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Abstract

This thesis aims to provide an understanding of the nature of tribes and tribalisation in Maori society that is not readily available from secondary sources. It is an attempt to move out of the fog created by the intense politicisation that surrounds definitions and perceptions of the tribe, which in turn have created a bewildering maze of issues and demands. For example, social change and development among Maori – and by implication the tribe – has been characterised variously as renaissance (Durie 1998), neo-tribalism (Rata 2000), the reification of culture (Hansen 1989, van Meiijl 1996), and political struggle (Walker 1990). These conceptualisations have not taken into account the fact that the tribe as the fundamental social organisation of Maori society and the tribe as the fundamental essence of Maori identity diverged as the twentieth century progressed. This thesis offers an alternative view of social change based on a study of the changing perceptions of the tribe throughout the twentieth century. The underlying premise is that perceptions of the tribe evolved according to a range of endogenous and exogenous social and political influences. This position is juxtaposed against the proposition that the tribe is, and can be understood simply from observation of communities, past and present.

Throughout the twentieth century the tribe’s status as the primary organising force changed. In the early stages of the century the tribe was the primary, as well as the fundamental, form of Maori social organisation and identity. As the century progressed and Maori became progressively integrated into the wider New Zealand society, alternative forms of association became available to Maori. The tribe remained the fundamental source of identity: it was, however, no longer the primary social grouping for many Maori. That is, the majority of Maori claimed affiliation to a tribe but did not live and work in a tribal context. It is argued in this thesis that existing perceptions of the tribe have taken into account only the former, that the tribe was the fundamental expression of Maori kinship and identity and have ignored the reality that the tribe was no longer the most common and influential organizing force of Maori social organisation.

It is also argued that these perceptions have been formed through three sets of interacting agency: Maori, government and scholarship. Maori understandings of the tribe were primarily sourced in life circumstances, in understandings of a society with a range of kinship inter and
intra relationships that are encapsulated in traditional forms of association, namely iwi, whanau and hapu. However, what was not widely understood is that the influence of government through its Maori policies and its fostering of academic scholarship through research publications and advocacy, have had formative, descriptive and prescriptive influences on the tribe. This ongoing process has resulted in an interplay of categorical definitions and adjustments and strategic developments.

Understanding conceptions and perceptions of the tribe are very pertinent, not only to Maori, but also to New Zealand as a whole. The tribe dominates notions of Maori identity as well as Maori political and social organisation. Since Maori constitute 15% of the total population of New Zealand, any research that assists in understanding the tribe assists in understanding New Zealand society. The tribe is also an integral part of Treaty-centred politics, and, therefore, a key plank of nation-building within New Zealand. The tribe as an autonomous polity had became a contested site in the late twentieth century, to the extent that definitional disputes disrupted and threatened to derail attempts by government and tribal leaders to arrive at Treaty settlements. Understandings and misunderstandings of the tribe therefore have ramifications for race relations, and the Maori quest for self-determination, as well as for republicanism, constitutionalism and democracy as understood and practiced in New Zealand.

This thesis argues:

1. That perceptions and conceptions of the tribe were formed through the interlocking agencies of Maori, scholarship and government.
2. That the key to understanding the tribe and tribalisation in Maori society in the twentieth century is the acceptance that the tribe as the basis of identity and the tribe as the basis community organisation diverged as the century progressed.
3. That tribal affiliation remained central to understandings of Maori identity in spite of major societal changes that they experienced during the twentieth century.
4. That in the latter part of the twentieth century that movement to revitalise the tribe developed into an ideology of retribalisation that successfully introduced a prescribed form of tribe, a development that changed the fundamental nature of tribes and tribalisation among Maori.
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Levene and Vasil, 183-85). As the hui was held barely a month prior to the Hui Taumata, the sentiments expressed would have been carried over to the more public forum of the Hui Taumata.

On the introduction of the Bill, the opposition members, led by the then spokesperson on Maori Affairs, Winston Peters, expressed some disquiet on the implications of these amendments. Peters described the amendments as being of a monumental nature, and that the Bill had massive ramifications (NZPD 460, 2702.). While he was supported by other members of his party (ibid. Graham, 2704, Upton, 2708, W. R. Austin, 2710), debate never developed on what the implications or ramifications of the Bill might be. While this amendment, therefore, has had considerable implications for New Zealand, the comments made at the time by the Opposition members were probably alarmist rhetoric that reflected the conservative leaning of the Opposition.

**Ngati Kahungunu tribal development in the 1980s**

This section looks at Ngati Kahungunu as a case study of tribal development in the 1980s. This study looks at the origins of Te Runanganui o Ngati Kahungunu, the Ngati Kahungunu grand council. The study then moves on to consider the effects of tribalisation in the tawhenua, districts, and, finally, the attempts of Kahungunu living outside the tribal area to form tribal groups, taura here. Observations and conclusions in this section have been drawn from an ethnographical study, as well as from an examination of Runanganui, tawhenua, and taura here minutes and publications, newspaper articles, and personal interviews. Two tawhenua, Tamatea and Wairarapa, were studied in some detail, and, in the process anecdotal information on a third tawhenua, Tamaki-nui-a-rua, was gathered.

Ngati Kahungunu claim descent from the ancestors Kahungunu and Rongomaiwahine, and claim the lands from the Wharerata mountains north of Wairoa to the Rimutaka mountains, a territory that encompasses the contemporary provinces of Hawkes Bay and Wairarapa. Although the majority of Maori in this vast area are of Kahungunu descent, there are other long-established tribal groups, Rongomaiwahine of Mahia, who claim the matrilineal line of descent and Rangitane.
The latter are of a totally different tribal origin and are concentrated in the districts of Tamaki-nui-a-rua (Dannevirke) and Wairarapa.

The popular perception is that Kahungunu are a homogenous group who are divided into broad regional groups: Kahungunu ki Wairoa, Kahungunu ki Heretaunga, and Kahungunu ki Wairarapa. These divisions are geographic and equate to north, central and south, respectively. Provincial boundaries and government policy, on the other hand, paid scant regard to any perception of Kahungunu homogeneity or territorial claims. Dannevirke North became part of Hawkes Bay and Wairarapa part of the Wellington province. More recently, in the 1980s, the Department of Maori Affairs had the Wairoa area under the jurisdiction of the Gisborne office. Government administration effectively divided Kahungunu into three divisions, a point made by Dr Pita Sharples during the cross-examination of his evidence to the High Court in 1998\(^2\) (XXD Mr. Wilson, 139).

Dr Sharples went on to explain that in 1980 he was summoned home from Auckland by his elders to assist in uniting Kahungunu, a development that was recorded in an article in a local newspaper:

In the early 1980s five men wanted an organisation to unify the people of Kahungunu (which stretches from Wairoa to Wairarapa) and Te Runanganui o Ngati Kahungunu – the council for all people of Ngati Kahungunu and other tribes – was born. Dr Pita Sharples, Canon Wi Te Tau Huata, Te Okenga Huata, Moana Raureti and Tohara Mohi, the present chairman formed the runangamui (council) because many Kahungunu people felt matters such as health and education were not being adequately dealt with by organisations such as Maori and executive committees and district councils (The Daily Telegraph, 26 August 1989).\(^3\)

This desire to unify and establish a coordinated and comprehensive tribal group reflects the mood of the 1980s. It was a movement that led to, and was dominated by, the enactment of the Runanga Iwi Act. To be recognised by government and be eligible to handle public monies, the Runanganui required a legal identity. They

---

\(^2\) See chapter eight for details of this court case.

\(^3\) Originally, the aim of unification was far more ambitious than explained in this article. The aim was to unify all tribes that claimed the Takitumu as their ancestral home. This organization would have included the various tribes of Gisborne and Poverty Bay, Ngai Taha of the South Island [4.] [5]. There was strenuous
attempted to establish a legal identity through separate legislation, but, as an interim measure, envisaged operation under the Maori Trust Boards Act (Runanganui minutes, 20 August 1988). However, neither of these measures eventuated, and, in October 1988, the Runanganui became an incorporated society.

During the establishment process, a draft constitution was submitted by Kahi Harawira to a Runanganui meeting at Martinborough, 25 June 1988. This constitution claimed nation status for Ngati Kahungunu, but, strangely and somewhat ambiguously, acknowledged the government’s responsibility to administer Kahungunu’s affairs:

Knowing, that the New Zealand Government has the responsibility for the administration of Kahungunu affairs must promote the realisation of the Kahungunu people’s right to self-determination, and that the New Zealand Government must respect that right, in conformity with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and The Treaty of Waitangi, (Harawira, Preamble to draft constitution).

The constitution was discussed at the October meeting of the Runanganui and was rejected in favour of a more conservative one drafted by Moana Jackson.

The constitution on which the Runanganui was incorporated established it as the Iwi Authority for Ngati Kahungunu, which effectively made it the official voice of the tribe, with the right to enter into contractual relationships with both the government and private organisations. Membership was given to all who claimed descent from Kahungunu and any other Maori living in Kahungunu territory.

The tribal area was divided into six autonomous regions or taiwhenua: Wairoa, Whangamui-a-Orotu (Napier), Heretaunga (Hastings), Tamatea (Central Hawkes Bay), Tamaki-nui-a-rua (Dannevirke), and Wairarapa. Although the boundaries of both the tribal area and those between taiwhenua were reported to have been surveyed (Runanganui Minutes, 14/15 May 1988), they were not clearly defined in the Constitution, but were covered in a vague catchall statement:

opposition from the other tribes and the vision was modified to include only Ngati Kahungunu (Pers Comun. To Okenga Hunt, 4 June 1987).
within the traditionally defined boundaries of the iwi named Ngati Kahungunu. Those boundaries are such limits as customarily defined by the six regions or taiwhenua (Constitution, 4).

The boundaries between taiwhenua were, in fact, drawn up arbitrarily with little consultation. In Wairoa, although there were strong hapu such as Ngati Pahauwera and Ngati Rakaipaaka, they accepted the Wairoa Taiwhenua because there was already a sense of regional identity encapsulated in the name Kahungunu ki Wairoa. The establishment of Whanganui-a-Orotu Taiwhenua was completely new, as this area, more commonly known as Ahuriri, was never considered as being a strong Maori area. The newly-imposed taiwhenua was an urban development centred on Napier city. Similar to other urban centres, it had a substantial immigrant Maori population. Heretaunga is a traditional regional name with numerous hapu living in or near the city of Hastings. Although there are well-known divisions between the hapu (6), there was an existing sense of regional identity among Kahungunu ki Heretaunga.

Tamatea (which was the name of the local district created by the 1900 Maori Councils Act) was the only taiwhenua named for an ancestor, rather than a geographic feature. The name is that of the legendary captain of the canoe Takitimu, and the people of this region had no more exclusive claim to it than did a multitude of other groups with links to the Takitimu. This notwithstanding, there is no recorded opposition to the use of the name. An unexplained and very questionable move was the drawing of the boundary line between the Heretaunga and Tamatea taiwhenua. It is a line that divides the territory of the formerly powerful hapu of Te Whatiapiiti, resulting in three Whatiapiiti marae being located in the Heretaunga Taiwhenua and two in the Tamatea Taiwhenua.

The Tamaki-nui-a-rua and Wairarapa Taiwhenua were established on existing regional entities. They were accepted by those who accepted the Kahungunu mantle and were opposed by those who claimed their tribal rights under Rangitane.

The Runanganui was run by a Board consisting of a chairperson, deputy chairperson, a representative from each taiwhenua, and representatives from each of the kaumatua (elders), wahine (women), and rangatihis (youth) runanga. The
Runanganui set up an office in Hastings and employed a full-time executive officer. The board met regularly and, along with the Kahui Kaumātua, the Council of Elders, exerted their influence on the developments of the Runanganui. The day-to-day running of the Runanganui was the responsibility of the Executive Officer.

Taiwhenua

Each taiwhenua was autonomous, but accountable to the Runanganui. The rules of the Runanganui do not define the relationship with taiwhenua, but it saw itself as the central authority:

Tribal Reunification – It is essential that initially the six Taiwhenua be unified under one boundary and a single administration. (Runanganui response to Te Tirohanga Rangapu, 26).

By including the word *initially*, this statement implies that there was some intention for the taiwhenua to eventually become autonomous. There is no other evidence to support this intention and the wording is probably misleading. From the taiwhenua perspective, the Runanganui filled the role of the defunct Maori Affairs Department in providing resources, but had no authority over their activities.

Tamatea Taiwhenua

The first recorded meeting of the Tamatea Taiwhenua was held at Pukehou Marae on 28 January 1989. At this meeting, the role of the Taiwhenua was explained to the people and the relationship to the district Maori council was also discussed. From the tenor of the minutes, there appears to have been a large degree of support for the establishment of the Taiwhenua. The recorded roles of the Taiwhenua were:

1. [To provide] a communication network between iwi and runanganui
2. to identify and prioritise the needs of the iwi
3. to seek resources
4. to monitor the use of resources

The direction of the Runanganui, the Taiwhenua established twelve runanga\(^\text{84}\) to cover a wide range of community concerns and activities (Tamatea minutes, 28 January 1989).

---

\(^{84}\) Hauora (Health) Whakapunamu mahi, Employment
Arts & Culture Tangaroa, Fishing
Kohanga Reo Matauranga, Education
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The minutes of the meetings over the next six months reflect an organisation that was establishing itself. There were discussions on funding, constitutions, and ideas on how to operate. The Taiwhenua was also immediately occupied with a major project, the building of the tribal waka Tamatea Arikinui for Waitangi Day celebrations in 1990. Another item of significance was the election of the chairperson onto the United Regional Council. This body was a very influential part of local government, and the election of the Taiwhenua chairperson onto this council was public recognition of the authority of the Taiwhenua. In July, the Taiwhenua meeting passed the following motion:

[That] The Taiwhenua o Tamatea and the Executive of Maori Committees be linked by the Whatuiaipiti Economic Development Council (Tamatea Minutes 9 July 1989).

Neither the Whatuiaipiti Economic Development Council nor its role in this development is defined, but it is assumed that the effect of this motion was to merge the existing Maori Council Executive with the newly formed Taiwhenua. The same meeting also discussed a centre for the Taiwhenua, and the meeting was divided between establishing an office in the main street of Waipukurau and using a marae.85

Besides the building of the waka, which became a very major undertaking the Taiwhenua successfully staged an art exhibition, Nga Taonga o Tamatea, and a popular music concert. No constitution or certificate was sighted but, from some of the discussion in the minutes, it is assumed that the Taiwhenua eventually became an incorporated society. Funding for the Taiwhenua came from the government-sponsored Mana Enterprises via the Runanganui. A total of $250,000 was drip-fed to the Taiwhenua over a period of years. Some of the special-purpose runanga, such as Kohanga Reo and MACCESS, had access to separate funding. The Tamatea Taiwhenua was successful in establishing a network of contacts with local authorities of various types. These relationships with local authorities appeared to be cordial, productive, and lasting. As with the Runanganui, unity and commonality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Mana Wlaŋgæ, Fostering Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rangatahi</td>
<td>Waihie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaumātua, Elders</td>
<td>MACCESS, a government employment training programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of purpose were a problem for the Taiwhenua. Throughout the minutes, there are pleas for unity. There are a number of recorded incidents where people, either in groups or as individuals, walked out of meetings, as a well as resignations of individuals or sub-committees. Similar to the Runanganui, and for the same reasons, was the pattern of movement from intense activity to a state of inertia.

In both the Tamatea and Wairarapa Taiwhenua, relationships between constituent marae and the Taiwhenua executive committee were strained. Special-interest, non-tribal groups, such as the Whatuiapiti Trust, Tamatea Consultants for Youth, Puawai Whanui, Te Rongo o Tahu, Nga Waka o te Whanau formed. Also, alternative tribal organisations emerged and in the Wairarapa the Runanganui o Raongitane opened an office in Masterton. Among the general public, even among those who were active in the Māori community at a local level, there was very little awareness of the activities or purpose of the Runanganui and the Taiwhenua. The executive committees were plagued by constitutional problems and personality clashes and they had trouble attracting a full representation of members to monthly meetings. They only continued to function through the dedication of a few loyal members.

**The Runanganui and Taura Here (expatriate communities)**

The developments leading to establishment of the Runanganui were watched with interest by Kahungunu people living outside the tribal area. The first chairperson, Dr Pita Sharples, was a resident of Auckland during the formation stages. At the initiative of the Te Okenga Huata, Kahungunu groups throughout the country began to organise themselves. Te Okenga’s desire was to tap the talents of Kahungunu people living away from the home territory for development of the tribe as a whole. He wanted these groups to form themselves into associations and affiliate with the Runanganui. In June 1987, Ngati Kahungunu living in Christchurch formalised their kinship links by creating a runanga called Te Runanga o Ngati Kahungunu ki Waitaha, the Ngati Kahungunu Council of Canterbury. Over the following two years, they established themselves as a publicly known tribal entity and, as a consequence, they were a very important and visible link in the social network of Christchurch Māori. They were also successful in formalising their links with other Kahungunu.

85 In May 1990, the Taiwhenua began operating from an office on the main street of Waipukurau.
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groups spread throughout the South Island. In June 1988, along with Wellington and Auckland, the Runanga o Ngati Kahungunu ki Waitaha was formally recognised by the Runanganui as their taura here [6]. Even with formal recognition being given, the links between the Runanga and the Runanganui were tenuous for a while. Kahungunu ki Waitaha routinely communicated with and sent the minutes of their meetings to, the Runanganui, which only responded sporadically.

There is no evidence that Te Okenga’s idea of linking all Kahungunu people, regardless of where they lived, was fully understood and supported by the majority of Kahungunu people living at home. Like most tribes, Kahungunu were totally immersed in developments on the local scene and had little time or energy to devote to their relations living in other parts of the country.

This indifference towards Kahungunu living away from home was witnessed at a Runanganui meeting in September 1990, when representatives from the Kahungunu groups living in Wellington, Kahungunu ki Whanganui-a-Tara, petitioned to have voting rights on the Runanganui. While their request was not rejected outright, it was stalled through inertia, and nothing conclusive was decided. The meeting showed little enthusiasm for the idea and did not know how to deal with it. Kahungunu ki Te Waipounamu’s request for support to establish a carving school in Mataura, Southland, met with a similar reaction.86 Te Okenga’s vision of connecting Kahungunu throughout the country was, in reality, an individual one, and not seriously part of any tribal strategy.

The Vision

The implementation of the Runanganui and the taiwhenua was, in effect, an attempt at tribal self-government. It was part of a nationwide phenomenon of the retribalisation of Maori society, which will be discussed fully in another section. Tribal self-government was the grand vision. For most, however, it was simply a better way of providing service. The difference between the two is pragmatism versus philosophy.

86 In 1989, a delegation of Ngati Kahungunu representatives of Te Waipounamu requested support from the Runanganui to establish a school of carving at Mataura.
There was not really a dichotomy between pragmatism and philosophy, but more a
difference of emphasis. On the extreme pragmatist side were those who only saw the
issue in terms of community improvement. At the other extreme were those who
saw the issue solely in terms of tribal sovereignty. For most Maori, the two issues
were interrelated, and there were very few people who held extreme positions. The
visionaries saw the establishment of the Runanganui as the reassertion of tribal
authority over its own territory. The vision was to establish a supra-tribal identity
under the mantle of the ancestral canoe Takitimu while not explicitly expressing an
idea of nationhood. This is not surprising when the composition of the founding
group is considered. They were all well-educated, well-travelled, articulate public
figures who were steeped in the traditions of Ngati Kahungunu. A more explicit view
of nationhood for Kahungunu was expressed in the draft constitution submitted by
Kahi Harawira:

The executive power shall be vested in the Head of the Executive ... He shall be
resident of no less than three years, a citizen of the Nation, a person of
Kahungunu descent (Harawira, Article 6, Draft constitution).

In the end, pragmatism won out, even for the visionaries. The reality of inter-tribal
politics soon quashed the wider vision, which was then modified to include only
Kahungunu. Another instance where pragmatism won out over ideals was the
acceptance of the conservative constitution drawn up by Monna Jackson, rather than
the more overtly separatist constitution submitted by Harawira. The constitution
that was accepted was aimed simply at establishing the Runanganui as the iwi
authority for Ngati Kahungunu.

The majority of people, particularly the older ones, while lamenting the loss of
language and cultural values among the young, saw the whole process as an evolution
of improved service delivery to Maori, to enable them to solve problems of
educational failure, unemployment, criminal offences and poor health. They held that
the Maori Council and Maori Affairs Department were not the best vehicles to
deliver services to Maori. The Maori Council favoured only those who lived on
mana and took no account of the contemporary situation of the majority of Maori
[8.]. On the other hand the Maori Affairs Department was seen as friendly, but rather incompetent, and served its master the government rather than the people:

In particular, we applaud the government for outlining a broad agenda for social and economic change, admitting to the socio-economic disadvantage faced by Maori and accepting that the existing delivery system for government services has not and cannot work for Maori. (Runanganui response to Te Tirohanga Rangapu, 12 July 1988, 3).

Even with modification the vision was still flawed. Flaws prevented the universal acceptance of the Runanganui within its district and eventually affected its operation. First, the constitution of the Runanganui assumed that Kahungunu were a homogenous group who held sovereignty over the area that lay between the Wharerata and Rimutaka ranges. The claim to tino rangatiratanga was based on notions of traditional tribal boundaries and ignored the tribal rights of Rongomaiwahine and Rangitane. The Runanganui minutes record expressions of concern from these groups:

Rongomaiwahine, Waikaremoana Trust Board Hui called by Ned Ihaka; -- L. Manuel, D. Fox on Waitangi Tribunal [were] concerned that mana may be taken from Rongomaiwahine (Runanganui minutes, 20 August 1988).

Against the trend of resistance to Kahungunu attempting to impose authority over other groups was the request from Ngati Hine Manu and Ngati Paki of Taihape to come under the umbrella of the Runanganui (Runanganui minutes, 29 October 1988). This was a very unusual development and was a dilemma for the Runanganui as Taihape is located in the territory of the neighbouring Ngati Tuwharetoa people. Solving this dilemma must have been beyond the capabilities of the Runanganui as there is no recorded or anecdotal record of what happened regarding this request. There is no record of these tribes actually joining the Runanganui.

Another problem with the vision is that it claimed its right to existence on the notion of traditional tribal rights, but did not reflect these rights in its organisation. Traditional tribal rights claimed under the mantle of Ngati Kahungunu would have been centred on hapu. Under the runanganui system tribal rights were based on tawhenua, regions. The establishment of the six tawhenua was actually an
imposition with very little claim to any traditional precedent. The imposition was not a major problem in most areas. However, there was a problem in the Tamatea Taiwhenua. From the outset, the Whatuiapiti people expressed reservation about being included or having their specific identity submerged under the name Tamatea. This sentiment is illustrated in extracts from the Taiwhenua minutes:

The Taiwhenua o Tamatea and the Tamatea Executive of Maori Committees be linked by the Whatuiapiti Economic Development Council (Tamatea, minutes 9 July 1989)

[W]e unanimously agreed that the people consider the benefits of registration as an incorporated runanga ourselves as the Taiwhenua O Tamatea. There was also strong support for us to be recognised as Whatuiapiti (Tamatea minutes, 14 November 1990).

At the Taiwhenua meeting of 27 November 1990, the suggestion that the Taiwhenua be named Whatuiapiti was raised and rejected by the meeting (Tamatea minutes, 27 November 1990). No solutions to the Whatuiapiti concerns are recorded, so their continuation must have been an underlying source of tension.87

While the majority of people supported the establishment of the Runanganui, it was vigorously opposed by some. Opposition to the Runanganui came from existing groups who wielded a degree of influence in the community and were opposed to development centred solely on the tribe. Other tribal groups objected to being placed under the jurisdiction of the Runanganui and wanted their own tribal authority. Publicly recognised organisations provided executive members with status and influence, and the establishment of the Runanganui threatened to overshadow and possibly replace these organisations. Opposition came from those who did not have the confidence that any type of Maori organisation could stand alone without government support. This type of opposition was most frequently displayed by senior public servants who took a dismissive line to aspirations for sovereignty. Both of these latter two groups argued that use of tribal organisations led to tribal chauvinism and divided the community. They therefore supported the status quo.

87 The most recent overt development was the establishment of the Whatuiapiti Trust that was set up ostensibly to cater to health concerns in the region. Equally, it has been an expression of Whatuiapiti tribal autonomy.
and promised adaptations to their own operations to meet changing community needs.

Retribalisation of Ngati Kahungunu in the 1980s took the form of establishing a centralised administration, the Runanganui o Ngati Kahungunu. The development was spearheaded by respected high profile personalities and supported and encouraged by government policy. The move gained widespread support from Kahungunu within the tribal area as well as those living away from the district. It was established on some ill-defined and nebulous notion of tribal sovereignty. The implications of this non-specific philosophy were not fully explored or debated, and the implementation of the Runanganui system was regarded as tribal imperialism by other tribal groups. Also, the notion of complete tribal autonomy was not accepted by the politically conservative who wanted to hedge their bets by having autonomy as well as protection from government sources. The result was that the Runanganui opted to be a tribally operated replacement for the Maori Affairs Department.

**Te Runanga o Nga Mataawaka 1987-1990**

When the fourth Labour government indicated that it was about to disestablish the Maori Affairs Department, two kaumatua, Hohua Tutengahe and Hori Brennan, approached the South Island Manager of Maori Affairs, Bill Edwards, to call a hui to discuss the implications of the change for Maori living in Christchurch.  

The meeting was held Sunday 12 July 1987, and all tribal groups in the city with the exception of Ngai Tahu, were invited. The apparent reason for not inviting any Ngai Tahu representation was that it was thought by Maori Affairs staff that Ngai Tahu would automatically be catered by their own Trust Board. This assumption was wrong, and demonstrated the lack of understanding that the department staff had about the policies that they were being asked to implement.

---

88 The kaumatua asked the manager to call the meeting because they were without any resources to finance a meeting.
Concluding commentary

In this section, the survival and the future of the tribe is considered, followed by concluding remarks.

The tribe into the future

In both intention and substance, this thesis presents a historical examination of the conceptualisation of the tribe. Yet through this study, or because of it, it is possible to make predictions about the tribe and tribalisation into the future with a degree of confidence and certainty because there are only a limited amount of options. Choices are limited because the dominant form of tribe is a static one that was so entrenched by the end of the twentieth century that all others diminished into insignificance.

The concept of tribe in Maori society endured the forces of incorporation and modernisation in the twentieth century because it was the essence of Maori identity, rather than the way that Maori lived. All indications are that the tribe will survive into the future for the same overall reason in principle, however, with a number of differences.

The tangible forms that kept the notion of tribe viable were commercial assets (tribal trusts, land incorporations, and the like) and cultural assets (marae and associated customary practices for example). These collectively owned assets provided a physical expression of identity. Their very existence and the requirement for management sustained the notion of tribal entities. With retribalisation, the acquisition of assets has increased considerably. These include the acquisition of political assets (articulated as Treaty rights) such as customary fishing rights and government recognition, which in turn, have materialised into considerable amount of fiscal and property assets; and accompanied by considerable political influence. Through this tribes have acquired the wherewithal to be relevant in contemporary society, and thus ensure their survival into the future.

By the close of the twentieth century, the introduced form of tribe was a recognisable feature of New Zealand society. It had become integral to contemporary
Maori society and increasingly to New Zealand society. Casual forms of tribe, already overshadowed by the newly accepted form of tribe, will be totally subsumed by it with the passage of time. Although they are subsumed, other forms of tribalisation will continue to be potent social forces, while being largely unrecognised and unarticulated. Not only is there no social mechanism to recognise alternative collectivities as tribes, they could not, and cannot, ever be conceived as tribes in this paradigm of social organisation. The likely result is that Maori society will be further dichotomised into tribal and non-tribal individuals and tribal and non-tribal groupings.

As the tribe in its introduced form is a prescribed social formation, it can only evolve within the limits of prescription and the necessity for formal interaction with external agencies such as central and local government, and commercial interests that cause tribes to become more, rather than less, formally organised, and thus more prescriptive. Changes in status are possible in this paradigm but it will be managed change rather than evolutionary change. It is conceivable, for example, that a group presently regarded as a hapu or whanau could, given the right circumstances, become an iwi. This raises the issue of how the change would be decided. At the end of the century, it was motivated from within Maori society, but it is questionable if this internal impetus can survive into the future. The most probable eventuality is that a group will be forced to undergo a validation process to meet certain prescribed criteria including recognition by the government and established iwi. Two additional points need to be raised at this juncture. First, groups understood as hapu and whanau could conceivably become publicly understood as iwi because they exist in the prescribed form of tribe, whereas other forms cannot. The second point is that any other forms of social collectivity, such as UMAs, could conceivably gain equal status in terms of rights to that of an iwi, but never be iwi. This is because the tribe is now a reified form of social organisation, and, as such, cannot accommodate any deviation from the paradigm of prescription.

182 Without being sidetracked into a tangential argument, it is assumed here that the tribe is relevant to Maori, it is, by implication relevant to New Zealand society as a whole.
183 Possible circumstances would probably have to include some historical precedence and a group claim to property or rights, a sizable membership, and collective desire coupled with determined leadership. In other words, while it is conceivable, it would be an extremely rare occurrence.
184 Iwi is a sought-after status as it is the locus of political autonomy.
Membership

Registration of members will become a requirement rather than remain optional. At the end of the twentieth century, there were strong political incentives to have as many members as possible. The greater the numbers of publicly affiliated members, the more political influence an iwi was likely to command. As eligibility to share in tribal assets is contingent on membership, proof of membership would have to become more formalised than it is at present, and is therefore a possible source of litigation.

There is also pressure from the Crown to ensure that iwi cater for all their members.\textsuperscript{185} While there are compelling reasons for iwi to cater for their diasporic communities the Canadian experience suggests that catering to non-resident (off-Reserve) band members results in\textsuperscript{186} contests for scarce resources, which in turn led to bitter litigation between parties. This experience suggested that when rights and benefits were distributed membership was acknowledged quite freely. Because of this, there could possibly evolve a conceptualisation of two levels of membership, full membership for those members who reside in the tribal territory and a secondary form of membership for expatriate members.

Governance

Interrelated with membership is the issue of tribal governance. In the previous section, the rights to membership were considered, but in this section the rights of members are considered. The notion of tribal government is currently in its infancy and most accurately described as management, rather than government. Tribal structures include business entities for the management of assets, claims committees for the management of Treaty claims, and iwi representative bodies in the form of runanga. There will be incentives (including government pressure) to manage

---

\textsuperscript{185} The 1998 High Court decision on the allocation of the Fisheries settlement is an example for the Crown’s concern, see (chapter nine).

\textsuperscript{186} In June 1985, the Canadian government in an effort to bring the Indian Act into line with their Constitution and Charter of Rights & Freedom and introduced a number of amendments, popularly known as Bill C-31, which were aimed at reinstating lost status and allowing bands to formulate their own policy on membership. The bill met with such strenuous opposition from Indian leaders it has not been yet been passed. Indian leaders that worried to have a direct say in who was to be given status (Dumpey, pp 26-7).
resources by following accepted business practices. As members become more familiar with the idea that they are shareholders in large commercial enterprises, there is likely to be closer scrutiny and demands by members for increased economic performance of assets. One of the imperatives underlying Treaty claims was the avoidance of fragmentation of assets through individualisation, a trend consistent with the concept of collectivism that is implicit in tribalisation and one of the pillars on which contemporary tribalisation is founded. This trend is likely to be perpetuated.

The platform on which the management of assets has been set will continue to become increasingly sophisticated, but what has not been addressed, at any great level of sophistication, are the rights of the membership. In accepting an introduced form of tribe in contemporary society, there is an inherent tension between the right of the individual and the collective right of the tribe. Had the tribe been a product of an evolving society, there might well have been an adaptation of customary forms of expressing individual rights within the paradigm of collectivity.

The ideal of operating for the common good falls short in practice. This is mainly because most Maori have lived non-tribally for several generations and, during this time, the notion of individual rights has become firmly entrenched. New tribalisation has not developed a mechanism to cater to the entrenched individualism within the prescriptive form of collectivity. This conundrum raises the question, can the tribe, which is fundamentally centred on collective rights and exclusivity, be democratised? It is both conceptually possible and feasible but the signs suggest that there will be ongoing contests of mana and for both political and property rights. If the present ambiguities of membership rights are not resolved, as tribes acquire more assets, an increasingly litigious environment will result. At present, most public disputes have been over property and territorial rights and have been between tribes. In the future, disputes within tribal groups are likely to become more common.

With the reinstatement of "status" to former band members through the Bill C31 amendments, there is a constant tension between providing for the long standing Band members and the reinstated ones.

*This observation is a comment on the level of sophistication and bears no relationship to the ability of tribal management structures to succeed.*
Structure

The stereotype is that the tribe is a three-tiered social structure: iwi, the tribe, being made up of hapu, sub-tribes, and hapu consisting of whanau, families. However, in practice, there are signs of various subtle reconfigurations. One variation is that sub-units are more likely to be a group of hapu based on a geographic subdivision of a tribal territory or a customary location (often articulated as marae) than a single hapu. In smaller iwi, whanau are likely to communicate directly with the iwi rather than through a hapu. These are signs of a shift from a three-tiered system to a two-tiered system, that is, individuals will express their tribal rights either through whanau directly to iwi or directly through hapu (missing out the whanau level) to iwi. The stereotype of whanau, hapu iwi will remain the ideal, but will be very rarely manifested.

The tribe survived through the twentieth century because it remained relevant to Maori society. Initially, because it was a continuity from the past, the institution was the way that Maori society was conceived and organised. It retained its relevance because it remained central to Maori identity to the extent that it could be revitalised into new forms when the political climate became suitable to tribalisation. By the end of the century, the tribe had become more relevant for Maori because it controlled access to substantial assets and political rights. The tribe also became relevant to the wider New Zealand society and the international discourse on indigenous rights. It has been concluded here that this increased acceptance, combined with the reified nature of the contemporary tribe, will assure its survival into the future. It would be very difficult, if not politically impossible, for the non-Maori polity to reject the tribe in a global society increasingly concerned with human rights and indigenous rights. As a prescribed and static social form that primarily manages assets, rather than a demotic way in which Maori organise their communities, the survival of the tribe is assured regardless of how Maori society may change in the future.

This thesis has explored the perceptions, conceptions, and realities of the tribe in Maori society in the twentieth century. It has argued that during the twentieth century the tribe as identity and the tribe as the organising paradigm of Maori
society diverged, and that conceptualising this development is the key to understanding the tribe in the twentieth century. It has also maintained that failure to take this social movement into account has resulted in ahistorical conceptualisations of the tribe. It has also been established that, while the retribalisation movement successfully introduced a new form of tribe and tribalisation, it did not recreate a totally tribalised society. What it did succeed in doing, however, is entrench an ideology of tribalisation that excluded all other perceptions and conceptions of the tribe and has ensured that the tribe will be a feature of Maori and New Zealand societies into the future. Finally, it has identified that perceptions and conceptions of the tribe in the twentieth century were formed through the interacting and interlocking agencies of Maori society, scholarship, and government.