Manawa does not have a strategic plan for its long-term development as an iwi. However, I was told that although this might not be stated in words in a strategic planning document, “Ngāti Manawa want to create a better world for our mokopuna”. Ngāti Manawa’s representative said that the establishment of a governing body would be the first step towards enabling the iwi to undertake strategic planning for its future development. While Ngāti Manawa does not have a stand alone ‘Māori Language Plan’ it does have a ‘Strategic Education Plan’, and the maintenance and development of the Ngāti Manawa reo lies at the heart of a number of recent education/community based activities being undertaken by the iwi. “Ngāti Manawatanga is first and foremost about te reo”.

Ngāti Manawa formed ‘Te Ope Mātauranga o Ngāti Manawa’ (Ngāti Manawa Education Group), which spearheaded the establishment of the country’s first iwi based ‘special character’ school, ‘Te Kura Kaupapa Motuhake o Tawhiuau’ which opened in July 2000. Ngāti Manawa saw the opportunity to establish the kura, when the Ministry of Education, as part of an Educational Development Initiative (EDI), restructured the schools in Murupara which were suffering from falling rolls. “The Minister of Māori Affairs was approached by Ngāti Manawa to create a different type of governance authority that would allow Ngāti Manawa to share in the governance of the kura as of right”. “It was about standing up for ‘iwitanga’, ‘Ngāti Manawatanga’, not ‘Te Aho Matuatanga’.(Te Aho Matua is the charter used by schools officially designated as Kura Kaupapa Māori).

The Kura is “central to rebuilding Ngāti Manawa’s integrity as an iwi”. Members of Ngāti Manawa living outside of Murupara who possessed the appropriate language and teaching skills were encouraged to return to Murupara to help establish the Kura. The Kura works closely with the four kōhanga reo in Murupara to ensure that the whānau of the kōhanga children can make informed decisions about which school to send their children on to, Te Kura Kaupapa Motuhake o Tawhiuau, or to Murupara Primary School which has an immersion unit.

The Ope Mātauranga o Ngāti Manawa is also working to integrate, co-ordinate and extend the provision of education and training in Murupara. It has been establishing pathways to further education and training so that when children leave the Kura they have somewhere to continue their learning. The Wānanga o Aotearoa is offering the National Diploma in Te Reo Māori and the Auckland College of Education is delivering the B.Ed.

Asked about the focus on formal education institutions to revitalise the language, Ngāti Manawa’s representative replied that, “te reo planning cannot be done in isolation, but needs to be looked at in a number of contexts, social, cultural, economic and educational”. Also, “if you take the kōhanga and the kura out of the picture, what have you got left?” Asked about the economic development of Murupara, he said, “at the end of the day, it doesn’t matter if the people are poor, as long we look after one another”.

Members of Te Ope Mātauranga o Ngāti Manawa are aware of the importance of inter-generational transmission of the language and for the language learning and use to be extended to the homes and wider community, but the point was made, that you “have to start somewhere”. It is part of the Kura’s long-term plan to establish itself as a real community school, to engage the parents and whānau of the Kura children, and to excite them about their children’s learning. It has established a whānau reading programme and is guiding parents on how to support their children in te reo. Regular wānanga are also held at the Kura.

Ngāti Manawa has not conducted a survey to gauge the current level of language ability amongst the iwi. However, Māori is still occasionally spoken in Murupara in a few domains – at the kōhanga, kura, the marae, at times in the pub and at the shops, and Ngāti Manawa realise that they are fortunate in that they still have some fluent native speakers of the language. Ngāti Manawa plan to bring all their speakers together, to discuss the Ngāti Manawa dialect, its kīwaha (idiom) and nuances and to ensure that these are recorded. Ngāti Manawa’s representative is of the view that survival of each iwi dialect should be a focus of ‘Māori’ language revitalisation. He also felt that Pākehā learning te reo is secondary, and “irrelevant”.

Asked about Ngāti Manawa’s view of Government’s role in Māori language revitalisation, and Government’s Māori Language Strategy, I was told that “Ngāti Manawa are just doing their thing, regardless of what the Government is doing”. Ngāti Manawa had not heard of the Government’s Māori Language Strategy. Their representative felt that a priority for Government should be gather together fluent speakers (representing all the iwi dialects) and to train them as quality teachers of the language. It was felt that this could be a role for Te Taura Whiri. Ngāti Manawa see Te Taura Whiri as an agent of the Crown and the iwi has not engaged with that organisation as part of its language development activities. Ngāti Manawa had not heard of the Puna Reo and had not received a copy of Te Taura Whiri’s guide on iwi language planning.

Ngāti Manawa’s representative was strongly of the view that Māori need to commit to the language and learn and use it. That they need to send a clear message to the Government, that they want the language. And that they need to “stop blaming the Government and get on with it”.

While Ngāti Manawa adhere to the traditional iwi model for Māori development, their representative felt that there is also a place for a national forum consisting of both iwi and other Māori representatives to enable Māori rather than the Government to make policy in relation to Māori resources, and singled out one particular model, that put forth in recent years by Whatarangi Winiata of Ngāti Raukawa.

Case Studies Summary

These two quite disparate iwi are both concerned about the state of the language within their tribal areas and are taking steps to revitalise the language. For both, this desire to

see their language and thereby their cultural integrity survive, is strongly linked to their expressions of rangatiratanga or self-determination.

Ngāi Tahu clearly seems to have followed the trend identified by Fishman where the establishment of a strong economic base is put before significant linguistic and cultural developments. Ngāi Tahu language planning is informed by linguistic theory, and the iwi has been able to buy expert advice from an internationally renowned linguist. It has profiled the position of the language within its rohe, and has set measurable targets to achieve. Of necessity, it has centered its plan on establishing a pool of second language learners. It is aware of the importance of the homes and community and the reinstatement of inter-generational transmission. With its strong governance arrangements, Ngāi Tahu is taking control and responsibility for the language. It is identifying its needs and ensuring that Government assists it as appropriate.

Ngāti Manawa, on the other hand, is pursuing its language and cultural development before it has been able to establish an economic base, although it is pursuing this through its land based claim to the Waitangi Tribunal. Its language planning is centered on the new Kura, and this development seems to be as much about Ngāti Manawa's expression of self-determination as an iwi, as it is about the survival of the language and culture. Ngāti Manawa is also aware of the importance of the home and community and inter-generational transmission of the language, and this forms part of its long-term plans.

Ngāti Manawa like Ngāi Tahu has developed a number of local partnerships with education/government providers related to the language, but is not involved in language policy making at the national level.

Other Iwi/Māori Language Planning/Activity

A number of other iwi are involved in some form of language planning, be it part of an overall iwi strategic plan, an education partnership with the Ministry of Education, or a specific language plan.

Perhaps the most well-known iwi planning document is that developed by the confederation of three iwi, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toa Rangatira and Te Ātiawa. 'Whakatipuranga Rua Mano', was developed in 1975 with the general aim of assisting the iwi and hapū to prepare for the 21st century. One of the aims of the plan was to increase the number of speakers of the Māori language, and thereby ensure its long-term survival. While the two major 'sub-objectives' of the plan are about closing the gap in educational achievement and rejuvenating the marae in the confederation, one of the four underpinning principles of the plan is "that the language, as a deeply treasured taonga left by the Māori ancestors of New Zealand, is to be protected from further decline and our activities must guarantee revival" (Te Wānanga O Raukawa Website <http://www.twor.ac.nz>). The establishment of the Wānanga o Raukawa at Otaki, a tertiary institution based on the traditional whare wānanga, is an integral part of the overall plan.

Whakatipuranga Rua Mano is generally seen as a success story of holistic tribal development, not only within New Zealand, but internationally. Speaking of the considerable achievements of the plan over its first 25 years, Professor Whatarangi Winiata, Tumuaki (CEO) of Te Wānanga o Raukawa, said in relation to the language, “The reo is now much stronger among the rangatahi of ART (Te Ātiawa, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Toa Rangatira)” (Winiata 2000 Pg. 135).

Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou has also targeted language planning as part of its strategic iwi planning processes. Language planning was stated as being a key outcome for 2001, with ‘Ngā Ahorangi o Te Reo Ake o Ngāti Porou’ being on top of its ‘to do’ list. This venture will focus on the promotion, enhancement and protection of Ngāti Porou reo amongst Ngāti Porou at home and abroad. The iwi plans to support the use of Ngāti Poroutanga in schools and communities to both revitalise Ngāti Poroutanga, to support improved education outcomes.

Other iwi are choosing to base their various language activities on relationships that they have established with the Ministry of Education. The previous Chapter mentioned the new fund that the Government recently set aside for locally developed Māori language projects that :

- support community based language initiatives
- help revitalise the Māori language
- help promote local dialect and tikanga, and
- foster and enhance closer links between schools and the Māori community

In its first year of implementation, this fund is being used to supplement and strengthen the Ministry of Education’s iwi partners (those iwi with whom it has established iwi partnerships). They are Ngāi Tahu, Tūhoe, Ngāti Porou, Tūrangānui-a-Kiwa and the confederated iwi of Te Tai Tokerau (Te Aupōuri, Te Rarawa, Ngāti Kahu and Ngāpuhi). The range of initiatives that these iwi are undertaking as part of their contracts with the Ministry is wide. It includes such things as the convening of tribal wānanga and parent support groups, developing databases of local words (dialect), and developing language websites,

‘Te Reo o Te Tai Tokerau’ (the language of Northland) is an organisation which represents the iwi of the North, and which has been actively involved in Māori language education since 1986 and the assessment of Te Reo Māori School Certificate and Bursary programmes, as well as other language initiatives. It now wants to broaden its focus, by introducing learning experiences for parents, caregivers teachers and students in schools, and to establish a ‘center for excellence’ in Te Reo o Te Tai Tokerau.

Other Māori Language Planning

In addition to the iwi based language planning and activity which is occurring there is also a plethora of pan-tribal Māori language development activity occurring, often in collaboration with the Government. Most kōhanga, kura, wharekura, and wānanga are pan tribal initiatives which are actively involved in language planning for their own

organisations. Other schools and communities are also developing and implementing new language initiatives. For example, a new Tauranga school made the news this year when the hapū in the area and the school parents “withdrew their children from school to attend a month-long Māori language school” ...”which is under serious threat in Tauranga” (Arotahi News Service 2001). There will undoubtedly be many more examples of this small local language initiative occurring right around the country.

Te Ataarangi is a pan-tribal organisation. The Ministry of Education is currently funding Te Ataarangi to improve the language skills of parents and care-givers to help them support their children’s learning in Māori, and work is underway on a parent Māori language literacy pilot which will provide further support for Māori language learning in the community.

There are many Māori Private Training Institutions offering Māori language courses and Māori teacher education institutions all making a contribution to the revitalisation of the Māori language. Other pan-tribal Māori groups such as the Anglican Church are also undertaking language planning of their own.

The Māori Anglican Church is faced with deciding whether to allow the Māori language to remain mostly a language for church services and public greetings, a kind of religious classical language, or whether it will strongly support the language becoming a much more vibrant vernacular. If it resolves seriously to pursue the latter solution, then it will become intimately involved in planning and policy making which facilitates Māori language community building” (Nicolson 2000 Pg. 143).

Summary Chapter Five

Having shown that Māori language development lacks a secure home within Government affairs, Chapter Five set out to answer the question ‘does the Māori language really have a secure ‘home’ within Māoridom?’

The latest survey of attitudes towards the language endorses the hypothesis that the survival of the language and culture is a central Māori goal. Chapter Five has supported this by showing that there is a lot of positive language activity occurring at the iwi, pan-tribal and Māori organisation levels, as well as a number of collaborative iwi/Māori–Government initiatives focussing on home and community. The two case studies of iwi language planning being undertaken by Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Manawa are indicative of the determination of iwi to ensure that their language and culture survives, and to do it ‘their way’. The experiences and approaches are different, but the underlying desire is the same, that is to preserve their language and culture.

The Chapter has provided evidence to support the hypothesis that there is much to be optimistic about and the next 25 years will see a continued strengthening of the Māori language, as Māori continue to pursue the revitalisation of their language in spite of the

ongoing difficulties surrounding the nature of the Māori-Crown relationship and intra-Māori difficulties.

However, it has also shown language development amongst iwi/Māori, as within Government, to be uncoordinated, uneven and ad hoc. While the Government's Māori Language Strategy has been the subject of critical analysis, Māori do not have an overarching Māori language strategy. Whether or not a Language Strategy developed by Māori would be more effective than the Government's is beside the point. What is important, is that the key responsibility for major decisions regarding Māori resources, such as the language, must reside with Māori.

Currently the various Māori language interest groups and iwi tend to work in isolation of one another. And because there is no overall Māori language body, there is no means by which Māori as a whole, can have input into policy making and resource distribution in relation to Māori resources at the national level.

CHAPTER SIX

Summary and Conclusion

The introduction to this thesis outlined a number of hypotheses that have been tested throughout the five preceding chapters. The starting point of this summary is a review of those hypotheses.

- That power to ensure cultural survival (the right to develop as Māori), including the survival of the Māori language, has always been, and remains a key Māori development goal;
- That the survival of the Māori language and culture has never been and is unlikely ever to be a key priority for the New Zealand Government;
- That the Māori –State relationship has historically been weak because it has never been based on agreed development goals, including cultural and language goals, nor has it implemented clear plans for achieving those goals;
- That the current Māori–State relationship is based on a structuralist model and is focused on historical grievances and risk aversion, and that Māori language development is a prime example of this approach;
- That until Māori and the State move towards developing a new ‘relational’ partnership based on common development goals, (including Māori language development goals), Māori development will continue to be stilted and adversarial;
- That in spite of the ongoing difficulties surrounding the nature of the Māori-Crown relationship and intra-Māori difficulties, there is much to be optimistic about and the next 25 year period of Māori development will see a continued strengthening of the Māori language, as Māori continue to pursue self-determination and cultural survival.

This thesis has provided substantial evidence to prove the first two hypotheses, that the survival of the language and culture has always been, and remains, a key Māori development goal, while it has never been, and is not now, a priority for the New Zealand Government. However, it has also shown that while Māori leaders have consistently called for language and culture to be a defining aspect of Māori development and that this might be the practice at many local levels, at the national level Māori have no overall strategy for this to proceed. Language and cultural development within Māoridom is ad hoc, uneven and uncoordinated, and as a priority for action, it is often lost or subsumed by a focus on social and economic development.

This thesis has shown how this mirrors the Government's arrangements for Māori language and cultural development, and has suggested that this indicates that both parties might be relying on the other to oversee development in these areas.

Significant evidence has also been provided to prove the third hypothesis, that the relationship between Māori and State has historically been weak and indeed remains so, because it has not been based on agreed development goals. Like other indigenous peoples, a major development goal of Māori is self-determination, not only at the local, tribal and community level, but also at the national level. Evidence has been provided that shows how the New Zealand Government has not shared this goal. The Government's Māori development goals today appear to be settling historical grievances, increasing Māori capacity for greater autonomy at the local level and reducing disparity between Māori and non-Māori. Both the Government's 'Closing the Gaps' policy and its Māori Language Strategy were used as examples of how the Government avoids the Treaty Article Two, or indigeneity, right of self-determination.

This talking at cross-purposes or lack of agreed development goals has indeed, as suggested by the fourth hypothesis, resulted in a Government focus on historical grievances and risk aversion. The review of the Government's contribution to Māori language development provided a prime example of a reactive approach, more concerned with avoiding litigation or risk aversion. The Treaty Settlements process has been shown to be firmly focussed on historical grievances, rather than establishment of agreements for future development.

The thesis has also confirmed that the Māori-State relationship continues to be based on the structuralist model in which the Government deals with individual iwi or other Māori structures and organisations, rather than with Māori as a unified ethnic group. Examples of inter and intra Maori problems have been discussed and used to show how they are also contributing to stilted and adversarial Māori development. It has been argued that these problems need to be overcome to prepare the way for a new relational partnership between Māori and State based on agreed development goals - hypothesis five.

The sixth and final hypothesis suggested that, in spite of the ongoing difficulties surrounding the nature of the Māori-Crown relationship and Māori-Māori difficulties, the next 25 year period of Māori development will see a continued strengthening of the Māori language as Māori continue to pursue the revitalisation of the language as part of the broader goals of self-determination and cultural survival. There is a great deal of language development activity taking place today. Whether State driven, such as the Government's Māori Language Strategy, Māori driven, such as individual iwi language planning or collaborative arrangements between Māori and the State, such as the Puna Reo or the Ministry of Education/iwi partnerships, they are all aimed at strengthening the language. The results of the attitudes survey this year, for Māori at least, are positive, and confirm that the vast majority of Māori are behind the revitalisation of the language.

Yet in spite of all this activity, research available today indicates that the language remains at risk. When released, the results of the 2001 post-censal survey may provide

some hard evidence that the outlook for the language is improving and this will provide a real cause for optimism. But at the moment, in spite of the rash of language activity taking place, the overall picture created by this thesis is not a healthy one for language development. It has shown Governments allocating Māori language and culture a low priority rating, doing as little as possible to avoid further litigation and/or maintain the Māori vote. Māori groups involved in language and culture development work in isolation from one another, and there is no clear mechanism for Māori and the Government, at the national level, to work together in these areas. Māori language development lacks a secure 'home' both within Government and within Maoridom at the macro level.

Kotahitanga - A National Māori Body Politic

Another important theme to have emerged in the course of this thesis is that of Māori self-determination at the national level or policy and decision making 'by Māori for Māori'.

Chapter One showed how expressions of Māori unity or kotahitanga emerged in the early contact days with non-Māori. The early attempts at sharing of power with the Government, such as the Pāremata Māori, did not fare well during the period of colonisation, in which the sovereignty of the State was considered supreme and not to be challenged. Māori then tried other expressions of kotahitanga working within the single nation state, and while various Governments over the years have made some concessions to Māori participation in national decision making, on the whole, it shies away from any meaningful power-sharing at the parliamentary level.

However, Māori have continued to relentlessly pursue self-determination. Given that for many iwi/Māori, self-determination at the local and community level is now becoming more of a reality, it is likely that the focus will turn more to establishing a measure of power sharing at the top level. Internationally some Governments appear finally to have acknowledged their indigenous peoples right to self-determination and are entering into agreements that represent a practical expression of that acknowledgement. The Nigsa'a Treaty is one example of such an agreement. It is likely that New Zealand is moving, albeit slowly, to becoming a republic. This will involve constitutional reform and questions are being asked now about how self-determination or devolution of parliamentary authority to Māori might be accommodated in the new arrangements. In his new book Consedine outlines the key models that have been suggested (Consedine 2001 Pg. 223). These include:

- 1 Te Pihopatanga o Aotearoa model with a Tikanga Māori House, a Tikanga Pākehā House and a Treaty of Waitangi House.
- 2 Māori regional model, involves delivery of services at a regional level with the potential of a national structure based on regional representation.

- 3 A national Māori assembly including reps from iwi and Māori communities. All Māori policy units in the state sector including Te Puni Kōkiri retained as assembly staff.
- 4 A Māori Policy Commission, which would promote and propose Māori policy to government, taking over responsibility for Māori policy and the resources of Te Puni Kōkiri.
- 5 The New Zealand Māori Council model based on marae and Māori communities.

Durie has been persistent in his calls for a national Māori policy making body to be formed.

What is missing at present is an independent Māori capacity – some structure – for policy development at a national level. It might be called a Māori parliament or a Māori assembly, or a Māori National forum, or to use a term mentioned in the 1835 Declaration of Independence, a Māori congress. An independent Māori capacity for spearheading Māori development, in all its forms, is necessary so that development is not subject to a piecemeal approach, or divisiveness, or as a model of development which is based on notions of deficits” (Durie 1999 d. Pg.11).

Whatever its eventual structure, it is important that Māori collectively start debating the issue now. While constitutional reform might not be a reality for the next 20 or so years, it might well be that in the future, the 25-year period of Māori development from 2000-2025 is remembered for the Māori push for self-determination, within the confines of the state, at the national level.

However, the establishment of a truly representative national Māori body, necessary for Māori to control Māori resources at the national level, is a huge challenge. Durie has said that any such body will need to have a wide Māori mandate and that it would need to be able to develop policy and set broad strategic directions in relation to Māori resources. This thesis has discussed the significant Māori-Māori difficulties, which appear to have impeded the establishment of a viable kotahitanga body for the 21st century so far. Yet Durie does not believe that these are insurmountable. He argues that while Māori are diverse, that they also share commonalties. He also argues that while many iwi/Māori organisations are engaged in strategic planning of their own, there is a need for across the board planning for Māori development.

...although Māori people are highly diverse, belonging to different iwi, associating with different groups, living in different places, they share commonalties that bind them. Second, given that most Māori enjoy many – not single affiliations, Māori networks are close and intersecting. It makes no sense therefore to pretend that there is no such thing as a Māori collective – a Māori nation – or that planning for collective Māori futures can be met by adding together the separate efforts of tribal groups. Fragmented effort will simply leave a vacuum that others will fill (Durie 2001 b.).

Indeed others have filled the vacuum. The reality is that Māori, and indeed, sometimes the Government itself, are faced with the unsatisfactory situation where major decisions concerning Māori resources are being made by Governments and their agencies. While Māori representation in parliament is growing and Māori are now a significant force within parliament, majoritarianism politics means that, although Māori represent 15% of the total population, decisions about Māori resources are still made by and large by non-Māori. In addition, “The political reality, which has little to do with the moral justness of the cause, is that governments rarely move outside the framework established by public attitudes” (Coates and McHugh 1998 Pg. 45).

At the national level, policies and decisions about Māori resources are decided by a variety of Crown bodies including Te Ohu Kaimoana – The Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Commission (fisheries), Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori - the Māori Language Commission (language), Te Māngai Pāho – the Māori Broadcasting Purchasing Agency (broadcasting), the Waitangi Tribunal (resources subject to a Treaty claim), The Crown Forest Rental Trust (forestry claims), Te Puni Kōkiri – The Ministry of Māori Development (Māori policy) and the Crown appointed Māori spectrum trust (second and third generation radio frequency spectrums) (Durie 2000 b. Pg. 39).

The Te Puni Kōkiri led Māori Language Strategy provided an example of this. The analysis of the development and implementation of the Strategy to date also showed how sometimes decisions relating to key Māori resources can be made largely in isolation from Māori.

This thesis suggests that Māori need not wait for constitutional reform to establish a united representative body. It has provided evidence to suggest that today the Government would welcome a united Māori voice to guide it in its decisions in relation to key Māori resources. It has shown how the Māori language and cultural heritage sectors are not ones that it is comfortable with, and that it is ready to be guided by Māori in these matters. A united and representative Māori language/culture body should be established to provide the Government with that guidance and direction. It could also be used as a precursor or pilot for the time when the responsibility for decisions relating to all Māori resources is devolved to Māori. Durie has warned against duplicating the sectoral approach of the state urging a holistic approach to policy development (Durie 2001 b.), yet are Māori prepared to wait another 25 years for constitutional reform? Taking responsibility for developing strategic direction and policy in relation to Māori language and culture seems a worthy place to start.

A National Māori Language/Culture Body Politic?

What might a national Māori culture and language body politic achieve? Firstly, and perhaps most fundamentally, it would give Māori collectively a feeling of being in control of the Māori language and culture. This thesis has shown how important that is deemed to be. It would see all Māori language interest groups and iwi talking to one another rather than working in isolation. It would enable issues such as the broadcasting

one (English or Māori language?) to be worked through by Māori and some consensus reached. It could lead to economies of scale and sharing of valuable resources. For example it would give Ngāi Tahu and Ngāti Manawa a forum at which to share their language and culture development experiences with other iwi and Māori organisations.

Secondly, it would enable Māori to provide the Government with strategic direction concerning Māori language and culture. Regarding the Māori language, Māori and the Government would be able embark on effective, integrated Māori language planning. A new Māori Language Strategy could be developed, this time premised on revitalisation goals determined by Māori and decisions about the best strategies to achieve those goals with the available resource. For example, Māori might decide to advise Government to forget “the frills” (Fishman 2001) and cut straight to providing concentrated support to Māori families and communities wishing to reinstate inter-generation transmission of the language. Or its advice might be to concentrate on strategies that would provide an economic basis for the language. It might even decide to lobby to have a proportion of the Fisheries settlement devoted to providing Māori language education free of charge to Māori! There are many possibilities but the key is that Māori would be determining and driving the development.

Such a body would be independent of Government and as such would not as of right be part of the current formal policy making process. However, a united Māori stance on Māori culture and language is unlikely to be ignored and it could provide a very effective lobby group.

Conclusion

The world’s indigenous peoples successfully united in order to define and articulate their rights to the rest of the world in the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Surely, if peoples so diverse as the world’s indigenous populations can find unity in their similarities, so too can iwi/Māori in Aotearoa/New Zealand?

As this country moves inevitably towards becoming a Republic and the constitutional reform that this will necessarily encompass, iwi/Māori must be ready to provide an agreed position on how they wish to see their rights, be they Treaty, indigeneity or citizen rights, reflected in any new constitutional arrangements. Rather than waiting for the rest of the country to adapt to the idea of constitutional reform, Maoridom needs to begin to establish a unified position now. Prolonging the rural-urban, iwi-pan-tribal debates and disputes will put Māori in the danger of missing a crucial opportunity to realise the most fundamental of their development goals – national self-determination.

In the interim, language and culture offers itself as the ‘cause’ for a new or revamped kotahitanga movement. The language has proved its ability to unite Maoridom in the past. During 1986, iwi/Māori rallied behind the Waitangi Tribunal Te Reo claim with a level of unity that has possibly not been seen since. While other Māori resources such as

land and fisheries continue to divide, the language and culture today offers another opportunity to unite.

The New Zealand Government has signaled that it “will be looking to Māori for some decisions about what revitalisation should achieve”, and has acknowledged that the lack of a “unified Māori voice” is thwarting the development of a clear strategic direction. The formation of a united national Māori language/culture body consisting of iwi and Māori organisation representatives could provide that voice. Such an arrangement would represent a move away from the current structural relationship and a move to a new relational partnership with the Government in which Māori and the Government, in a true partnership, work towards the survival of the Māori language and culture.

Such a body could also act as a pilot which would allow the Government, the general public it represents, and those iwi/Māori who have reservations about Māori controlling their own development as a united Māori nation, to allay their concerns. A successful pilot would allow all parties to consider the potential that Māori self-determination at the national level has, not only for Māori, but also for the Government and the wider New Zealand population.

Self-determination is now a reality for many iwi/Māori at the local and community levels. It has yet to become a reality at the national level. Māori unity or kotahitanga is a necessary precursor to that happening.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Homes for Māori Language Development in the 21st Century (tentative title)

INFORMATION SHEET

- 1 My name is Jasmine Cooper. I am a Massey University post-graduate student completing my Masters degree in Māori studies. I am currently working on the thesis component of this degree, which I hope to have completed by the end of 2001. I am also currently working for Te Puni Kōkiri, as a policy analyst in the Māori Cultural Heritage, Language and Broadcasting team.
- 2 The primary supervisor for my thesis is Ian Christensen, senior lecturer at Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, School of Māori Studies, Massey University. Both Ian and I can be contacted in relation to this thesis research on 06 356-9099 and 04 922-6221 respectively. Should you have any queries relating to this research, please feel free to contact either of us. Professor Mason Durie, head of Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi is my second supervisor.
- 3 My thesis looks at Māori language development today within the broader political context of overall Māori development. It looks at those factors hindering Māori language development, and at what both Māori and Government are currently doing to support Māori language development. It argues that iwi/Māori must control the language revitalisation process, not only at the local level, but also at the national policy making level.
- 4 Chapter Five looks at the different stages that iwi/Māori are at in their efforts to revitalise the language and at the range of approaches being used. While there is information available publicly on the language planning being undertaken, for example, by Ngāi Tahu, there is little known about what other iwi, such as Ngāti Manawa are doing. I am therefore inviting you to participate, on behalf of Ngāti Manawa, in this research.
- 5 I have invited you to participate in this research as I am aware that you are actively involved in Ngāti Manawa activities, in particular, in relation to education and language.
- 6 I am asking for your agreement to being interviewed regarding Ngāti Manawa's language planning and revitalisation activities. I envisage the interview taking

approximately 3-4 hours of your time, at a time and place that is convenient to you.

- 7 If you agree to participate, extensive notes will be written up during the course of the interview. These will later be summarised and returned to you for verification.
- 8 It is hoped that the result of this research will not only result in the completion of my Masters degree, but that it might prove to contain useful information to iwi/Māori in their future language planning and development activities. A copy of the final findings will be made available to Ngāti Manawa should they wish to receive them.
- 9 Of course, you have the right to decline to participate. However, if you do choose to participate, you have the right to decline to answer any questions or to withdraw at any stage.
- 10 If you agree to participate, your name will not be used unless you give your consent.
- 11 If you agree to participate, all material relating to the interview will be treated confidentially.
- 12 If you agree to participate, the information you provide will only be used for this research and publications arising from this research project.

NB: This project has been approved by the Ethics Committee of Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi (School of Māori Studies), Massey University

Homes for Māori Language Development in the 21st Century (tentative title)

CONSENT FORM

I have read the Information Sheet and have had the details of the study explained to me. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the study at any time and to decline to answer any particular questions.

I agree to provide information to the researcher on the understanding that my name will not be used without my permission. *(the information will be used only for this research and publications arising from this research project).*

I agree/do not agree to the interview being audio taped.

I also understand that I have the right to ask for the audiotape to be turned off at any time during the interview.

Signed:

Name:

_____ *(mandated representative of Ngāti Manawa for the purpose of this research)*

Date:

NB: This project has been approved by the Ethics Committee of Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi (School of Māori Studies), Massey University

Appendix 2

Glossary

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| Aotearoa | New Zealand (literally land of the long white cloud) |
| hapū | sub-tribe |
| He iwi tahi tātou | 'We are one people' Phrase uttered by Governor Hobson at the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi |
| He Pūtahitanga Hou | Name of Labour Party's 1999 Māori policy document, literally, 'New Pathways'. |
| hīkoi | a walk, march, journey |
| hui | gathering, meeting |
| Hui Taumata | summit conference (?) |
| Hui Whakapūmau | Māori Development Consolidation Conference |
| iwi | tribe |
| Ka Awatea | Name of Māori development policy document, literally 'it is dawn'. |
| kāwanatanga | Government, governance |
| Kīngitanga | The King Movement, Tainui, Kingship |
| kotahitanga | unity |
| 'Ko Te Whānau' | name of Māori Language Commission publication, literally, 'it's the family'. |
| kauhanganui | great council, the governing body of Tainui tribes |
| kaupapa, kaupapa Māori | subject, issue, matter for discussion – matter concerning Māori |
| kōhanga reo | pre-school Māori language immersion institutions run in accordance with Māori custom, literally, 'language nests' |
| kura kaupapa Māori | primary school Māori language immersion institutions run in accordance with Māori custom |
| Kura Teina | term given to new or forming Kura Kaupapa Māori, under the wing of an established Kura. |
| mana | power, prestige, authority |
| Mana Motuhake | Name of Māori political party, special power, prestige |
| marae | meeting area of whānau, hapū or iwi, focal point of settlement |
| Matatiki | A publication produced by the Māori Language Commission containing new Māori words |
| Maungapōhatu | Bay of Plenty settlement |
| Ngā Kaiwhakapūmau i Te Reo | name of the Wellington Māori Language Board |
| Ngā Matatini Māori | diverse Māori realities |
| Ngā Mōteatea | A collection of Māori poetry and song |

| | |
|--|--|
| Ngā Tamatoa | The Young Warriors |
| Pākehā | Non-Māori, European |
| papatipu rūnanga | Name given to the many smaller councils which collectively make up the governing body of Ngāi Tahu |
| Pāremata Māori | Māori Parliament |
| Pūao Te-Ata-Tū | Name of Department of Social Welfare Report, literally, 'Day Break' |
| puna reo | community language bases, literally 'language springs' |
| pūtea | fund |
| rakatahi | young people, youth (Ngāi Tahu dialect) |
| rangatiratanga | self-determination |
| rohe | tribal area |
| Ruia Mai | National Māori Radio service |
| rūnanga | council |
| tangata kāinga | Māori person who has made his/her home outside of their own tribal territory |
| tangata whenua | Indigenous people, Māori people living within their own tribal territory, literally 'people of the land' |
| tangihanga | period of mourning between death and burial |
| taonga | anything highly treasured, prized possessions |
| Tātou, Tātou | The motto of the Māori Women's Welfare League, 'Working together' |
| Te Ataarangi | A Māori community based Māori language movement for adults |
| Te Āwhiorangi | Māori Television Trust |
| Te Ika Whenua | Confederation of 3 Bay of Plenty iwi |
| Te Iwi Mōrehu | The surviving people, the survivors |
| Te Karere | The Messenger (Name of a Māori television programme and newspaper) |
| Te Māngai Pāho | The Māori Broadcasting Funding Agency |
| Te Mātāpuna | Name of the Māori only dictionary being developed by the Māori Language Commission |
| Te Ope Mātauranga o Ngāti Manawa | Ngāti Manawa Education Group |
| Te Pihopātanga o Aotearoa | The New Zealand Anglican Church Bishopric |
| Te Puni Kōkiri | The Ministry of Māori Development |
| te reo Māori | the Māori language |
| Te Rōpū Wāhine Māori Toko i te Ora | Māori Women's Welfare League |
| Te Rūnanganui o Ngā Kura Kaupapa Māori | The governing body of Kura Kaupapa Māori |
| Te Rūnanga o Tūranganui-a-Kiwa | The Council representing the three tribes which make up Turanganui-a-kiwa. |
| Te Tai Tokerau | Northland |

| | |
|---|--|
| Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori | The Māori Language Commission |
| Te Tiriti o Waitangi | The Treaty of Waitangi |
| Te Tūāoma Te Reo Māori :Ngā Tapuwāe Kua Takahia | Name of Publication, Te Tūāoma The Māori Language: The Steps That Have Been Taken |
| Te Ūpoko o Te Ika | Māori name for the wider Wellington region, literally ‘the head of the fish’ |
| Te Whare Wānanga o Aotearoa | university level tertiary institution based at Te Awamutu. |
| Te Whare Wānanga o Awanuiārangī | university level tertiary institution based at Whakatane |
| Te Whare Wānanga o Raukawa | university level tertiary institution based at Otaki |
| tikanga Māori | customary Māori concepts and practices |
| tino rangatiratanga | self –determination |
| tipuna | ancestors |
| Tūranganui-a-kiwa | Confederation of three iwi, |
| urewera | part of the Bay of Plenty region, home of Tuhoe |
| wānanga | course, learning session, discussion |
| whakapapa | genealogy |
| Whakatipuranga Rua Mano | Generation 2000 (Name of Strategic Plan for Ngāti Toa Rangatira, Ngāti Raukawa and Te Ātiawa |
| whānau | extended family |
| whanaungatanga | kinship |
| wharekura | secondary school Māori language immersion |
| whare wānanga | institutions run in accordance with Māori custom |
| whakataukī | Māori tertiary institution, university |
| | Māori proverb |

Iwi (tribes referred to in this thesis.)

Te Aitanga–ā-Māhaki
Te Ātiawa
Te Aupōuri
Ngāti Awa
Ngāti Kahu
Ngāti Manawa
Ngā Puhi
Ngāti Porou
Ngāti Raukawa
Ngāi Tahu
Ngāi Tāmanuhiri
Ngāti Toa Rangatira
Rongowhakaata
Tainui
Tuhoe
Te Rarawa

Appendix 3

Bibliography

- Alix, Lola Garcia. (Editor) 1999. *The permanent forum for indigenous peoples: The struggle for a new partnership*. Copenhagen: IWGIA Document No. 9.
- Arotahi News Service 2001. *Māori parents start school for new year and te reo Māori month*. June Edition 1.
- Arotahi News Service. 2001. *Alternative Tauranga schooling initiative*. June Edition 12.
- Baker, Colin. 1996. *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism*. (2nd Edition) Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.
- Bawden, Patricia. 1987. *The years before Waitangi: A story of early Māori/European contact in New Zealand*. Auckland. Institute Press Ltd.
- Benton Nena and Richard. 1999. *Revitalising the Māori language: Consultants report to the Māori Development Education Commission*. Wellington. Māori Development Education Commission.
- Benton Richard. 1987. *From the Treaty of Waitangi to the Waitangi Tribunal*. In *Living Languages – Bilingualism and Community Languages in New Zealand*. Hirsh, W (Editor). Wellington. Heinemann.
- Benton, Nena, B. 1986. *Māori perceptions of school experience, and other influences on the maintenance and use of the Māori language*. Wellington. NZCER.
- Benton, Richard. 1981. *The flight of the amokura*. Oceanic languages and formal education in the south pacific. Wellington. NZCER.
- Benton, Richard. A. 1979. *The Māori language in the nineteen seventies*. Wellington. NZCER.
- Berry, Ruth. 2001 a. September 14. *Treaty process review avoids court action*. Evening Post. Wellington
- Berry, Ruth. 2001 b. May 12. *Golden age for Ngāi Tahu*. Evening Post. Wellington
- Berry, Ruth. 2001 c. July 28. *Māori TV Service may upset funding*. Evening Post. Wellington
- Berry, Ruth. 2001 d. May 21. *Māori TV likely to get \$29m*. Evening Post. Wellington

- Berry, Ruth. 2001 e. March 3 *Parekura Horomia on....* Magazine, Evening Post. Wellington
- Bird, Henry Tahawai. 1980. *Kuranui O Ngāti Manawa*. Rotorua.
- Brell, Rawiri. 1996. *The wellbeing of the language – What is the role of Iwi Māori and what is the role of Government?* In proceedings of *Te Hui Taumata Reo Māori*. Wellington, Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Brown, Michael. 1998. *Laws and institutions for a bicultural New Zealand – actualising the partnership*. Address to Te Oru Rangahau, Māori Research and Development Conference. Conference Proceedings, Pgs. 387-393. Palmerston North. School of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Carlson, Kirsten. 1999. *Sovereignty and tino rangatiratanga in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Master of Arts Thesis. Wellington. Victoria University.
- Chrisp, Tipene. 1997. Home and community language revitalisation. In *New Zealand Studies in Applied Linguistics* 3:1-20
- Chrisp, Tipene. 1995. *Setting goals for Māori language revival* Unpublished Paper
- Christensen, Ian. 2000. *Māori language proficiency*. Unpublished Paper. School of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Christensen, Ian. 1999. *A discussion of the Government's Strategy for Māori Language and the Review of the Māori Language Commission*. Unpublished Paper.
- Christensen, Ian. 1998. *He anga whakamua. Towards a framework for the revitalisation and maintenance of Māori language*. Publication Pending
- Coates, Ken S and McHugh, P, G. 1998. *Kōkiri ngatahi: Living relationships The Treaty of Waitangi in the new millennium*. Wellington. Victoria University Press.
- Consedine, Robert and Joanna. 2001. *Healing our history*. Auckland Penguin.
- Cox, Lindsay. 1993. *Kotahitanga: The search for Māori political identity*. Auckland. Oxford University Press.
- Cormack, Donna. 1997. *Tōku reo, Tōku mana: The role of the school in the maintenance of Māori tribal dialects*. Paper submitted for 50.791 Kaupapa Motuhake, Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Dafis, Cynog. 1998. *The Welsh Language and the National Assembly for Wales*.

- Department of Māori Affairs. 1984. *Māori Economic Development Conference Proceedings*. Volumes 1,2, and 3. Wellington.
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet, *Queensland. Government Language Services Policy*
- Durie, Mason. 2001. a. *A framework for considering Māori educational advancement*. An Address to the Ministry of Education. Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, School of Māori Studies. Massey University.
- Durie, Mason. 2001. b. *A framework for considering Māori educational advancement*. Opening address for Hui Taumata Mātauranga. Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, School of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Durie, Mason. 2000. a. *A Framework for considering constitutional change and the position of Māori in Aotearoa* In Building the Constitution James, Colin (Editor) Wellington. Brebner Print.
- Durie, Mason. 2000. b. *Parliamentary devolution and self-governance* from “Nation Building” and Māori Development in the 21st Century Conference Proceedings. Hamilton: The University of Waikato.
- Durie, Mason. 1999. a *Māori self-governance*. Topic Twelve, Study Guide, Tino Rangatiratanga, Strategic Māori Development, Māori Studies, Massey University, Palmerston North.
- Durie, Mason. August 1999. b. *Māori Development: Reflections and strategic directions: An address to senior Maori public servants*. Wellington.
- Durie, Mason. 1998. a. *Te mana, te kāwanatanga: The politics of Maori self-determination*. Auckland. Oxford University Press.
- Durie, Mason. 1998. b. *Whaiora Māori health development*. Second Edition. Auckland. Oxford University Press.
- Fishman, Joshua. (Editor). 2001. *Can threatened languages be saved?* Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.
- Fishman, Joshua. 1991. *Reversing language shift*. Clevedon. Multilingual Matters.
- Fleras, Augie and Spoonley, Paul. 1999 *Recalling Aotearoa:Indigeneous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand* Auckland. Oxford University Press.
- Garlick, Jennifer. 1998. *Māori language publishing: some issues*. Wellington. Huia Publishers.

- Grin, Francois and Vaillancourt, Francois. 1998. *Language revitalisation policy: An analytical survey*. Report to the Treasury. Wellington.
- Haden, Frank. 1999. August 1. *Te Reo Māori starved by its owners*. NZ Sunday Star Times. Auckland.
- Havemann, Paul (Editor). 1999. Indigenous peoples' rights in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Auckland. Oxford University Press.
- Heart of the Nation Strategic Working Group. 2000. *The heart of the nation. A cultural strategy for Aotearoa New Zealand*. Wellington. McDermott Miller.
- He Pukenga Kōrero A Journal of Māori Studies. Ngahuru, Volume 5, Number 2, 2000. Palmerston North. Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi, Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Hewson, Laura. 2001. February 10. *Minding the language*. The Press. Christchurch.
- Hill, Richard S and O'Malley, Vincent. 2000. *The Māori quest for rangatiratanga/autonomy 1840-2000*. Treaty of Waitangi Research Unit. Occasional Papers Series. Number 4. Victoria University of Wellington.
- Hollings, Mike. 1996. *The role of Government in Māori language maintenance and development*. Pgs. 123-124 Te Hui Taumata Reo Māori Conference Proceedings. Wellington. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Hollings, Mike. 1991. *The politics of education in Māori*. In McGregor G and Williams M (Editors) *Dirty Silence*. Oxford University Press.
- Humpage, Louise and Fleras, Augie. 2001. *Intersecting Discourses: Closing the gaps, social justice and the Treaty of Waitangi*. Social Policy Journal. Issue 16, July 2001.
- Jackson, Syd. 1984. Address to Hui Taumata (Māori Economic Development Summit Conference). Conference Proceedings Vol. 1 D3.
- Jackson, Moana. 1997. Radio NZ Mana News, 31 October
- James, Colin. (Editor). 2000. *Building the constitution*. Wellington. Brebner Print.
- Jeffries, Tauhe. 1995. *Proposal to establish a national Māori language association*. Pgs. 132-135 Te Hui Taumata Reo Māori Conference Proceedings 1996. Wellington. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Karetu Timoti. 1992. *Language protocol of the marae*. In King, Michael (Editor). (Pgs 29-43). Auckland. Reed Publishing Group NZ Ltd.

- Kersey, Harry A Jr. 2000. *Indigenous sovereignty in two cultures: Māori and American Indians compared*. Treaty of Waitangi Research Unit. Occasional Papers Series. Number 1, Victoria University of Wellington.
- King, Michael. (Editor). 1992. *Te ao hurihuri: Aspects of Māoritanga*. Singapore. Reed Publishing Group (NZ) Ltd.
- Loomis, Terrence. 2000. *Government's role in Māori development - Charting a new direction?* Working Paper No. 6. Development Studies Programme. Hamilton. The University of Waikato
- Loomis, Terrence. 2000. *The political economy of indigenous peoples and development*. Working Paper No. 4. Development Studies Programme. Hamilton: The University of Waikato.
- Loomis, Terrence. 1999. *Indigenous populations and sustainable development - Building on indigenous approaches to holistic, self-determined development*. Working paper No. 3. Development Studies Programme. Hamilton. The University of Waikato.
- Loomis, Terrence, Morrison Sandra, Nicholas Taari. 1998. *Capacity building for self-determined Māori economic development*. Working Paper No. 2. Development Studies Programme. Hamilton. The University of Waikato.
- Māori Language Act 1987. Wellington: Government Printer.
- McLay, Geoff. (Editor). 1995. *Treaty Settlements: The unfinished business*. Wellington. NZ Institute of Advanced Legal Studies and Victoria University of Wellington Law Review.
- Massey University. 1998. *Te Oru Rangahau Māori Research and Development conference proceedings*. Palmerston North. Te Pūtahi-ā-Toi (School of Māori Studies).
- Massey University. 1999. *Tino rangatiratanga: strategic Māori development*. 50.701 Study Guide. Palmerston North. Te Pūtahi -ā -Toi (School of Māori Studies).
- Massey University. 1994. *Kia pūmau tonu*. Hui Whakapūmau Māori Development conference proceedings. Palmerston North. Massey University.
- Mead, Aroha. 1987. *Cultural and intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples of the Pacific*. Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights: Economics, Politics and Colonisation Vol 2 Auckland. Moko Productions/IRI, Auckland University.
- Melbourne, Hineani. 1995. *Māori Sovereignty: The Māori perspective* Auckland. Hodder, Moa, Beckett.

- Mikaere, Ani. 2000. *Māori and self-determination in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Working paper No. 5. Development Studies Programme. Hamilton. The University of Waikato.
- Milne, Jonathan. 2001. July 25. *Māori TV gets \$55m from Govt*. The Press. Christchurch.
- Milne, Jonathan 2001. January 3. *Horomia pledges cooperation*. The Dominion. Wellington.
- Ministerial Advisory Committee, Department of Social Welfare. 1988. *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, A Māori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare*. Wellington. Appendix
- Ministerial Advisory Committee, Department of Social Welfare. 1988. *Puao-Te-Ata-Tu, A Māori perspective for the Department of Social Welfare*. Wellington
- Ministry of Education. 2001. *Ngā Haeata Mātauranga. Annual report on Māori education 1999/2000 and direction for 2001*. Wellington. Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Cultural Affairs. 1998. *Governments' role in the cultural sector: A Survey of the Issues*. Wellington.
- Murphy, Hineihaea. 1998. *Priorities for action in te reo*. Journal of the Linguistic Society of New Zealand. Volume 41 Special Issue 1998
- Nicloson, Rangi and Garland, Ron. 1991. *New Zealanders' attitudes to the revitalisation of the Māori language*. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development Vol. 12, No.5.
- Nicolson, Wayne, Rangi. 2000. *Hei tīmatanga kōrero*. Master of Arts Thesis in Linguistics. University of Canterbury.
- New Zealand Labour Party. 2000. *He pūtahitanga hou: Labour on Māori development*. Māori development manifesto.
- Parata, Hekia. 1995. *Mainstreaming: A Māori affairs policy?* Pgs. 131-141 Kia Pūmau Tonu - Hui Whakapūmau Conference Proceedings. Palmerston North. Māori Studies Department. Massey University,
- Pool, I. 1977. *The Māori population of New Zealand*. Auckland. Oxford University Press.
- Quentin-Baxter, Alison (Editor). 1998. *Recognising the rights of indigenous peoples*. Wellington. The Printing Press.

- Revington, Mark. 2001. *Māori Mirror: Does the proposed Māori TV channel herald a broadcasting breakthrough or is it an example of misplaced funding priorities?* New Zealand Listener. September 15.
- Selby, Rachel. 1999. *Still being published*. Wellington. Huia Publishers.
- Simon, Judith, and Smith, Linda Tuhiwai. (Editors). 2001. *A civilising mission? perceptions and representations of the New Zealand native schools system*. Auckland. Auckland University Press.
- Spolsky, Bernard. 2000. Speaking status. *NZ Education Review* 14 July 2000 Pg. 14.
- Spoonley, Paul. 1995. 'Constructing ourselves' *The postcolonial politics of Pākehā*. From Justice & Identity: Antipodean Practices. Wellington. Bridget Williams Books.
- Spoonley, Paul. Macpherson, Cluny. Pearson, David. 1996. *Ngā patai: racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand*. Palmerston North. The Dunmore Press.
- Statistics New Zealand. 1996. *Census of population and dwellings*. Wellington.
- Stewart, Alexander George. 1992. *Te mauri o te reo: A thesis investigating a new pathway for enhancing and improving the status of Māori language and Maori pupils in schools*. Masters Thesis. University of Auckland.
- The Mataatua declaration on cultural and intellectual property rights of indigenous peoples*. June 1993.
- Te Aika, Lynne Harata. 2000. Focus on te reo. *Te Karaka. The Ngāi Tahu Magazine*. Summer 2000 Issue 15, 29-31.
- Temm, Paul. 1990. *The Waitangi Tribunal: The conscience of the nation*. Auckland. Random Century.
- Te Māngai Pāho. 2000. *Statement of intent 2000-01*. Wellington. Te Māngai Pāho.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 2001. a. *Survey of Attitudes towards, and beliefs and values about, the Māori language*. Summary Report. Unpublished.
- Te Puni Kōkiri 2001. b. *The role of Te Puni Kōkiri in Māori development through the Māori language*. Speech presented by Leith Comer, Chief Executive, to Uia Ngā Whetū Hui Mō Te Reo conference, 21-22 June.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 2000. a. *Capacity Building: Application for assistance (over \$2,000)*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.

- Te Puni Kōkiri. 2000. b. *Progress towards closing the social and economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori: A report to the Minister of Māori Affairs*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri 2000. c. *Kōkiri Paetae: A celebration of Māori achievement*. September Issue 29. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 2000. d. *The Māori language and education*. Fact Sheet 8. Monitoring & Evaluation Branch. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 2000. e. *The inventory of Māori language services*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1999. a. *Te Tūāoma The Māori language: the steps that have been taken*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1999. b. *Te Mātaaho: Māori language policies and practices in selected public sector agencies*. Unpublished report prepared for Te Puni Kōkiri by Szekey, Chris. Wellington.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1999. c. *Mātātupu: How to develop your Maori language policies and plans*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1999. d. *Mātātupu: Maori language policies and plans: Guidelines to assist public service departments*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1999. e. *Māori women in focus – titiro hāngai, ka mārama*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1998. a. Review of Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1998. b. *Progress towards closing the social and economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori: A report to the Minister of Māori Affairs*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1997. *Te reo Māori: policies and practices in selected public service agencies*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. 1995. *The national Māori language summary report*. Wellington. Te Puni Kōkiri.
- Te Rūnanga o Ngāti Porou. 2000. *Nati Link* December Issue 15.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. 1995. *Te Hui Taumata Reo Māori Conference Proceedings*. Wellington.

- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. 2000. a. *Purchase Agreement between the Minister of Māori Affairs and the Māori Language Commission for the year ending 30 June 2001*. Wellington. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. 2000. b. *A guide for Iwi and hapū to the preparation of long-term Māori language development plans*. Wellington. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. 2000. c. *Report of the Māori Language Commission for the year ended 30 June 1999*. Wellington: Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. 2000. d. *Using Māori in the home: Having fun with the Māori language*. Wellington. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. 2000. e. *Using Māori in the home: Some common questions and answers*. Wellington. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori. 2000. f. *Promoting positive attitudes to the Māori language in the classroom*. Wellington. Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori.
- The Press. 2001. *Minding the language*. February 10. Christchurch.
- The University of Waikato. 2001 Nation building & Māori development in the 21st Century. Conference Proceedings. School of Māori and Pacific Development. Te Pua Wānanga Ki Te Ao.
- Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act. 1995. Wellington. Government Print.
- United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations. 1993. *Draft declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples*.
- Waitangi Tribunal. 1986. *Te reo report*. Wellington. Department of Justice.
- Waite, Jeffrey. 1992. *Aotearoa Speaking for ourselves*. Part B: The Issues. A discussion on the development of a NZ languages policy. Wellington. Learning Media.
- Walker 1985. *Cultural Domination of taha Māori: The potential for radical transformation*. In *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*. Eds. Codd J, Harker, R, Nash, R. Palmerston North. Dunmore Press.
- Walker, Ranginui. 1990. *Ka whaiwhai tonū mātou struggle without end*. Auckland. Penguin Books.
- Webster, Steven. 1998. *Patrons of Māori culture: Power, theory and ideology in the Māori renaissance*. Dunedin. Otago University Press.

Winiata, Whatarangi. 2000. *Whakatipuranga rua mano: capacity building in practice*. Pgs. 131-143 Nation Building and Māori Development in the 21st Century Conference Proceedings. School of Māori and Pacific Development, University of Waikato.