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I dedicate this dissertation to my father, George:

‘Dad, you always encouraged me to expect big things for myself. *Thank you* for instilling in me that with knowledge great things can be achieved.*

*Toi te kupu, toi te whenua, toi te mana.*

*Knowledge is the word, knowledge is the land and knowledge gives dignity.*
Abstract

Ngai Tahu Whanui claims most of the South Island as its takiwa (territory) and is one of the largest Maori iwi (tribe) of Aotearoa/New Zealand. In 1996 Ngai Tahu Whanui became the first tribal group to have its identity recognised in legislation. The basis for membership in the legal-political identity, Ngai Tahu Whanui, is registration of whakapapa (genealogy) to a South Island kaumatau (elder) listed in the ‘Blue Book’, a list compiled in negotiation with the Crown in 1925.

I argue that the management of whakapapa by the contemporary leadership – Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu - constitutes the adhesive that holds together the individual members, who have historically been geographically, politically and culturally dispersed. This management is carried out through the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll of members and is legitimated by a supporting public narrative. The Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative relies on the potency of whakapapa as metanarrative and three meta-themes about time, place and ‘The Claim’ Ngai Tahu have made against Crown violations of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi. This management privileges the new legal-political identities of ‘Ngai Tahu Whanui’ by silencing or excluding other historic South Island Maori identities.

Research for this dissertation includes participant observation in a range of Ngai Tahu settings and a series of recorded life histories and face to face interviews with Ngai Tahu individuals over the period from 1996 to 2000. Through investigation of political events over this period, within a context of historical events since 1840, and the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals, the complexities of contemporary South Island Maori identities are examined.

The dissertation does not adopt a ‘body of theory’ as such but uses a range of theorists from various disciplines. Anthony Giddens is relied on for consideration of whakapapa as cultural resource. Margaret Somers, Ken Plummer and Nigel Rapport are followed in their consideration of the role of personal and public narratives in the constitution of identity. Somers’ concept of ‘metanarrative’, the most potent form of cultural resource, is used to analyse whakapapa. It is because of its metanarrative properties, including its role as narrative and a range of metonymic associations and the interweaving of the meta-themes in whakapapa, that its strategic uses by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership are consented to both by the Crown and by South Island Maori. While other political practices by the contemporary leadership are often challenged in counternarratives by Ngai Tahu individuals and by non-Ngai Tahu, the management and use of whakapapa as a resource is never challenged.

I also consider Russell Bishop [1996] for his autobiographical contribution to account of the role of whakapapa as narrative. I have also used Corrine Kratz’s typology of ‘rhetorical techniques’ to investigate aspects of tradition in my analysis of the Ngai Tahu public narrative.

The dissertation includes an argument about the framing in narrative and supporting management of a national ethnic identity, borrowing from Margaret Somers, Craig Calhoun, Charles Tilly and Benedict Anderson.

To my knowledge, this dissertation is the first in the study of contemporary identities for Maori to consider whakapapa for both its metanarrative qualities and for its uses as political resource.
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Chapter one

Introduction

On Wednesday, the 17th of April 1996, Parliament passed an Act that gave us back by way of the law, the Cloak they stole from us in 1865. We no longer have to borrow the hand-me-downs of others, clothes that never really fitted, that were uncomfortable, and did not reflect who we were, and where we came from. The Cloak we wear now is one that we ourselves have made, the fine woven threads of our whakapapa bind us together. It is beautiful, it is unique, it is Ngai Tahu Whanui. [Waiata written and sung by Hana O'Regan, at passing of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, Wellington, April 1996]

Ngai Tahu claims most of the South Island as its takiwa and is one of the largest Maori iwi of Aotearoa/New Zealand.¹ In 1996 Ngai Tahu became the first tribal group to have its identity recognised in legislation ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 49]. This was preceded by a series of events and negotiations in the field of South Island Maori relations and between South Island Maori and the Crown since 1840.² The 1996 legal recognition of 'Ngai Tahu Whanui' is

---

¹ Mason Durie lists Ngai Tahu as the fifth largest iwi in New Zealand, according to the 1996 Statistics New Zealand 'Census of Population and Dwellings' recorded population of 29,000 [2001: 13].

² The Treaty of Waitangi was an agreement signed between representatives of the Crown and Maori chiefs throughout New Zealand, beginning in 1840. The Treaty was introduced by the Crown as a means to address issues of claims to land at this time of colonial settlement. The Treaty contains three articles and was written in both an English version and a Maori version. Since its signing, it has been surrounded by a great deal of confusion, debate and political practice. Primarily, the confusion falls around differing interpretations of what the Maori chiefs actually ceded to the Crown by signing the Treaty. According to the 'Submission to the Royal Commission on Social Policy by the Ngai Tahu Social Policy Task Force':

While the Queen was to govern, the Maori were to retain their chieftainship over their lands, estates and prized possessions. What must be understood here is that the Maori were ensured that they would have the right to determine and control what they owned
seen by both Ngai Tahu and the Crown as an outcome of unresolved land claims issues since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. The introduction of this legal identity is also situated in a history of contingent and shifting South Island Maori identities that are interwoven in perception and in presentation by Ngai Tahu with key themes of time, place, political event and whakapapa.

My earlier research in this area examined strategies adopted by a collective representative body of Ngai Tahu, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, introduced by legislation in 1944 and 1946 to distribute partial claims settlement to a list of registered beneficiaries. In a Canterbury University lecture to the New Zealand Historical Association on December 2, 2001, Sir Tipene O'Regan, past-Chairperson of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and Chief Negotiator, stated that the Trust Board had been 'the only unifier of Ngai Tahu' in this century. In 1990 the New Zealand government was proposing the devolution of its centrally organised Maori Affairs Department to tribally-based groups, referred to as 'iwi authorities'. The Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board had made submissions to the Select Committee in 1989 setting out a proposed new tribal structure to act as the iwi authority for Ngai Tahu.

Out of this research I identified that one of the key strategic resources available to the Trust Board in its management of affairs and negotiations with the Crown, was the effective accumulation, storage and dissemination of whakapapa information. Proof of whakapapa and its registration formed the basis of membership as a beneficiary of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board. The significance of whakapapa - its required proof by beneficiaries for registration and its management by the Trust Board - is reflected in the fact that the only full-time employee of the Trust Board from 1976 to 1990 was a Whakapapa Enrolments

---

and were promised. Their rangatiratanga or authority over what they owned and were promised was guaranteed. [1988:3]

Chapter Two outlines the three articles of the Treaty and its place in contemporary Crown-Maori relations.
Officer/Researcher. The Trust Board's whakapapa records were passed on to a new governing body with the introduction of the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. Proof and registration of whakapapa in the Whakapapa Unit of the Office of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu continues to form the basis of membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui.

My earlier research identified that the Trust Board was aware of the power of strategic management of whakapapa information to be used as documentary 'proof' to maintain tribal distinctions in the South Island, and hence to establish itself as the representative body of the tangata whenua with access to manawhenua rights, and to be recognised as the preeminent iwi authority for the South Island of New Zealand.

After completing my M.A. and prior to beginning my doctoral research in 1996, I continued to attend meetings in Ngai Tahu settings. Over this period I was coming to terms with the questions to be addressed by the Doctoral thesis. I was very aware that for Ngai Tahu, this was a period of rapid and huge change, arising mostly out of the settlement of the longstanding Ngai Tahu land claim, 'Te Kereme', and the requirements of the 1990 Runanga Iwi Act.

In 1986 the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and Henare Rakihia Tau (Deputy Chairperson), on behalf of himself and others of Ngai Tahu descent, lodged a claim with the Waitangi Tribunal for territory comprising most of the South Island of Aoteaora/New Zealand, alleging Treaty breaches for lands lost since the signing of the 1840 Treaty ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 59].

The Runanga Iwi Act was passed in 1990. Even though this Act was subsequently repealed when a conservative National Government came into power in 1991, the criteria set out in the Act, for Maori to organise in the form of iwi-representative bodies, was to have a profound impact on the Trust Board's efforts throughout the next decade to organise and manage whakapapa to
present a Ngai Tahu *iwi* identity with discrete boundaries, that were distinct from other *iwi* at 1840 and since.\(^3\) The Trust Board set about establishing a structure to meet the Crown’s definition of a satisfactory body to represent a Ngai Tahu *iwi*. Then in 1991 the Waitangi Tribunal published its recommendations finding in favour of Ngai Tahu’s nine claims against the Crown.

Since my introduction to Ngai Tahu settings in 1990, Ngai Tahu individuals and collective structures have grappled with the development of appropriate infrastructures to deal with the effects of these political events, while Ngai Tahu individuals have continued to reflect on issues of *hapu*, *runanga*, *whanau*, *iwi* and individual identity. Over this period, *whakapapa* registrations grew ten-fold from around 2000 registered beneficiaries in 1990 to around 30,000 by the year 2002 [according to Terry Ryan, *Whakapapa Unit Manager: Interview*: June 2002].\(^4\) In 1986 when the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board took its claim to the Waitangi Tribunal there were approximately 800 registered beneficiaries. By 1990 this number had increased to around 5,000. At 2002 there are now just over 30,000 registered members of Ngai Tahu Whanui [T. Ryan: Interview: June 2002].

While I had not then specified my research question, I was acutely aware of the presence of this resource called *whakapapa*. I was aware that it held a great deal of power both for Ngai Tahu individuals and in the collective structures. I became interested in understanding the role of *whakapapa* both in the

---

\(^3\) In fact, as outlined in my previous research, Ngai Tahu was pleased with the original proposal to disband the Department of Maori Affairs in favour of *iwi* authorities because the Department had been viewed historically by Ngai Tahu as focused on the interests of North Island Maori [Kelly: 1991: 51-52].

\(^4\) According to Statistics New Zealand 2001 Census of Population and Dwellings data, 39,180 Maori identified their *iwi* as Ngai Tahu/Kai Tahu, from 20,304 in 1991 [Statistics New Zealand media release 2001 Census Snapshot 4 ‘Maori’ 20 March 2002]. There is a significant gap between Statistics New Zealand population numbers and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit population numbers. This discrepancy and the growth in population from 1991 to 2001 are positioned in political practice over this period, as discussed further in this dissertation.
presentations of identity by the collective bodies of Ngai Tahu leadership and in the understandings of identity by Ngai Tahu individuals.

This dissertation is based primarily, on participant observation research in a range of Ngai Tahu settings — at hui, runanga meetings, wananga meetings, te reo classes over the period from 1996 to 2000. My 'time done' in the field extends back to 1989, continuing on through the period from the completion of my M.A. research. I have also recorded a series of life histories and face-to-face interviews with Ngai Tahu individuals. The research has also incorporated analysis of Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu publications and documentation held in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu archives, Canterbury University Library, Canterbury Public Library; and magazine and newspaper articles over the period 1996 - 2000.

Methodology and Methodological Issues

On Sunday evening, November 29th, 1998, my son and I watched the Television One News coverage of the historic Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu Whanui at Onuku marae on Banks Peninsula. There we were - both of us - in the forefront of the crowd standing with the tangata whenua, welcoming the Prime Minister and the Crown's representatives, and other manuhiri onto Onuku marae. We had become part of this historic event. Our presence with the tangata whenua has now become etched into the picture of this particular event, part of the history of South Island Maori-Crown relations at this particular Ngai Tahu place. This event best symbolises the assertion and recognition of a distinct and separate Ngai Tahu Whanui iwi identity in the twentieth century. In a lecture to the New Zealand Historical Association on December 2, 2001, Sir Tipene O'Regan identified the Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu Whanui as of 'enormous significance' to Ngai Tahu. He stated that while the settlement of the Claim in itself was one of

---

5 The interviews I conducted are listed in the Bibliography of this dissertation.
the most significant events in Ngai Tahu history, there have been three significant events/issues around this, of which the Crown Apology at Onuku was perhaps the most significant. The other two events/issues include: the restoration of tribal personality under the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, and the basis of representation of this identity within the tribe that is now a key issue to be addressed by Ngai Tahu.

On this cold windy day in 1998, the Crown's Representative, Prime Minister Jenny Shipley, delivered an official Apology to Ngai Tahu for breaches of the Treaty since 1840. My own attendance at this event left me once again with a strong sense of the two-edged nature of *whakapapa* - as a resource that both unites and distinguishes South Island Maori.

It would be easy for any of the MP's, government officials and even Ngai Tahu individuals present that day to perceive 'Ngai Tahu Whanui' as one and the same as Ngai Tahu *iwi*; that the primary Maori identity shared by all contemporary Ngai Tahu is their Ngai Tahu *iwi* identity; that for all Ngai Tahu this *iwi* identity is considered as equivalent to their identity as members of Ngai Tahu Whanui; and that all Ngai Tahu have historically shared one grievance with the Crown, as addressed by one claim. To many Ngai Tahu it would appear that all seemed right on that day; that the settlement being celebrated was the only possible outcome of a singular historic process that began with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi by a number of Ngai Tahu chiefs at various locations around *Te Waipounamu* beginning in 1840.

In the newspaper and television coverage and in the presentations on the day, this event was held up as an end point, the outcome of a long historical struggle for land, cultural recognition and *iwi* identity, by a united, homogeneous *iwi* through time, since 1840. For my story, however, I have chosen the Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu Whanui at Onuku *marae* on November 29, 1998 as a starting point from which to consider the history of events, presentations and
narratives of whakapapa, time, place and 'The Claim' in the understandings and presentations of identity, both those represented there on that day and those that were absent, for contemporary Ngai Tahu. According to Becker, starting analysis from the activity or event allows the researcher to consider the historical, political and geographical contexts within which the event occurs and the connections of these contexts with one another' [1998: 41]. Becker suggests that, as sociologists, we should assume that whatever we want to study has a history of contingent events stories, narratives [1998: 60-61]. He writes that when studying an event, it must be remembered that events do not just happen, but rather occur in a series of sometimes accidental or contingent steps [1998: 31]. This is also a feature of my sociological research – discovering chance and contingency while doing Participant Observation in Ngai Tahu settings.

Finding a starting point to write about concepts like whakapapa and time is difficult because these concepts do not easily lend themselves to tidy, linear chronological structure.\(^6\) Using a seemingly 'final' event like this as a starting point from which to peel back layers goes beyond the surface to reveal the many histories and complex issues associated with whakapapa, identity and politics for Ngai Tahu individuals, all of which have fed in some way into this 'final'\(^7\) outcome.

---

\(^6\) I was reminded of Judith Fyfe's words, in her recording of the life history of Sophie Kaa (a Ngai Tahu matriarch): 'Recording Sophie Kaa is like trying to catch a butterfly in a fishing net. Her memory darts in many directions... She moves from past to the present as if they were one, and thinks in terms of many generations rather than simply yesterday and today...Every name mentioned becomes part of an intricate networking system, which explains why the material recorded is more organic than strictly chronological' [1990: 35].

\(^7\) I refer to 'final' in the sense that it may be considered as such by Ngai Tahu Whanui, For example:

The Crown has made a formal offer to settle Ngai Tahu's long-standing Treaty Claim dating back to last century.... The Crown's apology is fundamental to the settlement. It acknowledges the validity of the claims that our people have made over seven generations. It begins the positive process of rebuilding, whilst not forgetting the past. The Apology marks the end of the grievance period. The healing process can begin. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 3]
My dissertation is enriched by having 'done time' in the field prior to the culmination of such a landmark event. Hence, my own field notes become part of a collection from which to think about and critically engage the content of all the possible histories and stories that have preceded this event. Over the period from 1993 to 2000 I attended quarterly meetings of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, Te Runanganui o Tahu and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu; annual tribal *hui a tau*; special events *hui*; Waitangi Day celebrations; and *runanga* meetings at Onuku, Wairewa, and Te Taumutu *runanga*. I spent extensive time in places where Ngai Tahu met between 1989 and 2001. As well, I recorded life histories and face-to-face interviews with 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals and library and archival research. Excerpts from narrative accounts used throughout the thesis reflect the material gained from wider participant observation over this extensive period. To further enhance the research I have relied on secondary sources of narrative and academic research, either by Ngai Tahu or involving them in some way. I have deliberately chosen such sources out of the collection of writing in New Zealand on issues of Maori identity, politics and culture, in order to keep the focus on all the potency of Ngai Tahu *whakapapa*, as cultural resource.

In terms of my time with Ngai Tahu, this place - Onuku on Bank’s Peninsula, east of Christchurch - also holds a special significance. The Crown Apology is one of many experienced in my participant observation at Onuku. Onuku was one of three *runanga* that permitted my attendance at monthly *runanga* meetings through 1997. In 1997 my son and I were privileged to travel with a group of Ngati Irakehu from Wairewa in the middle of the night to witness the dawn opening of the extraordinary new *wharenui* at Onuku. On that weekend, we were also privileged to attend the unveiling of the headstone of Henry Robinson, a Ngati Irakehu *kaumatua*. On February 6th, 2000, my son and I also attended the

Whether or not the settlement and corresponding new legal-political identities represent an 'end' to a historic story or the beginning of a series of new stories is yet to be seen. This issue is addressed further in Chapter Eleven.
Waitangi Day celebrations at Onuku, at which Prime Minister Helen Clark and a range of local and central government representatives spoke.

My 'time done' in Ngai Tahu settings has included key events in South Island Maori-Crown relations, key shifts in collective South Island Maori identities and consideration of these issues by Ngai Tahu individuals. It has also been a period of huge growth in Ngai Tahu Whanui membership and its supporting administrative and managerial infrastructure. When I first entered the Trust Board offices in Te Wai Pounamu House on Armagh Street in Christchurch, at the beginning of 1990, there was one board room where the Trust Board of eight members met quarterly, one part-time receptionist, one full-time person working on whakapapa, and one Executive Officer on secondment for a year from the Department of Maori Affairs. By June 1999, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu employed ninety three salaried employees, governed by the eighteen papatipu runanga representatives who make up the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and a series of other Boards of Directors in a multi-tiered structure, under the overarching 'Office of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu'. The organisation shifted from

---

6 This excludes contract staff and Ngai Tahu Fisheries Ltd factory staff. Eighteen Runanga Representatives and eighteen Runanga Alternates govern the following: Ngai Tahu Development Corporation Limited, Ngai Tahu Group Management Limited, Ngai Tahu Fisheries Limited, Ngai Tahu Finance Limited, Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation Limited, Ngai Tahu Property Group Limited, Ngai Tahu Radio and Television Limited. Each of these structures is governed by its own Board of Directors, accountable to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. Whale Watch Kaikoura is owned 43.0% by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and operates under a Board of Directors, some membership of which are Ngai Tahu [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999].

Ngai Tahu is grouped into 18 Papatipu Runanga or hapu based councils whose representatives form the governing body known as Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. These representatives guide and control the activities of the three arms of Ngai Tahu -

- Ngai Tahu Group Management provides an administrative and monitoring function to both Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and Papatipu Runanga.
- Ngai Tahu Holdings Corporation Limited - the commercial pulse of iwi Ngai Tahu is charged with a critical three part role of protection, enhancement and maximising financial returns on the tribal assets through management of its commercial and business initiatives.
- Ngai Tahu Development Corporation Limited - responsible for empowering support for strategic development of Papatipu Runanga, and improving the welfare of tribal members culturally, socially and through health and education ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 4].
Armagh Street to new offices in Hereford Street because they needed more space.

After an initial meeting with Tipene O'Regan, then Chairperson of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, at which he approved my M.A. research proposal and granted appropriate access, I spent 1990 attending quarterly Trust Board meetings and regular meetings with Koa Mantell, Executive Officer, carrying out interviews with Trust Board members and employees of the Iwi Transition Agency, and attending a six-week immersion class in Te Reo Maori at Christchurch Polytechnic Institute. The course Tutor was Katarina Daniels, wife of Monty Daniels, Trust Board member and Upoko from Wairewa, and mother of James Daniels, whom I did not know then but who was later to become a close friend and a key informant in my PhD research.

In 1996 the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act was introduced, giving Ngai Tahu legal recognition as a tribe. This was a legal precedent both in New Zealand and around the world. The Act also provided a mechanism to transfer all the assets and activities of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board to a new body, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, made up of representatives from eighteen papatipu runanga (sub-tribal regional councils) to replace Te Runanganui o Tahu.

From 1993 to 1996, after submitting my M.A., but prior to starting my PhD research, I continued to attend quarterly meetings of both the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and the newly formed Te Runanganui o Tahu. I also attended annual Ngai Tahu Hui a Tau at marae around the country.

---

9 In 1990 the affairs and responsibilities of the New Zealand Maori Affairs Department were devolved to tribal groups referred to as iwi authorities. Ngai Tahu leadership began measures to develop an appropriate structure to meet this requirement, consisting of a combined leadership structure of Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and Te Runanganui o Tahu (a form of tribal council and the precursor to the current Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu). To support these iwi authorities, the proposal was to set up a Ministry of Maori Affairs and an Iwi Transition Agency to assist with policy-making and development of the operational bases of iwi authorities, respectively ["Te Urupare Rangapu": November 1988: 5].
From 1996 to 1998, I attended bi-monthly Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meetings and annual Hui a Tau. I also attended a series of special hui, including the 1995 Fiscal Envelope Hui at Tuahiwi, the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Crown Settlement Document Roadshow hui at Nga Hau e Wha marae in Christchurch in October 1997, the Crown Apology at Onuku in November 1998 and the Waitangi Day celebrations at Onuku in February, 2000. In October 1997, I attended a one-day 'Social Cohesion' hui in Christchurch, with representatives from many local community agencies, as well as representatives from Ngai Tahu Development Corporation and Tuahiwi marae, to discuss issues/determinants of contemporary social cohesion.

In 1997, as well as attending these meetings and monthly runanga meetings at Wairewa, Onuku and Te Taumutu runanga, for several weeks I attended a weekly te reo class at Tuahiwi marae. The class tutor was Aroha Reiti-Crofts, and I attended with an M.A. student from the Sociology Department who was herself Ngai Tahu from Tuahiwi.

The role of time in the management of contemporary South Island Maori identities is fundamental to my dissertation. 'Doing time' as a participant observer has been absolutely crucial to my research. This is especially so considering the significant role played by time in the presentations and understandings of South Island Maori identities. As my dissertation argues, in the management and presentation of contemporary identities by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership, a binary 'two-time' notion is utilised, setting up two times - 'then' and 'now' - as key to the determination of contemporary outcomes. As Kratz argues, such an approach to time glosses over the incremental social and political developments that have occurred between 'then' and 'now', as well as the voices of individuals that have been silenced in the dominant narratives [1993]. I am reminded of this statement made by the Ngai Tahu woman I chose to interview after the historic Crown Apology at Onuku in 1998, for her absence
on this historic day from this place of great importance to her, which said as much about key events and perceptions that led up to this outcome:

*When you're sitting at a table of eighteen* [the governing body of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu] *and you ask a question about something over the last nine years, there'd be a number of people sitting there going, 'What's she on about? ...and they even put their hands up and say, I don't even know what you are on about and that's right, they don't.... The Act doesn't make any reference to [the validity of past Runanganui policy] and I would have thought with all the legal advice we had...and the thing is with some of our policies, we've actually put documents out...[to] regional councils and district councils throughout Te Wai Pounamu. So you've got to go back and acknowledge those. And if you don't go back and acknowledge those pre-1996 policies, we're actually saying to everybody, history actually means nothing. But we can't say that because we've just come through a settlement. For us to get to now, you have to go back.... And to say something like our policies haven't really got a place or are irrelevant now; until you actually can go through them and have a look, that's when you can make an informed decision. I had the same question posed last night: 'But they're old, they mean nothing'. But how can you say that? [Interview: July 1999]*

'Doing time' over an extended period is the cornerstone of participant observation as a research method. According to Goffman, 'if you've got a short period of time, there would be all kinds of reasons why you wouldn't be able to get in that situation' [1989: 126].

On the weekend of the Crown Apology, I was sitting in the marquee listening to a presentation from the key negotiators and researchers involved in the negotiated settlement of the longstanding Ngai Tahu Claim that resulted in the inclusion of the Crown Apology at this place on that weekend. One very 'experienced Ngai Tahu' woman leaned over to me at the end of the talk and said, 'It's good to see you here today. I think you've have been around here longer than most of these people' (those non-Ngai Tahu involved in the massive research process that contributed to the Ngai Tahu Waitangi Tribunal hearings and many Ngai Tahu also present on that day).
In an interview with Te Maire Tau [May 2000], he likened 'new Ngai Tahu' to me to illustrate a point he was making about the significance of place in the determination of authentic Ngai Tahu identities. He was considering the significance of living in the traditional surroundings of one's ancestors, the criteria held by those I refer to in this dissertation as 'experienced Ngai Tahu', but not possessed by those I refer to as 'new Ngai Tahu'. He said to me: 'like yourself, they are on the outside, looking in'. Here, Te Maire pointed out that the two determinants of identity that exclude me from authentic Ngai Tahu identity are whakapapa and lack of experience at the pa or the marae of one's ancestors, what the educational researcher Russell Bishop refers to as whanaungatanga [1996: 63]. This is the criterion of 'experienced Ngai Tahu'.

With the growth in the number of registered beneficiaries since 1990, my time spent in 'Ngai Tahu fields' over this period sees me as, in fact, having 'done time' beyond the majority of 'new Ngai Tahu'. Each time I attended a hui or a meeting I would see more new faces than the time before, particularly in the period after 1997. For the years between 1990 and 1997, those attending annual Hui a Tau and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meetings remained a core group, with only a little growth. My participant observation over this period allowed me to witness perhaps the most significant time in Ngai Tahu's history, at least in terms of growth of registered members, claims settlement issues, and growth in a centralised leadership and supporting administrative and managerial infrastructure. Also over this period, there has been a marked cultural resurgence. This has indeed been a time of reflection (on issues of political practice, history, whakapapa, and identity) for Ngai Tahu individuals and collectives, as well as for me as a participant observer. The fact that for most of the twentieth century Maori was not the primary language spoken by most Ngai Tahu has also contributed to my ability to take part in worthwhile participant observation.
One Ngai Tahu person who has been reflecting on these issues in terms of his own Maori and Ngai Tahu identities is James Daniels. I first met James at a Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meeting at the beginning of 1997. I continued to see him at Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meetings and annual Hui a Tau over this year and throughout 1998 when I attended runanga meetings at Onuku and Wairewa. In April 1997 we had a three-hour interview. James was a very interesting person, raised in a family that had been heavily involved with Ngai Tahu politics and 'The Claim' in the twentieth century. His grandfather and father were both members of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board until it shifted responsibilities to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu in 1996. His mother headed the Te Reo Maori courses at the Christchurch Polytechnic for many years. His sister Wiki was a member of Te Runanganui o Tahu and the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu representative for Wairewa runanga from 1996 until James took over the position in 2000. Wiki continued as Chairperson for Wairewa runanga until October 2001. James was also elected to the Board of Ngai Tahu Property Group in 2000.

What is interesting about James is that he began to show interest and get involved in claims issues and Ngai Tahu politics in 1996. My first meeting with him in January 1997 was also his first visit to a Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meeting. He jokingly referred to himself as 'the white sheep of the family'. Growing up he showed little interest in Ngai Tahu politics, cultural identity, or claims issues. In his adult life prior to 1996, his lifestyle and identity did not incorporate a particular Maori or Ngai Tahu ethnic identity. In our first interview he indicated that when he was growing up he had never heard of 'Ngai Tahu': 'we were Maoris'. While he had spent much time at the marae with his family, for all his adult life he had shunned this part of his identity, so that at the time I met him he was in many respects 'new Ngai Tahu'.

In my interviews with James, the issues I asked him to reflect on elicited rather unique responses. He was really a 'new Ngai Tahu' but from a family of very 'experienced Ngai Tahu'. He was very grateful for that interview process
because, as he said repeatedly, I was asking him to reflect on issues both in a way that he had never done and at a time when he was beginning to consider these issues for himself.

The stories of contemporary Ngai Tahu individuals coming to experience the relationships represented by whakapapa are varied. James’ experiences differ from those of Russell Bishop, a New Zealand educational researcher who began his journey in his adult life to establish relationships with the kin represented by his Tainui whakapapa from the starting point of getting hold of one of the names in his family whakapapa from his mother and beginning a geographic and personal journey of discovery.

James and I struck up a friendship from that point which has continued and grown since. Partly this was because we both lived in the same local community: both had children at the same school, and both were involved in similar businesses in the same suburb. Also, it was at James’ family runanga that my son and I spent the most time from 1997. Furthermore, James became as interested in talking to me about issues he was discovering about ‘The Claim’, Ngai Tahu politics, whakapapa and identity, as I was in talking to him. When I ceased to attend Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meetings and runanga meetings, James continued to act as a reference point for me. We met regularly or chatted on the telephone, and he kept me informed about significant developments, sharing meeting agendas and other literature with me where appropriate. Often, he would ask for my point of view on particular issues.

We have acted as respective sounding boards for one another over this period, and while I have benefited significantly from this relationship, James has also regularly commented on the benefits to his political and cultural development of having my input and listening to my reflections from my unique viewpoint as participant observer. Over this period my identity as participant observer moved through stages from ‘outsider’ to ‘informed insider’. At the beginning of his own
personal cultural journey in 1996, James also showed respect for my 'time done' in Ngai Tahu settings, as in many ways my experience of recent Ngai Tahu history extended further and offered him both insight and questions to reflect upon.

Goffman [1989] warns against developing political relationships in the process of participant observation that will compromise access to certain groups, but for me, the benefits have been significant, and in fact it was never my initial intention to 'find a friend', as Goffman puts it.¹⁰ This just happened - as friendships do. While, as participant observer, I have always maintained the position of witness at hui and meetings, in other aspects of the research relationships have invariably developed. Over such a period of time, I think it would be impossible to avoid this and absurd to try.

While I traveled extensively to attend Ngai Tahu events around the South Island over the decade from 1990 - 2000, this was not field research in the anthropological sense of the word. Ngai Tahu individuals live in the contemporary world in which their experiences of identity are multiple - whanau, hapu, runanga and iwi as well as Pakeha and urban [see H. O'Regan: 2001]. As well as meeting Ngai Tahu individuals and making friends in Ngai Tahu settings, many have moved in similar circles. Some became regular customers at my cafe, living in the same local community as I do; one father and son who have become friends of my family would see us regularly at the ice rink where both our sons play ice hockey; another father and son we see regularly at the roller rink where both our sons play roller hockey! This illustrates the way in which the Ngai Tahu people that I interviewed move between two worlds - traditional Maori and contemporary urban settings.

¹⁰ 'People like to find a friend where [they're doing their study] and tell the friend the “true things” and discuss with their friend what's going on. Unless that friend is in a structural position of not being able to retell the stories - and there are ways in which you could find such a friend - then I don't think you should talk to anybody' [Goffman: 1989: 129].
In the book, *Constructing the Field: Ethnographic Fieldwork in the Contemporary World*, editor Vered Amit argues that, while doing research 'in the field' has traditionally been the hallmark of distinction between anthropological and sociological endeavours, anthropology as a discipline is now grappling with the issue of how to immerse oneself in 'the field' when 'the field' as an entity separate from other aspects of everyday contemporary life is continually in question. Amit writes, 'The increasing mobility of the people whom anthropologists study has coincided with a period of critical introspection in anthropology, resulting in a re-evaluation of a number of long-standing conventions and assumptions. Among these has been the deconstruction of 'a place-focused concept of culture' and the allowance instead for a more contingent relationship between collective identity, place, social relations and culture.

Anthropologists have correspondingly redefined their ethnographic 'fields' to explore the multi-sited, transnational circulation of people, practices and objects' [Marcus: 1995 cited in Amit: 2000: 13]. In terms of doing anthropology in the contemporary world Amit writes, 'We cannot disconnect ourselves from our lives to live our fieldwork, just as our subjects cannot disconnect themselves from the world and their pursuits to engage with or to be abandoned by us' [2000: 16].

While carrying out my research, I also worked as a Consultant Community Researcher for Christchurch City Council and several other local community organisations. This brought me into contact with representatives of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu management and administrative structure on several projects. Also, entering a business arrangement with the charitable trust that owns Whale Watch Kaikoura in 1999 brought me into contact with a number of Ngai Tahu individuals as fellow directors in another setting. When this opportunity presented itself I went to see the *Kaiwhakahaere* of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Mark Solomon, who is the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu representative for Kaikoura Runanga and involved with Whale Watch. He indicated that he was completely comfortable
with this business relationship at the same time as my ongoing research relationship with Ngai Tahu.

I recall my son at the Kaikoura Seafest in October 1999. We had been invited up through my business relationship, as part of a 'v.i.p.' group for a trip on the boat to see the whales. Four individuals were sitting at one table: Garry Moore, Mayor of Christchurch and a Director of Whale Watch Kaikoura, Sir Tipene O'Regan, who was also a Director of Whale Watch, and Sir Doug Kidd, retired speaker of the House, and my son, Jordan! He was sitting back, relaxed and chatting away, holding in his hand autographs from each of the men around the table. He had asked each for their autographs and they happily obliged, even after he told them that the reason he wanted their autographs was because they had all met Bill Clinton, President of the United States on his recent visit!

Striking a balance between being closely involved in the decisions and interactions at meetings, and maintaining a certain distance has been a balancing act at times. I can appreciate the acknowledgement by Goffman of this delicate balance between maintaining a sense of observer while participating in the setting in some way [1989: 128].

I have found attendance at hui and wananga over the years one of the most intensely 'alone' experiences of my life. It seems an interesting paradox but one that has also reinforced my perceptions of the dual-edged nature of whakapapa and whakawhanaungatanga as resources that both unite and exclude. To be in so many settings in which all in attendance are united by a common bond - whakapapa (even for those who are 'new Ngai Tahu' meeting their whanau and fellow Ngai Tahu Whanui members for the first time), where I was aware that I had spent more time in such settings than many of those who share whakapapa connections and yet to be so acutely aware of my difference from the rest. I longed to feel less 'separate', yet in order to carry out participant observation research I had to maintain a degree of separation from the political debates
which may close off access to some Ngai Tahu. Goffman acknowledges this dilemma of participant observation research in which the researcher needs to be prepared to leave one's everyday lifestyle in order to enter a new site and take on, often rapidly, very new ways of doing things and being involved – to be 'in a position to cut yourself to the bone' [1989: 127].

To find friends or occasionally travel with a friend to these meetings was always a huge relief for me. It meant I didn't feel quite so alone. For a period in 1997, I traveled to several meetings with another graduate student in the Sociology Department who was carrying out M.A. research, and I always enjoyed this. Sometimes it was a relief to have my son with me and I used to find I could easily rely on his company in these settings. Goffman warns against taking along such individuals to depend on because they detract from the researcher's ability to be 'naked to the bone' [1989: 127].

To shift out of the roles I play in the rest of my everyday life, roles where initiative, active participation and leadership are essential - single parent, self-employed businessperson, tutor, team manager - to quiet, unobtrusive observer was something I found challenging, particularly in settings where public speaking and oratory abilities are such highly valued resources. I followed the political discussions closely over a time when Ngai Tahu were coming to terms with political change and negotiating possible outcomes. In many ways I felt I could see these issues - the history, the possible outcomes - so much more clearly than others. I would often want to contribute to discussion. I appreciate Goffman's acknowledgement of this research dilemma: 'You have to open yourself up to being snubbed. You have to stop making points to show how "smart assed" you are' [1989: 128].

Having 'a friend...in a structural position of not being able to retell stories' of commercial or political sensitivity, as James Daniels has been, has served in some ways as an outlet for me to make commentary on the issues that I have
held back from doing in meeting contexts. I recall one incident where I was very tempted to make a contribution to the discussion on a political issue at Wairewa runanga in October 1997. In some ways I almost felt obliged - as someone whose presence had been so visible at the marae over the time - to contribute to the discussion in a way that might have added value. I was also aware, though, that to do so might seem inappropriate as a non-Ngai Tahu participant observer - someone who lacks Ngai Tahu whakapapa. So, rather than speak out and offer my opinion, I wrote my suggestion down and leaned over to show it to James, leaving it with him to decide what to do. I remember how very nervous I was about making even that contribution. After another weekend wananga at Wairewa in which I took part in a discussion about issues pertaining to te reo (Maori language) development, I was telephoned for a copy of my notes by a Canterbury University lecturer who was a member of the Ngai Tahu language development committee. He was present for the discussion but had not taken notes. I gladly obliged, as I did not have concerns about possible political ramifications.

However, on another occasion I was not so forthcoming. I was telephoned by a Ngai Tahu woman who requested my notes from a particular Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meeting in which issues of a highly political nature were being discussed. She was very disillusioned by the words and actions of members of the 'A Team' of negotiators who chaired this particular part of the meeting. This woman wanted to make a written challenge based on my notes. On this occasion I felt I had no choice but to decline.

At the start of my participant observation I could identify feeling partisan for the Ngai Tahu claims. As the process continued, I found that often I felt a sort of philosophical allegiance to particular collective groups within Ngai Tahu Whanui. For the entire period leading up to the Crown Settlement and Apology in 1998, the bulk of most discussion at Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and Trust Board meetings, Hui a Tau and runanga meetings was around the issue of claims
settlement. The rhetoric from the negotiators and leadership could be characterised as 'warlike'. And there was a prevailing sense throughout this period of two sides - an 'us' and 'them'. The 'us' were those 'experienced Ngai Tahu' who had lived close to the marae, usually less educated than those working in the leadership and management structures. The 'them' was the leadership, not necessarily as individuals, but as a collective. This was the case even given that many of those involved in the Trust Board and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu leadership were also 'experienced Ngai Tahu' who came back regularly to their marae and adopted this identity - runanga identity- and associated standpoint vis-à-vis the central leadership. Some of the basis to this dichotomy will unfold through this dissertation. It is interesting that, from my perspective, I always felt a stronger allegiance to the 'we' at the flax root marae level - the seeming underdogs; those I observed as feeling excluded from real political power. Goffman talks about the role of the participant observer entailing subjecting oneself to the life circumstances of the set of individuals you are amongst.... to 'try to accept all of the desirable and undesirable things that are a feature of their life', and putting oneself 'in a position to note their...response to what's going on around them and [where] you're empathetic enough - because you've been taking the same crap they've been taking' [1989: 125-126].

My M.A. research had required attendance at Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board meetings and ongoing interviews with the Trust Board's Executive Officer. When I began the PhD research, it was necessary to spread out and spend time at marae and to interview individuals who were detached from the centralised structures. I learned about the ambiguous position of the Ngai Tahu Claims Negotiators and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu vis-à-vis Crown requirements to settle 'The Claim' over this period. I also became very involved in the political dilemmas experienced and discussed at the runanga level because of the sense of disempowerment felt by many runanga people and also because these people and places had been so open to me. Onuku and Wairewa runanga have been very welcoming to both my son and me. Te Taumutu runanga was also very
welcoming, allowing me access to their monthly runanga meetings through the year of 1997. Many of the families at Wairewa share whakapapa to Onuku. The Daniels family has been particularly welcoming and helpful since my participant observation research began in 1996. I have maintained a close association with this family, mostly through James Daniels. From 1996 to 1998, Wairewa welcomed me to their monthly runanga meetings as well as to three weekend wananga, which my son attended with me. My son had the opportunity to join in with the other children in the local activities, including eeling one night. I also have a fond memory of my son standing up on the little stage in the wharenui - front and centre - with several other Ngai Tahu children to perform a haka they had been practising all weekend. One of the other children called out something to the Upoko, Monty Daniels, who was standing at the back, in preparation for their performance to begin. Monty could not hear what was said, so Jordan piped up and called out at the top of his voice, 'He said turn up the music, Monty'.

As well, I recorded life histories and conducted several unstructured interviews and held many informal conversations with Ngai Tahu individuals, considering issues of identity. Included in these were two interviews with Ngai Tahu individuals about their individual perceptions of the effects of, and events that led up to, the Crown Apology at Onuku on November 29, 1998. One of these was the then Kaikwhakahaere, Mark Solomon, and the other was a Ngai Tahu woman from Wairewa, whose absence from the Crown Apology at Onuku, a very significant place to her, was conspicuous to me.

As well as the Daniels family from Onuku and Wairewa, particular individuals from Tuahuriri runanga and from Takahanga in Kaikoura have been very helpful. I contacted both of these runanga at the beginning of 1997 requesting permission to attend their runanga meetings, but both declined on the grounds that, due to the nature of 'political' issues of the time, confidentiality was of utmost importance. However, as I have already mentioned, Aroha Reiti-Crofts allowed
me to attend her weekly te reo classes at Tuahuriri in 1997. Rick Tau, who was then Upoko for Tuahuriri, spoke with me in an initial interview towards the recording of his life history, and his son Te Maire Tau has acted as my thesis consultant for the duration of this research.

In the course of my M.A. research, I traveled up to Kaikoura in October 1990 to interview Bill Solomon, who was a member of the Trust Board at the time. We sat in what were then the tearooms of the Kaikoura Railway Station, where Whalewatch Kaikoura was located, at a table with a red and white checkered tablecloth. After the interview, Bill shouted me a trip on the boat, then just a small dinghy, to see the whales. On the way up to that interview, I was pulled over, just arriving in Kaikoura and received the very first speeding ticket I had ever received! Eleven years later I attended Bill Solomon's tangi at Takahanga marae in Kaikoura. I sat at this event with hundreds of Bill's friends and family and walked to his burial site at Oaro, where he grew up as a child. As we walked up to the hilltop of Oaro I considered the twist of events of my own life that had brought me to this place to take part in this ceremony. Eleven years ago, when I first came up to Kaikoura to interview Bill, it was also the beginning of the most blessed gift of my life, as my son was conceived on that visit to Kaikoura. This is something I never told Bill in the visits I had made to record his life history over the months shortly before his death, while my son played at the most beautiful marae in the South Island11 with Bill's mokopuna. Then in 1999, by an interesting turn of events, the charitable trust which owned Whalewatch became my joint venture partner in a private business I owned. As a result, I developed a relationship with another young Ngai Tahu person who was very close to Bill through his life and for whom Bill expressed immense respect in our meetings - Wally Stone, the C.E.O. of Whalewatch.

Bill never got to see the finished product of his recorded life history. He died shortly after our meetings but before I had a chance to show him the final copy.

11 See map of Ngai Tahu Whanui papatipu runanga; Figure 2: page 365.
His family will now have this significant taonga, and while I am disappointed that he did not see the final copy, I feel so privileged to have been invited to record the life history of this very private and self-effacing, gentle giant - the Upoko of Kaikoura. On the way home from his tangi on that day in February 2001, I was pulled over, just as I came off the highway, into the north of Christchurch. That was my second speeding ticket. It did not even occur to me at the time, but later I lay in bed thinking about the day's events and the events of a decade for Ngai Tahu and for myself that saw me back at Takahanga for this day. The day seemed to mark the end of a chapter, both for Kaikoura Ngai Tahu and for me and I grinned at the place of the speeding ticket and thought, Bill somehow got the last laugh: my first speeding ticket on my arrival in Kaikoura to meet Bill and now the second, eleven years, one child, and one business relationship later, on my arrival in Christchurch on the way back from Bill's tangi! Bill and aspects of his life had a more significant place in my life that he ever would know.

In 1997, I attended a Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meeting at Kaikoura. I drove up to this meeting with James Daniels and his son, Jesse. At that meeting, Te Maire Tau introduced me to Karen Pohio, a young Ngai Tahu woman who had been living and working in the U.S.A. for the previous fifteen years and was home visiting her family. Karen introduced me to her father, Jim, a Ngai Tahu kaumatua who grew up between Tuahuriri and the Chatham Islands, situated off the east coast of the middle of the South Island of New Zealand. Jim and his daughter talked with me at some length about issues of Ngai Tahu culture and tikanga, and I asked Jim and Karen if they would allow me to record Jim's life history. They agreed.

For the next few months I had several visits with Jim at his brother's home in Tuahiwi and at the home of his ex-wife in Cashmere. After finishing the recording of the life history, Jim saw the final product and gave it his blessing. A few days later I was speaking to James Daniels on the telephone, and he mentioned he

---

12 See map of New Zealand: Figure 1: page 364.
had recently been to Jim Pohio's tangi. Jim Pohio passed away three days after we met for his final blessing on the recorded material of his life. Three years later, it was by a telephone call from James Daniels, that I heard the news about the death of Bill Solomon. At a recent Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu special meeting, I was chatting with James and another Te Runanga representative. James issued a quiet warning to this individual: 'whatever you do, don't let Stephanie talk you into recording your life history. Or at least if you do, maybe leave it as unfinished work. Something seems to happen when she finishes recording a life history.' A short time later I was reading the life history of Syd Cormack, a Ngai Tahu kaumatua, as recorded by Joanna Orwin [1997]. In her introduction Joanna recorded that Syd Cormack also passed away before the publication of his story. I have to admit that these coincidences have caused me to consider the issues of tapu associated with whakapapa.\textsuperscript{13}

At the beginning of 1997, Rick Tau, longstanding Deputy Chairperson of the Trust Board and Upoko of Tuahuriri, whom I had interviewed in 1990 for my M.A., agreed for me to record his life history. We met once, but Rick then became so overwhelmed with business pertaining to the negotiation of the settlement and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu that he could not continue the meetings - possibly a wise decision, given James Daniels' analysis!

On a more serious note, I was always fully aware that the details of the life of a Ngai Tahu person, as recorded by another person outside the whanau are to be received as a gift, a privilege, not to be taken lightly by a Pakeha academic. Just as I was always acutely aware of my difference at hui and meetings - that it was my lack of whakapapa that contributed to the distance I was able to maintain as a participant observer - I was also aware that the recording by a Pakeha of details (particularly details about whakapapa) of the life of a Ngai Tahu kaumatua is frowned upon by many Maori. As addressed in Chapter Four, whakapapa is

\textsuperscript{13} The issue with the sacred, tapu, properties of whakapapa for Ngai Tahu will be discussed in Chapter Four.
considered tapu, both by Maori and by Pakeha academics [King: 1999, 1996, 1992, 1988, 1985, 1984, 1981, 1977, 1975; Salmond: 1980; Bishop: 1996; T. O'Regan: 1993, 1991]. According to Te Maire Tau, the Ngai Tahu Development Corporation is acutely aware, as Ngai Tahu Whanui moves into the next phase of tribal and cultural development, of the gulf in world-views between Maori and Pakeha and the impact of this for cross-cultural research. He points out that as part of its strategic vision for the future, Ngai Tahu Development Corporation continues to address this gulf and consider policies and ways to integrate these two world-views into a more rounded ontological and epistemological approach to knowledge accumulation and its uses [Christchurch Press: January 26, 2002: 3].

My lack of whakapapa reinforced to me its cultural potency, in that it is whakapapa that Ngai Tahu individuals in Ngai Tahu settings possess in common, while it is also the basis of my 'separateness'. But all Ngai Tahu who contributed to my research have been very open to sharing their understandings and experiences of whakapapa, history, political events and the multiple subjectivities of their identities to me. They have done this by allowing me access and opening up aspects of their lives to me in interviews, conversations and material from life histories. A very politically active Ngai Tahu woman once said to me that Pakeha should be more confident in assertion of their whakapapa; that whakapapa is not a mystery and not something specific to Ngai Tahu - we all have it; we just do not all share the same whakapapa. Had I shared the same whakapapa with the Ngai Tahu individuals who welcomed me into their lives, this may have challenged my capacity to identify the political contexts of its uses as cultural resource.

My 'done time' over an extended period in Ngai Tahu settings, something several Ngai Tahu have told me is certainly my mark on Ngai Tahu, has been both a privilege and, I feel, a resource. And as one Ngai Tahu individual recently said to me, he feels I am 'philosophically Ngai Tahu, if not genealogically so'! The mark of this, I suppose, is that the more time I spent in Ngai Tahu settings, the more I
considered myself part of the 'we' of the discussion. I felt philosophically part of the 'we' across a range of Ngai Tahu settings toward the end of the research process, and therefore it was without question that my place was granted, alongside my son, with the tangata whenua at Onuku on November 29th, 1998 for the emotional Apology from the Crown to Ngai Tahu. On that day, I felt more connected to the tangata whenua than I did to the manuhiri.

Outline of Dissertation

In his Macmillan Brown lecture at Canterbury University on September 22, 1998, Sir Tipene O'Regan stated that the biggest challenge facing Ngai Tahu in its post-settlement era is to identify and build upon the factor that now bonds and unites Ngai Tahu Whanui membership - whakapapa, which he defined as 'DNA'. He identified the whakapapa link as the only adhesive that still exists to bind contemporary Ngai Tahu. Since the 1840s, Ngai Tahu have been united in their opposition to the Crown over 'The Claim' ("Te Kereme"). 'The Claim' had become Ngai Tahu culture and the adhesive that bound Ngai Tahu individuals to one another. His thesis was that, since 'The Claim' has reached a full and final settlement, Ngai Tahu will revert back to whakapapa as the adhesive that binds members of Ngai Tahu Whanui. He also asked whether this will be enough to take the membership into the twenty-first century in a united way.

I argue that it is not whakapapa, but rather the management of whakapapa and the presentation of a supporting public narrative interwoven in the metanarrative potency of whakapapa that constitutes the adhesive that holds together the new structure of individual members. These individuals are otherwise geographically, politically and culturally dispersed, into a new Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens framed by the contemporary leadership. I rely on Somers' analysis of narratives. She defines public narratives as 'those narratives attached to cultural and institutional formations larger than the single individual' [1994: 619]. In this new
nation, particular identities are privileged: Ngai Tahu Whanui, presented as Ngai Tahu iwi; eighteen *papatipu runanga* governed by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu; and individual registered members.

This dissertation considers the role of narrative and *whakapapa* - from wide social narratives to the level of personal narratives - in the constitution and experience of identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu. The management of *whakapapa* and the telling of stories impose order on the historical chaos of heterogeneous South Island Maori identities.

The roles of place and kinship have altered dramatically for Ngai Tahu since 1840. The new 'cultural adhesive' that now binds members of Ngai Tahu Whanui together is based on the management of *whakapapa* and narratives about identity by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

In my observations, *whakapapa* is everywhere for Ngai Tahu. It is integral to identity, implicated in understandings of past, present and future, incorporating all time, interwoven with understandings of place, and utilised in political practice. Yet it seems to escape any singular definition. It is at the centre of all definitions, uses and understandings of identity, time, place and political practice for contemporary Ngai Tahu. Due to these characteristics and uses, *whakapapa* is what Margaret Somers [1999: 130-136, 1994: 619] refers to as a metanarrative - the most potent cultural resource.\(^4\) It is because of its metanarrative properties that its strategic uses by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership are consented to both by the Crown and by South Island Maori.

The collection of written and oral presentations from the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership to its registered members over the research period (1996 to 2000), which I refer to as Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, relies on the potency of

\(^4\) Somers discussion of metanarrative will be addressed further in Chapter Four. *Whakapapa as metanarrative* will be addressed in Chapter Four.
whakapapa as metanarrative to cast a contemporary legal-political identity in themes about history, significant ancestral place and identity. While the political purposes are often challenged in counter-narratives by both Ngai Tahu and non-Ngai Tahu, what is never challenged by Ngai Tahu is the management and use of whakapapa as a resource.

Through the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals and further investigation of political events between 1840 and 2000, alternative possibilities and the complex nature of contemporary South Island Maori identities are illustrated. Ngai Tahu individuals who have lived through and experienced political developments since the introduction of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board in 1944 - whom I refer to as 'experienced Ngai Tahu' – indicate an appreciation of the multiple and contextual perspectives that are missing from Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. What is imaged in the public narrative as original, united and unchanged identity is actually constructed in response to political developments throughout the twentieth century. The personal stories and histories of individuals interviewed disrupts these attempts to construct a unified, immemorial Ngai Tahu history, place and identity.

Chapter Two constitutes a brief historical background of relations between South Island Maori and the Crown from 1840. The common thread running through these events is the management of whakapapa in the determination of tribal identity for the purpose of the settlement of land claims issues.

Chapter Three outlines the theoretical positions that form the framework for the dissertation. Apart from Russell Bishop [1996], no sociological research in New Zealand has considered the role of narrative as constitutive, not simply representative, in the management of contemporary Maori identities. Certainly, there is no research which considers whakapapa as narrative and metanarrative. This may contribute to its potency as metanarrative. The Pakeha academics
referred to in this thesis may consider its tapu potency, and possibly Maori academics are subject to its potent powers.\footnote{This issue will be discussed further in Chapter Four.}

The theoretical framework for this dissertation does not draw upon a particular 'body of theory'. Rather, I have brought together a range of diverse theorists from a variety of fields, each for their particular contribution to the argument. None has addressed one another.


Somers is also relied on for her consideration of issues of citizenship and nationalism [1993]. As well, Craig Calhoun [1997], Charles Tilly [1996] and Benedict Anderson [1991, 1983] contribute perspectives on issues of citizenship as 'imagined community'.

My dissertation argues that for contemporary Ngai Tahu, whakapapa constitutes metanarrative. Corrine Kratz [1993], who carried out research into the construction of understandings of tradition for contemporary Okiek, offers what she refers to as 'rhetorical techniques' in her methodological model. Kratz's rhetorical techniques will be adopted in this dissertation for the effective analysis of the key themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. I also use Russell Bishop [1996] for his autobiographical contribution to consideration of the role of whakapapa as narrative. To my knowledge, my dissertation is the first to consider whakapapa both for its metanarrative qualities and for its uses as political resource, in the study of contemporary identities for Maori. Bishop is the
only other New Zealand researcher who has begun to address the narrative properties of *whakapapa*.

Chapter Four introduces *whakapapa*, the omnipresent and most potent cultural resource for contemporary Ngai Tahu. *Whakapapa* is used by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership to manage South Island Maori identities in order to achieve particular political ends. *Whakapapa* is also understood and utilised in diverse and complex ways by Ngai Tahu individuals in their narratives about history, place, political practice and identity. The Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership's management of *whakapapa* incorporates the complexities associated with this concept in order to enrich its management of South Island Maori identities. *Whakapapa* acts as the conceptual gatekeeper to determine membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui's privileged legal-political identities, setting up boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. 16 At any given time and in any given setting, a range of *whakapapa* identities are called into play by contemporary Ngai Tahu. Which identities come to be most salient for Ngai Tahu individuals and for Ngai Tahu Whanui leaders depends on a range of historical and political factors along with access to the resources to manage *whakapapa* and associated 'core stories'.

Chapter Five looks at the Ngai Tahu roll held in the Whakapapa Unit of the Office of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu in Christchurch. I argue that the register is a management tool for the administration of members or 'citizens' and hence South Island Maori identities. It is an effective institutional arrangement which uses *whakapapa* to realign disparate South Island Maori actors into specific new legal-political identities privileged by the Crown in legislation. These legal-political identities include Ngai Tahu as *iwi*, the eighteen papatipu *runanga* set out in the

---

16 In her book, Hana O'Regan states that, 'For the eight kaikorero interviewed in the course of this study, whakapapa is the one essential criterion for Kai Tahu identity. If a person has Kai Tahu whakapapa then they are considered to be indisputably Kai Tahu' [2001: 53]. Hana O'Regan uses a dialect that several young Ngai Tahu academics and some individuals working within Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu have begun to use, in which the primary distinction is the use of 'k' to replace 'ng'. Hence, 'Ngai Tahu' becomes 'Kai Tahu'. There is evidence of this usage in certain parts of the South Island historically.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and Ngai Tahu Whanui member. The roll, and the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act which secures its functions, effectively introduces a new 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens'. It is because the roll is based in the metanarrative of whakapapa and secured in legislation that consent to the privileged contemporary identities is maintained. Management of whakapapa by the roll also privileges particular key times and places. The roll and its management establish the gatekeepers of Ngai Tahu Whanui membership, strengthening the hand of managers to frame particular understandings of Ngai Tahu identity.

The management of identities is also a feature of Chapter Six. This chapter addresses the background and functions performed in the management of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens' by the introduction of what I refer to as Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, which I shall evaluate through written publications and oral presentations at hui, meetings and 'roadshows' beginning in 1996.

Chapter Seven examines the place of whakapapa as metanarrative and what I identify as two meta-themes about time and 'The Claim' in the presentation of what I refer to as the privileged identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui. In this chapter I outline how whakapapa is rhetorically interwoven with these meta-themes about a binary 'then/now' approach to time, and a particular presentation of the history of South Island Maori land claims, presented as one claim - 'Te Kereme' - to achieve particular representations about contemporary identity to manage and govern Ngai Tahu Whanui.

Chapter Eight shows how the focus on whakapapa as metanarrative shifts to consider the privileged identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui: the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' as Ngai Tahu iwi, eighteen Papatipu Runanga as represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and individual registered members or citizens. These are embedded in the metanarrative of whakapapa and the particular meta-themes about time and 'The Claim'. 
Chapter Nine draws upon the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals to critically engage Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. I argue that the key themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative are also fundamental to narratives about identity for Ngai Tahu individuals. But for individuals, understandings and perspectives of these themes and of identity are multiple and complex, incorporating elements of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative into the constitution of identity for particular purposes in particular contexts of time and place, while also acknowledging other identities and strands of collective whakapapa.

‘Experienced Ngai Tahu’ individuals who have had knowledge of their South Island Maori identities and have lived the relationships that arise from whakapapa (whanaungatanga), are very clear about the political context and purposes within which the recent collective identity, Ngai Tahu Whanui has been embedded. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative presents a specific and simplistic story to its members, offering a context of place and time and South Island Maori whakapapa within which to embed their lives as members of the collective identity, Ngai Tahu Whanui. Ngai Tahu individuals with embodied knowledge of their whakapapa, i.e., experienced relationship with the people and places recorded by whakapapa (whanaungatanga) do not deny Ngai Tahu Whanui’s themes, but in their talk, they incorporate many whakapapa identities. They also offer an ‘eventful’ notion of time, rather than the ‘two time’ binary presentation found in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. For these individuals, incorporation of understandings of history, whakapapa and ‘The Claim’ in their daily lives and talk indicate the richness and complexity of these issues.

For those ‘new Ngai Tahu’ without lived experience of their South Island Maori identities and the relationships connected by whakapapa, ‘new Ngai Tahu’, the public narrative offers the first and possibly only sequential and thematic order within which to situate their ethnic identity, offering a connection to history, as contemporary South Island Maori and hence, a narrative and cognitive ‘place’ to reside. The narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ however, disrupt attempts by
Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership to construct a unified Ngai Tahu Whanui identity. For both 'experienced Ngai Tahu' and 'new Ngai Tahu', the metanarrative power of whakapapa is always reinforced. This again, contributes to the potency of whakapapa as cultural resource.

The key themes also privilege particular understandings about place. Place constitutes a key theme, a meta-theme in all Ngai Tahu narratives - personal and public. Chapter Ten examines the meta-theme of place. 'Place' is addressed in this chapter in terms of both its uses in the public narrative and its understandings in the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals. ‘Place’ is considered separately and especially for the additional dimension it has added to my research method as Participant Observer. It was not until I had completed my M.A. research in 1991 and began to move away from the meetings and events around the Trust Board to other places of significance for Ngai Tahu that I began to understand that, as well as a key theme in stories about identity for Ngai Tahu, presence in place affects and is affected by both political practice and understandings of identity for Ngai Tahu.

For Ngai Tahu individuals the significance of place is inextricably interwoven with whakapapa and time - and hence identity. Place is integral to identity. Therefore, Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership incorporates place as a meta-theme both in the public narrative and in the management of whakapapa to achieve political outcomes and to privilege particular identities. For Ngai Tahu Whanui, the management and presentation of tribal boundaries and associations with place are embedded in contemporary political practice. How Ngai Tahu individuals consider the importance of place, however, often challenges its presentation in the public narrative. This chapter will consider these issues from the starting point of stories surrounding the 1998 Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu, at a place of significance for Ngai Tahu - Onuku, on Banks Peninsula.
Chapter Eleven concludes the dissertation by tying the threads together. It then considers some implications for the future management of South Island Maori identities. In his speech to Ngai Tahu Whanui, *manuhiri*, and distinguished guests, at the Waitangi Day celebrations at Onuku, February 2000, Sir Tipene O'Regan warned that 'the pa is not secure yet'. Ngai Tahu Whanui is currently facing cross-claims for boundary recognition and associated *manawhenua* rights in the South Island. The role of *whakapapa* and the meta-themes will continue to be important, both in the management of *whakapapa* and in the public narrative to an audience comprised of predominantly 'new Ngai Tahu'. How these themes will be framed will be a question worthy of further research.
Chapter two

The management of South Island Maori identities from 1840 to 1998

Te Waipounamu (the South Island of Aotearoa/New Zealand) at the east coast port of Onuku (Akaroa), 1840:

On the Ngai Tahu coast it was the Maori custom to be on the lookout. No Maori could afford to be careless of what vessels were on the coast. Everyone learned from childhood of the sudden violence that could arrive by sea... On Banks Peninsula every settlement had a lookout from which the ocean could be scanned for 50km or more out to sea....

Therefore when a large, unknown sailing ship approached Banks Peninsula from the north on Monday 25th May 1840 her presence was soon known. To those with knowledge of European ships, two things about this visitor appeared suspicious: the pattern of her sides showed that she carried guns, and she flew the British flag. It was now ten years since a British ship, pretending friendship, had smuggled Te Rauparaha and his taua into Akaroa to wreak death and destruction. Perhaps Te Rauparaha was now seeking vengeance....

When morning came, a boat carrying men from the warship pulled ashore in the rain at Onuku. One of these men greeted the Maoris [sic] on shore in the southern dialect...They asked the chiefs to put their marks on a parchment written in Maori and belonging to the British Queen. This was to be a Whakaetanga (agreement) between Maori chiefs and the Queen. The tohu or marks of six northern chiefs were already on the parchment, and many other chiefs, it was said, had already signed other copies at Waitangi in Tai Tokerau (the north of the North Island)...

To Iwikau and Tikao the promise of peace was welcome, for warfare had been a curse to their generation...

"After a little more explanation," wrote Williams in his journal, "they signed and received their blankets." They were the first in Te Wai Pounamu to do so. Williams wrote on the parchment the names and hapu of the two chiefs, to which they put their tohu (marks). [Evison: 1993: 127-129]
The placing of *tohu* on this piece of parchment, the Treaty of Waitangi, at Onuku on that day in 1840, marked a turning point both in the formation and management of South Island Maori identities and, more generally, in New Zealand’s settlement history. It triggered a series of events that would shift relations between Maori and the settlers (*Pakeha*) and play a key part in the determination of Maori identities in New Zealand well into the twentieth century.

Subsequent chapters in this dissertation continue to call upon the significance of this time (1840) and this place (Onuku) in the playing out of South Island Maori identities as these are embedded in political practice through the years leading up to and culminating in the Crown’s Apology to Ngai Tahu in 1998. The significance of the events of 1840 and the years following has been framed and managed in particular ways by contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership and in the narratives of South Island Maori. As Angela Ballara [1998] points out, considerations of collective kin and social organisation, and hence identity as these are embedded in political practice between Maori and the Crown since mid-nineteenth century, have developed in different ways for different *iwi*, *hapu* and *whanau* across New Zealand. To address such developments for other collective Maori identities would be too large a task to undertake in the course of this research. This dissertation builds on my M.A. [1991] research of Ngai Tahu settings.

It is important, therefore, to outline an historical story about the development of South Island Maori identities between 1840 and 1996. How identities are framed for contemporary Ngai Tahu is embedded in the Treaty of Waitangi and subsequent claims negotiations over this period, especially as these rely on particular forms of management of *whakapapa*. The Treaty of Waitangi has perhaps claimed greater significance in assertions of Maori *rangatiratanga*, culture and identity in the period from the mid-1970s to the present day than at any other time in New Zealand history. Contemporary recognition of the Treaty has been marked most significantly by the introduction of the Waitangi Tribunal in

Key dates from 1840 to 1996 in the development of South Island Maori identities

As outlined in Chapter One, 1840 is a key date in the framing and management of South Island Maori identities. It marks the starting point of a formal relationship between Maori and Pakeha in the form of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Treaty has acted as the basis of the 150-year Claim ('Te Keremē') that has continued between Ngai Tahu and the Crown. For Ngai Tahu, 'The Claim' has played the role of cultural adhesive of South Island Maori political and social organisation and hence identities, for a century and a half [T. O'Regan: September 1998]. The 1997 Ngai Tahu Annual Report suggests that 'The Claim' has been a unifying force for Ngai Tahu. For example:

As I look into the eyes of my mokopuna [grandchildren], I reflect that the Ngai Tahu Claim is now seven generations old. In many ways it has become our culture, a culture of grievance. In that sense The Claim, Te Keremē, is a taniwha, a monster that has consumed our tribal lives down through the years as generation after generation has struggled for justice'.

At the same time, though, that struggle has bonded us together in a special way. It has shaped our tribal organisation over the years and given us a focus that other tribes have not had. [T. O'Regan: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 25]

Prior to 1840, South Island Maori relations could be characterised as complex and shifting. The following excerpts from Angela Ballara’s book Iwi illustrate the complex and shifting status of Maori collective identities prior to and at the mid nineteenth century, in which inter-tribal hapu often formed the primary collective identity:
The title of this book concerns the many 'iwi' of Aotearoa, but in both 19th- and 20th-century Maori terminology these descent groups could perfectly well be alternatively termed hapu. In a phrase derived from a 1929 source, large, numerous, modern tribes such as Ngati Kahungunu and Ngati Porou could be termed 'nga hapu kaha o te motu' (the powerful descent groups of the country). The same source includes the following phrase: 'he hapu nui a Ngati Kahungunu'. Translated with the standard gloss this would mean: 'Ngati Kahungunu is a large subtribe'. To Maori, early 20th-century 'tribes' were contemporary descent groups, derived from others back along the long line recorded in whakapapa, which were currently the more powerful hapu or corporate groups of the country. [1998: 272-273]

These were major iwi which were disappearing. Not until the late 20th century did the number of 'tribes' begin to rise again: the official list put out by the Iwi Transition Agency in 1991 contains over 100 iwi names. Although the areas are described by district in 1892 and are listed tribally in 1991 rather than by settlement (accounting for the increased total), the 1991 list's estimation of what constitutes a major descent group bears a remarkable similarity to the Kotahitanga list of nearly 100 years before. [1998: 281]

Iwi in the 18th century were conceptual groups; that is, they were wide categories of people who thought of themselves as sharing a common identity based on descent from a remote ancestor. At that time they did not act together in corporate ways. In response to both internal and exotic influences this situation changed from the late 18th century; the word 'iwi' took on, in some cases, a new, more restricted meaning as some iwi activated themselves as alternative, more inclusive corporate groups; these iwi or 'tribes' adapted themselves to become, in the 20th century, the most recognised Maori descent groups. [1998: 336]


It is this especially which frustrates any attempt to view the process as a simple inter-tribal war. Ngati Mamoe had come down many of the same lines of descent as Ngai Tahu in the North Island and had settled in the South Island only a few
generations earlier. Ngai Tahu were themselves of broad tribal extraction, with strong links to Ngati Ira, Ngati Kahungunu and even Ngai Tara and Rangitane. [1998: 59]

These links have been excluded from the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996. Bubbling under the tribal dominance was a state of continually shifting hapu rivalries [A. Anderson: 1998]. Authority was maintained by strong hapu leaders. The chiefs who put their tohu on the Treaty document were hapu leaders. Migration and war were at the hapu level. While Ngai Tahu became the politically dominant iwi for the majority of the South Island, hapu continued to be inter-tribal, maintained by a complex system of whakapapa and intermarriage [Ballara: 1998: 279-280].

1996 marks the beginning of what I refer to as a 'legal-political' South Island Maori identity, Ngai Tahu Whanui – an identity that incorporates the three main historical South Island iwi: Ngai Tahu, Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha -. The development of South Island Maori identities between 1840 and 1996 is embedded in developments around land claims issues and in the shifting uses of whakapapa information and the actors involved in the management of these issues.

The period from 1840 until the end of the nineteenth century was characterised by uncertainty throughout New Zealand as to the status of Maori land rights, citizenship rights and the Treaty of Waitangi. According to Evison, by 1859 the Maori tribal title to land had been mostly extinguished except for a few reserves remaining in Maori hands, 'but the problem of how to "improve" the Maori and hasten his civilisation continued to exercise southern colonial minds' [1993: 397]. Citizenship status and subsequent rights depended on divergent understandings between the Crown and Maori of the articles of the Treaty.¹

¹ This is set out in the following caption from Evison:
The translation of the Maori version of the Articles of the Treaty is:

The first: The Chiefs of the Confederation and all the chiefs who have not joined that Confederation give absolutely to the Queen of England for ever the complete government over their land.

The second: The Queen of England agrees to protect the chiefs, the subtribes and all the people of New Zealand in the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages and all their treasures. But on the other hand the Chiefs of the

[Edward Marsh] Williams [Interpreter to Captain William Hobson, Lieutenant-Governor of New Zealand] read the parchment aloud to Ngai Tahu [at Onuku] while they listened. Its message was that the Queen wanted to keep peace and good order in New Zealand, and protect the Maori people from the evils of lawlessness among European and Maori. It proposed three rules –

1. The chiefs were to allow the Queen complete "kawenatanga" (powers of a governor).
2. The Queen was to protect the Maori chiefs, the hapu and all the Maoris of New Zealand in the exercise of their "tino rangatiratanga" (absolute or unqualified chieftainship) over their lands, villages and all their treasures. But on the other hand the Chiefs would sell land to the Queen at a price agreed to together by the owners of the land and by the Queen’s agent sent to buy it.
3. The Queen was to protect all the Maoris of New Zealand, and give them the same rights and duties of citizenship as Englishmen.

To Iwikau and Tikao the promise of peace was welcome, for warfare had been a curse to their generation. The promise that the Europeans in Te Wai Pounamu were to be brought under control was also welcome... The powers of a Governor were unknown, at least to Ngai Tahu. But since the rangatiratanga of the chiefs and hapu was guaranteed, kawenatanga could do no harm. If the Queen required land, it was in accordance with Maori custom that the payment should be acceptable to the owners. As for the rights and duties of Englishmen, the equality of Maoris with the tangata pora, rank for rank, had long been the rule among Ngai Tahu... Maori chiefs expected to be treated by the Queen in the same way as she treated English gentlemen, and would be glad to have such treatment guaranteed....

The Treaty promised Ngai Tahu that the Queen would protect them from "the evil of Maori and European living in a state of lawlessness", and it promised them the "rights of Englishmen". But the Government did little to put these Treaty promises into timely effect in Ngai Tahu territory. More than three years were to pass before Ngai Tahu south of Banks Peninsula saw another Government official....

In New Zealand, the Government (and later the courts of law) interpreted Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi as giving the Queen the right of pre-emption over the purchase of Maori lands – a term used only in the English version of the Treaty... But Ngai Tahu knew nothing of this. The Maori version of the Treaty, explained to them by Bunbury and Williams, said nothing of "pre-emption" or any such concept. [1993: 128-135]
Confederation and all the Chiefs will sell land to the Queen at a price agreed to by the person owning it and by the person buying it (the latter being) appointed by the Queen as her purchase agent.

The third: For this agreed arrangement therefore concerning the Government of the Queen, the Queen of England will protect all the ordinary people of New Zealand and will give them the same rights and duties of citizenship as the people of England. [Translation of Maori Version of Treaty: Evison: 1993: 504-505]

At this time, traditional Maori social and political structures of *iwi*, *hapu*, and *whanau* were neither legally recognised nor fully ignored by the New Zealand government [Spoonley: 1997: 4]. From 1844 to 1864, the Crown initiated a series of land purchases from South Island Maori [Evison: 1993: 481]. The Crown, in ignorance of the Maori way of life in Te Wai Pounamu, were still convinced that the tribes exercised no real land ownership beyond their cultivations and that places used for food-gathering were a 'no-man's-land' which should be classed as "waste lands" [Evison: 1993: 254-259].

Claims to land (which for Maori, have always formed an integral element to claims of identity, as addressed in Chapter Ten), began to follow a series of formal Crown-initiated processes, beginning with the Land Claims Commission arising out of the New Zealand Land Claims Act of 1841 [Evison: 1993: 162]. Ngai Tahu leaders began to show discontent with the Crown, which had been defaulting on the terms of a series of ten South Island land purchases dating from 1844. South Island leaders took their first case to the Maori Land Court before Chief Judge Fenton in 1868 ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 59, Evison: 1993: 417]. In order for the Crown to understand more about the population of South Island Maori for the purpose of land allocation, a series of Censuses were carried out between 1843 and 1886.² The first of these was by

---

² Shortland, E., 1844, 'Report on a visit to the South Island with a census of the Maori population', Typescript, ATL q091 1844

Mantell, W.B.D., 1848, 'Names of the Hapu (clans) of Kai Tahu tribe of Maoris inhabiting Otago. Letters and memoranda', 1848-1856, ATL 091 1848-5
Edward Shortland, as Assistant Protector of Aborigines, in 1844. The next was carried out by Walter Mantell in 1848. According to 'Te Karaka', the Ngai Tahu Whanui tribal magazine:

The 1848 Census of the "middle island natives" was the first census of an indigenous people ever held in the British Empire. A number of huge, but unexpected, benefits sprang from that historical census. One was that it established the basis for what later became known as the tribe's "Blue Book" - a detailed whakapapa through which all modern Ngai Tahu can trace their ancestry. At the time, the South Island Iwi was trying to determine the numbers of its beneficiaries as part of what was to later become the world's longest-running indigenous land grievance. [Spring 1997: 7]

These Censuses indicate the complex nature of South Island Maori identities at this time, taking into account sub-tribal identities (hapu) and the identities of other tribes, such as Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha. ³

³ According to Ballara:

Many iwi of the 18th century faded into memory, their hapu redefined as hapu of other tribes. Ngati Wai, Ngati Kauwhata, Ngati Mamoe and others... No official list was ever identical to the previous one. Lists of tribes published by Maori also vary, but similar tendencies are evident towards the shorter lists and larger units seen in the Pakeha and official lists compared earlier in this book. However, when organising their own affairs they made different kinds of lists: groups are recognised as iwi which European lists relegate to the status of sub-tribes; communities, settlements and other identifying terms feature nearly as often as descent groups....

hapu were another matter. Though official and Maori tribal lists varied, there were always fewer names than Native Land Court evidence suggests existed in the 18th century; many small hapu had disappeared and redefined themselves in larger groups. Nevertheless, the 1919 Maori electoral roll, in which information from Maori elders as well as Europeans was included, has more hapu names than any 19th-century official list. For example, in the 1881 official list, 18 hapu of Tuhoe are listed. In 1919, discounting some variant names for the same hapu, at least 51 hapu of Tuhoe are listed. In 1874, 12 hapu of Ngati Awa were

Mantell, 1848, 'Lists of Maori signatories [Ngati Mamoe chiefs], Letters and memoranda', 1848-1856, ATL 0911848-56

Mantell, 1852, 'Census of the Native and Half Caste Population Resident in the Southern Portion of the Middle Island, etc.' In MacKay 1873:i:274-276

Mantell, 1886, 'Census of the Middle Island Natives (1848 - 1853)', AJHR G-16
1848 has been marked by twentieth-century South Island Maori leadership as a key date in the development of South Island Maori identities. The significance of this date began retrospectively from 1925, when it was used to form the basis of a roll of South Island kaumatua developed by the Maori Land Court:

1865 marked the introduction of the Native Land Act. This constituted one of Walter Mantell's first acts as Minister of Native Affairs. The Act established a Native Land Court which had power to allocate titles for tribal land, to individual Maori who applied for them. According to Evison, 'The aim of [the] Native Land Court system was to bring about individual ownership of land throughout Maoridom, and thus advance New Zealand towards the familiar twin goals - the European settlement of Maori land, and the civilising of "savages"' [1993: 406]. This legislation went some way to addressing the issue of Maori citizenship rights and privileges, but it neither attributed nor denied legal recognition to traditional tribal identities such as hapu and iwi [Spoonley: 1997: 4]. Hana O'Regan identifies the 1865 Native Land Act as the first of a series of acts passed by the New Zealand parliament in the nineteenth century which effectively removed the legal identity of the tribe. She states that this Act destroyed the communal economic base of Maori by individualising title to land, and that this in turn served to destroy the political base of the tribes because rangatira no longer had the power to administer, manage and protect their lands. As a result, O'Regan argues that the Crown had to invent other representative bodies such as runanga, committees, trusts, incorporations, societies and later, trust boards, to act on behalf of Maori [2001: 125].

Ballara also identifies the 1865 legislation as a turning point in Maori-Crown relations toward the rise of the tribe as the preeminent form of Maori collective identity. Ballara attributes land legislation, rulings of the Native Land Court, and land alienation by sale or lease in the nineteenth century generally as 'the

officially listed, in 1878 there were, apparently, 7 Ngati Awa hapu, but the 1919 electoral roll records the names of 32. [1998: 281-282]
greatest catalysts of change in tribal organisation in the 19th century' [1998: 260]. She identifies three key phases of this process: 'sales' before 1840, sales to the Crown under preemption from 1840 to 1862; and sales to private persons following the institution of the Native Land Court, not effectively under way until 1865.' [1998: 260].

According to Ballara, however, it was actually the response of Maori to Crown requirements with respect to land alienation that shifted the shape of Maori collective identity, from smaller hapu units to progressively larger tribal units by the mid nineteenth century, rather than the other way around: 'the many problems for Maori deriving from colonisation, including lack of control over land alienation, motivated them to find communal solutions. Many of these Maori solutions contributed to the corporatisation of the modern tribe [1998: 283-284].

In 1867 a number of Ngai Tahu applied to the Native Land Court to have their individual rights of succession in their Maori reserves certified. The Native Land Court announced that it would sit at Christchurch and Dunedin in 1868 under Chief Judge Fenton. According to Evison, 'when this became known, other Ngai Tahu lodged claims for mahinga kai and parts of Kemp's block that they

4 According to Andrew Erueti and Alan Ward:

The Treaty claims process, in fact, virtually invites Maori to emphasise the competitive, rather than the cooperative, aspects of their culture. Consequently, in the North Island and in the northern South Island, the long-established trust board structure began to be challenged. Claims initially brought before the Tribunal by a trust board or by a runanganui (great council) representing a wide area, several iwi and many hapu, began to be overtaken by claims brought on a hapu or even a whanau basis. In short, the customary Maori social structure, cloaked for a hundred years by Pakeha-derived administrative processes, once more broke through. Claims multiplied rapidly and, as historical research disclosed more claims were lodged. Expectations held in the mid-1980s – that the historical claims could be dealt with through a relatively small number of large claims, and a scattering of relatively minor claims at family level – were being overtaken by the prospect of hundreds of claims, largely at hapu level and largely in competition with one another. [2001: 167]

Atholl Anderson reiterates the primary role of hapu, arguing that there was never a Ngai Tahu iwi migration from the North Island prior to the nineteenth century. Rather, there was a migration of a series of hapu [1998].
considered they had never sold to Kemp. It became clear therefore, to the Government that there was going to be a challenge to the finality of Mantell’s reserves and perhaps to Kemp’s Deed itself [1993: 417].

1868 marked the first Ngai Tahu hearings at Tuahiwi. According to Evison, the outcome of these hearings was not satisfactory to Ngai Tahu. While Chief Judge Fenton made some provision for increasing the allocation of land to Ngai Tahu, this was only in theory, as the Court had no power to compel the Provincial Governments to allocate this land promptly, if at all. The findings also left opportunities to readdress Kemp’s Purchase [Evison: 1993: 417-433]. The 1868 hearings were held to determine the South Island Maori land grant according to the introduced European title system. The 1848 Census was not used as part of this separate process [T. Ryan: Interview: June 2002].

In 1874 Alexander Mackay, Commissioner of Native Reserves and Civil Commissioner for the South Island, urged Parliament that for the loss of their mahinga kai Ngai Tahu should be properly compensated [Evison: 1993: 434]. Also in this year, Ngai Tahu chiefs held a hui of 300 people at Kaiapoi. The hui sent a petition to Parliament, restating the Ngai Tahu Claim, declaring that, Wakefield had promised the “10ths” at Otago, that the promises of Kemp and

---

5 After the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, the Crown had no alternative but to recognise Ngai Tahu ownership of its rohe. In March 1848 Governor George Grey, instructed by the Colonial Office, visited Onuku to discuss with Ngai Tahu chiefs the question of a government purchase for the whole area of the South Island between Nelson and Otago. He gained agreement from Ngai Tahu chiefs to the deed, known as ‘Kemp’s Deed’. The deed was signed on June 10, 1848. Twenty thousand acres were sold for two thousand pounds. Kemp was instructed to mark out reserves for the owners before the deed was executed. Instead of doing this first, he had the deed signed first. Later, Walter Mantell was given the task of awarding reserves which had been promised by Kemp. Mantell began his series of census towards settling this. Kemp’s Purchase remained unresolved [‘Whakapapa Ngai Tahu: A Guide to Enrolment and Research: 1996: 7].

6 The ‘tenths’ were Maori reserves set aside within the blocks purchased. As Evison writes, ‘The New Zealand Company had paid only 2,400 [pounds] for the 2000,000 ha Otakou Block. In the past, as we have seen, such “token prices” had been explained by saying that the real payment would lie in the fact that the Maori reserves or “Tenths” set aside within the block purchased would greatly increase in value after the settlers arrived.” [1993: 206].
Mantell had been dishonoured, and that Fenton's Court in 1868 had taken them unfairly by surprise' [1993: 438]. According to Evison, Parliament did not respond.

1879 marked the appointment of a Royal Commission to investigate the Ngai Tahu Claim – the Smith-Nairn Commission -, in response to the persistence of the Ngai Tahu chief, Taiaoroa [Evison: 1993: 442].

In 1881 the Smith-Nairn Commission issued its Report. The Report decided that Ngai Tahu were entitled to one-eleventh of the total proceeds the Crown had received from the sale of land within the Otago and Kemp's Blocks (including Akaroa), with accumulated interest, less the value of the reserves and other Government benefits which they had already received. The Report was also critical of Fenton's Native Land Court judgment at Tuahiwi in 1868 [Evison: 1993: 456-457]. The report was then put aside and in 1886 the Government decided that Smith and Nairn's recommendations of financial compensation for Ngai Tahu was unacceptable, but that 'the Claim' might justifiably be settled by means of further grants of land [Evison: 1993: 459].

1887 marked the issue of a Report by a Joint Parliamentary Committee on 'Middle Island Native' Claims, addressing South Island Maori land claims. The committee had found time to deal only with Kemp's Purchase. The Report was 'strongly sympathetic to Ngai Tahu' [Evison: 1993: 460]. As compensation for the widespread loss of their mahinga kai, Mackay recommended that Ngai Tahu should be awarded more land, recommending 200,000 acres to compensate for their losses under the Otago, Kemp's, Murihiku and Akaroa Purchases. According to Evison, in this Report, Mackay was 'the first to advance officially the idea that Ngai Tahu attachment to their ancestral lands had a spiritual quality' [1993: 460]. The Government of the time deliberated on the Report, but was swept from power in a general election in October 1887 before any decision had
been made. This Report was followed by another Joint Committee in the following session in 1889 [Evison: 1993: 462].

In 1891 Alexander Mackay set up a Royal Commission to find out how much land each individual Ngai Tahu actually owned. According to John Williams, this Commission arose out of Maori agitation for self-government in the 1890s. By the turn of the century the government of the day introduced minimal forms of Maori local government. Williams wrote:

They [the Maori population] wanted not only to make the laws in their own parliament but also to administer them, through a system of tribal and district committees. As the hope for the recognition of their separate parliament receded in the later 1890's, the Maori leaders depended more and more on these committees as the most practical basis for Maori autonomy. [1964: 93]

Williams also suggests that government recognition of the need for Maori self-government was largely a response to efforts by vocal and determined North Island Maori leaders such as Sir Apirana Ngata. The push by leaders such as Ngata for greater control over the lease and sale of land continued into the twentieth century. In the 1920s, Ngata tried to encourage the government to settle the grievances over loss of land that had occurred in the nineteenth century. It was the initiatives of Maori leaders, combined with demographic change within Maori society previously (a growing Maori population by the turn of the century rather than a declining population), which convinced the government that measures had to be taken to deal with these grievances [1964: 123].

According to Evison, MacKay 'got a cool reception' at Tuahiwai, where the process began:

Ngai Tuahuriri were fed up with the succession of Commissions and census-takers who had returned time after time to enquire into their condition and count their numbers.... Previous Commissions had produced no result, they said. The Government by now knew quite well what their grievance was, but seemed to find
some reason for perpetually postponing the settlement of it. The reason for repeatedly counting their numbers and checking on their living conditions, they believed, was to find out how long it would be before the Maori became extinct. [AJHR 1891 G-7, p2ff in Evison: 1993: 462-463]

Evison also writes that at this point in the history of South Island Maori:

Poverty had been a great leveller. The distinction of chiefly ancestry among Ngai Tahu, while still recognised on social occasions and in determining rights of leadership, had ceased to have much economic significance. In most communities all had been dragged down together, regardless of rank. [1993: 463]

By 1901 the South Island, 'Middle Island' Maori population was 1,916, compared to 43,101 in the North Island. ['Census of Maori Population', February 1901: Statistics New Zealand]. The total New Zealand population was 772,719 ['Census of Population', March 1901: Statistics New Zealand]. Most of the titles to the land for allocation to Maori outlined in Mackay's 1891 Royal Commission either had been issued or were waiting to be uplifted. South Island Maori leaders meanwhile continued to press for an official investigation into the lands that had been allocated.

1905 signaled the completion of the South Island Maori land allocation lists by Judge Alexander Mackay and the Surveyor-General Stephenson Percy Smith, of their South Island Maori land allocation lists. This took the form of the South Island Landless Natives Bill of 1906.

1906 saw the introduction of the South Island Landless Natives Bill, which proposed that 'the Government be authorised to allocate land to landless Maoris [sic] from all parts of Te Wai Pounamu, in accordance with the lists that Mackay and Smith had submitted' [Evison: 1993: 472]. According to the Manager of The Whakapapa Unit of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, lists were developed at this time, in keeping with the 1848 Census, later feeding into the 1920s 'Blue Book'. The
Crown's land allocation offer to 'landless Maoris from all parts of Te Wai Pounamu' [Evison: 1993: 472] was less than satisfactory to meet the needs for economic independence.

1907 marked a gathering of South Island Maori in which Evison reports, 'Ngai Tahu gathered once more...to discuss what could be done about the South Island Landless Natives Act fiasco.... a new generation of Ngai Tahu leaders was on hand to organise a new campaign. These were the sons or grandsons of those who had signed the land purchase deeds of the period 1844 to 1864.': "Te Kereeme o Ngai-Tahu raua ko Ngati-Mamoe" ("The Claim' of Ngai Tahu and Ngati Mamoe") [Evison: 1993: 480-481].

1914 saw a Government Commission of Inquiry find that most of the land that was set aside to be allocated under the 1906 legislation was unsuitable for farming.

1916 marked complaints to the Government by a number of South Island Maori that they or their children had been wrongly omitted from the allocations under the 1906 Act. The Government legislated to allow their claims to be investigated.

1918 marked the completion of a report by the Native Land Court, which set out that those able to qualify for a grant of land under the 1906 Act, had to be 'landless descendants of the Natives who had ceded their land to the Crown,' and born not later than 31st August 1896.

Again, the Government could not provide adequate land to meet the qualified claims so in 1920 the Government decided that the claims would be legally met by paying 'The Claimants' in cash equivalent to the estimated 1920 value of the lands.
In 1921 Kemp's Purchase, along with some North Island Maori Claims, was again investigated by a Royal Commission. The Commission's Report declared that the South Island Landless Natives Act had been no solution to the Ngai Tahu Claim and that Ngai Tahu were therefore entitled to a substantial award. Since no land was available, they recommended a payment of 354,000 pounds as compensation for the unfulfilled promises in Kemp's 1848 Deed [Evison: 1993: 482-483].

During the 1920s, the Crown initiated the collection of Ngai Tahu whakapapa in the form of a comprehensive and written register, the 1925 'Blue Book'. These whakapapa files were kept in the Maori Land Court and were utilised in the determination and settlement of land claims. The roll consisted of those who could trace whakapapa back to Ngai Tahu's 'Blue Book', a list of kaumatua alive in 1848:

Initially, the task was to update, check and recompile those missing whakapapa as prepared by families for the Court hearings held at Tuahiwi in the early 1920s. A massive job in reality: the whakapapa of 1334 names as printed in the Ngai Tahu Census of 1848. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Wananga booklet: August 1998]

In 1945 the Maori Social and Economic Advancement Act was introduced. This legalised Maori Committees and Tribal Executives in an attempt to give the Maori population limited powers of local government. The setting up of Maori Trust Boards was another attempt which came out of this legislation, to respond to longstanding Maori grievances over land lost. Angela Ballara characterises such moves as:

The pattern of forcing a large number of Maori into forming themselves into one corporate body to negotiate with the government was repeated [in parts all over New Zealand]...The imposition by government of 'tribal authorities' almost always provoked Maori resentment and the reassertion of hapu and community independence. This could be so even when there was a large degree of Maori initiative and involvement. The Maori War Effort Organisation was set up in 1942
under the control of a committee of the four Maori MPs and Rangi Mawhete from the Legislative Council, plus a principal liaison officer set in place to coordinate efforts with the army, the War Cabinet, the Home Guard, the Manpower Committee and other wartime bodies. This organisation was put together by Paraire Paikia, who travelled the country meeting with other Maori leaders, promoting the new body. A plan was devised to work through local ‘tribal’ committees, which elected regional ‘tribal’ executives; both were to be responsible at local and regional levels for coordinating the Maori war effort....

The records make it clear that the so-called ‘tribal committees’ were in fact ‘sub-tribal’, i.e., hapu, settlement, community or marae-based committees, many of which were in place before the Maori War Effort Organisation itself. The tribal executives were new organisations imposed on top of an existing network, and to some extent, when they attempted to do their assigned job, were resented as government-appointed bodies. At a meeting of the local committee at Arowhenua Pa in the South Island the liaison officer, Captain Pohio, had to appeal for ‘a happier attitude toward the formation of a tribal executive’[extract from Timaru Herald, November 7, 1944]....

The tribal executives and especially their recruiting and liaison officers, rather than trusted as tribal institutions, were resented and even feared at the flax roots as the agents of the (Pakeha) Manpower Committee, which could pressure if not force people to leave their own communities to work in essential industries.

In 1945 a conference of Maori leaders was held in Wellington to plan the metamorphosis of the Maori War Effort Organisation into a peacetime tool of government.... In 1945 Maori continued to aspire to set limits to control over their local communities, even when that control purported to come from ‘tribal executives’.

Hapu reluctance to accept tribal hegemony imposed by the government continued past 1945. Trust boards selected in the mid 20th century after the ‘settlement’ of some of the large claims also forced tribal status on some groups while excluding others from it.... This government and Crown pressure to define certain groups as tribes while excluding others from that status was to continue in the late 20th century; iwi transition (devolution of its powers from the Department of Maori Affairs to new tribal authorities), and claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and under the Crown Forest Rental Trust were to produce evidence of similar pressures and reactions to them. A tendency in the 1990s to redefine as iwi descent groups, usually previously known as hapu, emerged in some of these claims processes. It reflected the government, Crown and general Pakeha understanding of the equation: iwi = tribe = recognised status. Some Maori leaders were to reject the apparently lesser title, hapu, in a drive to have the separate and independent character of their communities and peoples officially recognised. [1998: 316-319]
The Trust Board structure provided a statutory mechanism for Maori to nominate representatives on a geographical basis to advocate to Crown on Maori issues.

1944/1946: Arrival of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board

The Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board was formed by legislation in 1944 and 1946. There had been a board by the same name for a number of years before, (the authority for its appointment being s65 of the Native Purposes Act 1931), but the earlier body was not elected by its beneficiaries and had no trust fund to administer until legislation of 1944 and 1946. Angela Ballara writes that the first Ngai Tahu Trust Board was actually formed in 1928, comprised of the appointees of the 1920s committee recognised to assist the Land Court in defining the list of beneficiaries [New Zealand Statutes: 1929: 611-13, New Zealand Gazette: 1929: 1787-8 in Ballara: 1998: 315]. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit Manager, Terry Ryan, has never been aware of a Trust Board in existence prior to its legislative introduction in 1944. He suggested that this may have been a 'loose' type of arrangement, the membership of which continued to be involved in claims issues leading up to the introduction of the Trust board in 1944 [Interview: June 2002].

The settlement of the Ngai Tahu [Treaty of Waitangi] claim, as enacted by the Ngai Tahu Claim Settlement Act 1944, provided the basis of a fund, and the 1946 legislation actually established the Ngai Tahu Trust Fund based on that settlement utilising proof of whakapapa to the 1925 'Blue Book', held in Maori Land Court offices, as the criterion for determination of entitlement as a Trust Board beneficiary.\(^7\) The 1946 Ngai Tahu Trust Board Act actually established

\(^7\) According to Ballara however, the matter [of determining the list of beneficiaries] was still unsettled in 1937, and a round-table conference was called by the Labour government to consider various outstanding Maori claims including that of Ngai Tahu. The question then became: who was to represent the many settlements of Ngai Tahu and Ngati Mamoe at this conference? The government would allow only three negotiators, and wanted the MP for Southern Maori, E.T. Tirikatene, and the official government appointee to the Ngai Tahu Trust Board, Dr James Hight, a Pakeha, to be two of them. Thomas Bragg, chairman of the Trust Board, protested to the
the Ngai Tahu Trust Fund based on the 'settlement'. The 1944 Ngai Tahu Claim Settlement Act authorised a payment to Ngai Tahu of 20,000 pounds a year for thirty years, in 'final settlement' of their claims regarding Kemp's Purchase of 1848. This was based on an amount of 354,000 pounds 'adjusted down (not up) to 'round figures' recommended by 1921 Royal Commission [Evison: 1993: 486]. The 1946 legislation authorised the Trust Board to administer the funds for the purpose of Ngai Tahu welfare, mainly by way of investment to support educational benefits. In 1955, both the Ngai Tahu Claim Settlement Act 1944 and the Ngai Tahu Trust Board Act 1946 were repealed by the Maori Trust Boards Act. This Act brought all Trust Boards around the country under one piece of over-arching legislation. This changed the designation of the Ngai Tahu Trust Board to Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board.

government that his exclusion would mean that Southland and Otago would remain unrepresented. Acting Native Minister Frank Langstone replied to Bragg that the decision was to be made by Dr Hight. W.D. Barrett, secretary of the board, and Hight himself protested. Eventually a compromise was reached: the delegates were Peter Macdonald of Picton, J.E. Ellison of Puketeraki, and Hight, with Barrett and Tirikatene as observer and backup.

In spite of this compromise, from the point of view of the various settlements and hapu of Ngai Tahu the arrangement was unsatisfactory. Tirikatene had visited 27 local runanga throughout the South Island to discuss a settlement. The beneficiaries had held numerous meetings around the South Island to discuss the claim and to select representatives to elect the three negotiators. These facts were well known to the government but were ignored. A conference much more satisfactory to the various hapu and communities of Ngai Tahu and Ngati Mamoe would have included representatives of the 27 runanga [Ngai Tahu Trust Board: T. Bragg, Telegram to Langstone 15 Dec. 1937 and reply; W.D. Barrett to M.J. Savage, 21 Dec. 1937; Hight to G.P. Shepherd, 29 Dec. 1937; Hight to M.J. Savage, 6 Jan 1938; T. Bragg to Native Minister, 17 Jan. 1938; AAMK 869/766b, 26/2/4, Part 2, 1929-1939, NA. in Ballara: 1998: 315-316].

Ballara goes on to write:

The pattern of forcing a large number of Maori into forming themselves into one corporate body to negotiate with the government was repeated elsewhere before 1945.... Hapu reluctance to accept tribal hegemony imposed by the government continued past 1945. Trust boards selected in the mid 20th century after the 'settlement' of some of the large claims also forced tribal status on some groups while excluding others from it.... These kinds of reactions to Crown pressures belong to a later study. But further evidence for similar government pressure before 1945 is found during the 1920s in negotiations with the Maori people of Taupo.... A similar pattern emerges to that seen in the negotiations with Ngai Tahu and Waikato. [1998: 316-319]
Board members represented seven geographical regions, six in the South Island and one representative for all the beneficiaries living in the North Island. The purpose for which the Board was originally legislated into existence, was to aid in the pursuit of land and fishery claims and to administer grants to beneficiaries for such things as education, training and the support of kaumatau. Under the 1946 Act, the Ngai Tahu Trust Board was authorised to administer the funds provided under the 1944 Act for the purpose of Ngai Tahu welfare, mainly by way of investment to support educational benefits. Since its inception, the Trust Board has gradually added a range of new functions to its repertoire.

According to Evison, while Ngai Tahu runanga who were canvassed at the time, accepted the 1944 Settlement Act, the Act made no mention of the Treaty of Waitangi or the fulfillment of Treaty rights with regard to Kemp's Purchase [1993: 486].

1955 to 1996/1998 in the management of South Island Maori identities

At the expiry of the 30 year term of the Ngai Tahu Settlement Act, the third Labour Government confirmed the continuation of the $20,000 annual payment to the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board in perpetuity in 1974.

In 1973 the Trust Board had an employee seconded from the Maori Land Court to work on collection and collation of Ngai Tahu whakapapa, based on the 1925 lists. According to the 1978 Annual Report, 'this job then focused on the listing of missing files, the listing of files which had been 'gutted' of whakapapa content,'

---

8 The 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report states that the Ngai Tahu-Maori Trust Board was a "paternalistic" structure which operated "under the control of successive governments for 50 years" and that the contemporary Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu structure which replaced the Trust Board in 1996 under the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, "is based on traditional regions of Ngai Tahu authority" [1996: 22].
the location of missing *whakapapa*, and at a later date, bringing *whakapapa* contained in all the files up to date by including later generations' [Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board Annual Report: 1978: 10].

**1975** the Labour government initiated the Treaty of Waitangi Act which set up the the Waitangi Tribunal. The Act and its 1985 amendment, were introduced by two successive Labour Governments. For the first time a door which had long been closed was finally opened for South Island Maori. The body that took on the task of representing the land claims interests of Ngai Tahu, to the exclusion of other South Island Maori, was the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board.

Contemporary Maori demands for the recognition of their sovereignty first surfaced publicly on February 6, 1971 at the annual formal celebration of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi [Waitangi Day]. From that time, the movement has been relentless and increasing in intensity and sophistication. Hauraki Greenland identifies a ‘new generation of Maori leaders who espoused a radical political consciousness that was distinctively Maori in its orientation’ who pointed to the continued loss of land for Maori as a basis for cultural and political shifts, leading to new developments in considerations of ethnic identity [1991: 90]. In 1975 the Waitangi Tribunal was set up by the Crown, facilitated by the Treaty of Waitangi Act, allowing Maori to make claims against the Crown for current breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. A decade later this Act was amended to allow claims retrospective to 1840 to be lodged with the Waitangi Tribunal.

Since the setting up of the Waitangi Tribunal, the Crown, iwi and academics have engaged in interpretation and discussion on the difference between Article One, Article Two and Article Three rights. In brief, the difference between Article One and Article two hinges on *kawanatanga* (government) versus *rangatiratanga* (chieftainship) for Maori. Article Three guarantees citizenship’ rights to all New Zealanders.
In 1983 the government passed the Fisheries Act and a subsequent amendment to this Act in 1986. This Act established a Quota Management System for commercial fisheries, 'to prevent indiscriminate and uncontrolled exploitation of New Zealand fisheries' [Evison: 1993: 488].

By 1981 the Ngai Tahu Annual Report stated that the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board planned to assume a much wider range of functions than it was originally established to undertake [Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board Annual Report: 1981: 106]. When I interviewed the chairperson of the Trust Board in 1990, he said that the function of the Board had changed since he was elected in 1976 and would change again as a result of the devolution process. He claimed:

My generation of Trust Board members has seen a major task of the Trust Board as being the continuance of the battle over 'The Claims [against the Crown] that have been running since 1848 [and] previous Trust Board members have taken that view too, because it is the only pan-Ngai Tahu structure that we have had. [T. O'Regan: Interview: 1990]

In 1986, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, represented by its Deputy Chairperson, made a claim on behalf of its beneficiaries for acknowledgement of its Article Two rights and compensation for land lost, comprising a significant area of the South Island. Ngai Tahu's claim was one of the first. As a result of legislation and actions of the Tribunal, there have been a number of land-mark decisions. In May 1995 the Waikato-Tainui peoples received $170 million as compensation from the government for lands confiscated by the Crown last century [Maaka and Fleras: 1997: 30]. In 1987 Ngai Tahu's leadership also submitted a claim regarding sea fisheries, objecting to the system adopted by the government to manage quotas. According to Evison: 'Ngai Tahu objected that by this system the Crown had usurped the right to dispose of New Zealand's fishing-grounds, contrary to Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi and without consulting the Maori partners to the Treaty' [1993: 488].
In 1987 the Maori Language Act was passed, making Te Reo Maori an official language of New Zealand. By the 1980s, the marginal position of Maori had become a matter for concern for Maori and for the Crown, for a number of reasons. As Paul Spoonley writes: 'The migration of Maori from their traditional *iwi* (rural) areas to cities added to the sense of cultural and economic alienation, and produced a new generation of Maori political leaders who combined long-standing concerns about land, language and culture with new political strategies.'

This message was reinforced by a series of reviews and public statements, including Puao Te Atatu (1986), the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) and Ka Awatea (1990). All highlighted (in varying degrees) the alienation that was a product of colonialism, the need for reparations and the desire for a degree of autonomy by Maori. Alongside these emerging politics was recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi in legislation, court rulings...and new requirements for the delivery of social services which required that Maori as clients should be consulted [Spoonley: 1997: 5].

1990-1991 - A benchmark time in the determination of South Island Maori identities

The Runanga Iwi Act was passed in 1990. This Act was subsequently repealed when a National Government came into power in 1991 with suggestions of reinstating the Maori Affairs Department. However, the criteria set out in the Act, for Maori to organise in the form of *iwi*-representative bodies, was to have a profound impact on the Trust Board's efforts throughout this decade to organise and manage *whakapapa* to present a Ngai Tahu *iwi* identity with distinct boundaries, exclusive from other *iwi* at 1840 and since. The Trust Board set about establishing a structure to meet the Crown’s definition of a satisfactory body to represent a Ngai Tahu *iwi*. The Crown’s criteria included:

---

9 According to Ballara, from the mid-twentieth century in New Zealand cities, where initially there were no *marae*, many Maori were cut off for some decades from the formal calling of *hapu* at Maori *hui* [1998: 282].
• that the created body is able to assert the iwi status of those it represents
• that the iwi represented by this body shares a definite language, culture, history
• that this iwi is distinct from other South Island Maori groups [Runanga Iwi Act 1990]

In 1991 the Waitangi Tribunal published its recommendations finding in favour of Ngai Tahu's nine claims. The outcomes of the Runanga Iwi Act 1990 and the Waitangi Tribunal's recommendations with respect to Ngai Tahu's claims were an indication to Ngai Tahu that the Crown was committed to settling with iwi through iwi representative bodies. iwi bodies were therefore required to prove their legitimacy as representative bodies of their iwi. This period in Ngai Tahu's history marked the beginning of a series of shifts in the range and inclusion/exclusion of whakapapa-based South Island identities to shift emphasis from whanau and hapu to runanga and iwi:

The Runanga Iwi Act...provided for the authoritative voice of an iwi to be the only voice with which the Crown would deal in a given region. It provided for a contestable process of validation of the various pretensions of a tribal group to speak as the tangata whenua (people of the land) in that region. To some extent, it provided for the restoration of the legal personality of the tribe, the destruction of which, by [Henry] Sewell and his fellow settler politicians between 1858 and 1866, is one of the great unsung Treaty crimes. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 161, 1991: 15]

One of the recommendations made by the Waitangi Tribunal was that the Crown should move swiftly to provide a legal personality for the tribe. That could only be done by legislation. Such a step was as important for the Crown, contemplating delivery of a substantial Treaty settlement, as it was for Ngai Tahu as the tribe. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 51]

1996/1998: The final act?

After the Waitangi Tribunal's recommendations were published, the Trust Board and Te Runanganui o Tahu, Ngai Tahu's newly formed tribal council, began a process of negotiation with the Crown to agree on a satisfactory compensation offer. As part of this process, these bodies lobbied for legal recognition of a Ngai
Tahu āwi identity with its own distinct takiwa. The Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 provided legal recognition of Ngai Tahu as a tribe, the first for a tribe in New Zealand. It also provided a mechanism to transfer all the assets and activities of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board to a new body, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, made up of representatives from eighteen Papatipu Runanga to replace Te Runanganui o Tahu. Ngai Tahu Whanui’s members must be able to claim whakapapa to one of the South Island Maori kaumatua alive in 1848 and thus demonstrate common descent from an eponymous ancestor, Tahu Potiki. The basis for membership is the Ngai Tahu whakapapa roll, passed on from Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu’s predecessor, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board’s register of beneficiaries.

1998 marks an historic ceremonial event for South Island Maori. On November 29, on a cold windy day at Onuku, the Crown’s Representative, Prime Minister Jenny Shipley, delivered an official Apology to Ngai Tahu for breaches of the Treaty since 1840:

In a biting easterly wind at Onuku Marae, the Crown and Ngai Tahu met face to face in a final act of reconciliation. For nearly 150 years Ngai Tahu has been pursuing its claim against the Crown for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. Yesterday Prime Minister Jenny Shipley said the official "sorry". Several hundred Ngai Tahu were at the marae, situated in a picturesque coastal setting near Akaroa, to hear the apology. The location was significant because on May 30, 1840, Ngai Tahu chiefs Iwikau and Tikao signed the Treaty at Onuku... [Christchurch Press: November 30, 1998: 1]

Summary

This chapter has outlined the factors that have contributed to the shifting and multiple assertions and understandings of South Island Maori collective identities from 1840 to 2000. An understanding of political events over this period is critical to understanding the context of the arrival of the legal-political identity, Ngai Tahu Whanui in 1996. As Becker suggests, it is necessary to look back through the history of events and narratives to understand the context of any activity, or in
this case, event [1998: 60-61]. The events that have led to this outcome have also been embedded in shifts in the form and function of management of whakapapa information. Management of whakapapa has been embedded in longstanding issues of land claims between Maori and the Crown over this period.

This dissertation traces the management of South Island Maori whakapapa for the purposes of management and governance of the developing Ngai Tahu Nation, and the roles played by the Crown and Ngai Tahu leadership in this. In the New Zealand context, Ngai Tahu Whanui is unique for many reasons. One key reason is that it is the only collective identity Maori group recognised in legislation as an iwi. According to Angela Ballara, the patterns of management of whakapapa by Maori and the Crown in terms of assertion of hapu and iwi as primary collective identities in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has followed a similar pattern throughout New Zealand. Although, Ballara writes that, 'every modern tribe has a different history of development', [1998: 302], her book iwi, is a historic account of developments toward 'tribal formation' or 'corporate bodies' [1998: 315, 316] for Maori communities throughout New Zealand, from the nineteenth century to the mid twentieth century. As this dissertation argues, whakapapa has been managed in a particular way for and by Ngai Tahu over this period, following this trend in the development of collective South Island Maori identities.
Chapter three

Theoretical Framework:
Whakapapa management:
Narrative and metanarrative in the
Crafting of the contemporary
‘Ngai Tahu Nation’

The goal of the theoretical exercise is to bring together narrative and identity in order to better understand social action. [Somers: 1994: 607]

Introduction


---

1 I borrow the term ‘framing’ from Jasper, who draws on Goffman [1975], whose symbolic interactionist approach to the study of social movements considers ‘framing work’ as the tools used by social movements to actively connect individuals to the collective. ‘Framing’ refers to ‘the conscious efforts by groups or recruiters to craft their rhetoric and issues in such a way that they appeal to potential recruits’ [1997: 77].
Greenland: 1991]; as integral to biological, political and cultural identity for Maori but these have not carried out comprehensive research into the role of whakapapa either as a management tool or as narrative in the contemporary development of cultural identity for Maori.\(^2\) As I argue, this gap contributes to the potency of whakapapa as cultural resource, in turn contributing to its political uses.

There is no particular 'body of theory' in which the theorists speak to one another that this dissertation draws upon. The research is grounded in participant observation findings, bringing together a diverse and unique mosaic of theorists from a range of fields to inform the participant observation findings. I have brought together perspectives from several sociologists, anthropologists and social archeologists whose work I have found useful to this project. The theorists I rely on each make a specific contribution to the whole argument of the dissertation.


\(^2\) All literature reviewed is found in the Bibliography of this dissertation.
Strategic uses of whakapapa in the management of contemporary South Island Maori identities

*Whakapapa* is a fundamental feature of the life of any Ngai Tahu person. It is also fundamental to the determination of membership in contemporary South Island Maori collective identities and the management of these. The management of *whakapapa* performs an important function for tribal cohesion and organisation - past, present, and future. This was demonstrated in Trust Board attempts through the second half of the twentieth century to mobilise *whakapapa* information about South Island Maori, towards the political goal of achieving a land claims settlement with the Crown.\(^3\) It is the collection and registration of *whakapapa* in a centralised space which binds the members of Ngai Tahu Whanui to the 'national' collective as well as to history and particular places while excluding those whose *whakapapa* does not meet the requirements to register as a member or who, for whatever other reasons, do not register.\(^4\) It is the storage of collective *whakapapa* in the form of the Ngai Tahu roll, held in the Whakapapa Unit of the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, which facilitates the administration, management and governance of the contemporary legal-political nation – Ngai Tahu Whanui. The management tool that accomplishes this is the

\(^3\) My M.A. thesis pointed out that the key forum relied on by the Trust Board for a rational form of dissemination of collected *whakapapa* information was the New Zealand court system, as part of the claims before the Waitangi Tribunal from the mid 1980s. The files which the Trust Board had managed to build up over the years by adopting rational means of accumulation and storage of *whakapapa* knowledge, made possible the dissemination of this knowledge in such a forum, to achieve claims settlement [Kelly: 1991].

\(^4\) Rodgers Brubaker argues that all forms of social closure include some way of defining and identifying 'outsiders or ineligibles'. Insiders and outsiders may be defined informally through tacit, internalised criteria deployed in social interaction or formally by specialised administrators. Formal techniques for the definition of insiders and outsiders include:

the elaboration of explicit and unambiguous criteria of insiderhood and outsiderhood; exhaustive enumerations of individual insiders or outsiders (guest lists, registers, rosters, membership rolls, blacklists); and formally administered identification routines in which a particular person is identified as an insider or outsider through the application of general criteria or through matching against enumerative lists. [Brubaker: 1992: 29-30]
Ngai Tahu Whanui roll. The history and processes of the development of the roll are addressed in Chapters Two and Five.

My earlier research relied on Giddens for his assertion that resources are media through which power is exercised, and resources comprise more than the allocative kind [1984: 258]. This research adopted Giddens' model of 'authoritative resources' to analyse strategic exercises of power by the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board at the time of the introduction of the Runanga Iwi Act 1990. Fundamental to the exercise of power by minority groups, according to Giddens, is 'storage' of knowledge because this acts as a medium of 'binding' time-space involving the knowledgeable management of a projected future and the recall of an elapsed past [1984: 261]. Storage, management and use of whakapapa information is integral to management of the contemporary legal-political identity – Ngai Tahu Whanui. For Giddens, profitability and power depend, among other factors, upon being able to predict events and subject them to calculation. He also suggests that getting to know what goes on 'in history' becomes not only an inherent part of what history is but also a means of transforming history [1984: 237].¹ Chapter Five addresses whakapapa management through the Ngai Tahu roll as a form of cultural capital.

¹ It is possible to argue that the Ngai Tahu roll also constitutes what John Law refers to as a 'durable material' that organises previously heterogeneous identities and relations among South Island Maori and between South Island Maori and the Crown. Law uses actor-network theory, which treats social relations, power and organisation as network effects. Social networks are formed and generated within wider networks which include agents, texts, devices and architecture. This view sees the task of sociology as analysing the ways in which materials join together to generate themselves and reproduce institutional and organisational patterns in social networks [Law: 1992: 379 (abstract)].

According to John Law, actor-network theory does not accept reductionist approaches that argue either machines, objects, or human relations are determinate in the last instance. As Foucault and Giddens would argue of power, for Law, determinants of social change or identity are empirical matters, in need of investigation [1992: 382-383]. Thus, along with Foucault and Giddens, actor-network theory assumes that social structure is not a noun but a verb and that power is about effect, rather than causes [1992: 387]. Law argues that to embody a set of relations, in this case as these are implicit in whakapapa, in inanimate durable materials such as texts, ensures they last longer and can introduce stability [1992: 387]. While the Ngai Tahu roll organises relations through time, it also achieves mobility through space.
Management of Ngai Tahu Whanui as a ‘Nation of Citizens’

Management of identities also arises out of what Foucault refers to as a ‘discursive formation’, a way of speaking that shapes consciousness [1969, 1977, Brennan 1990 in Calhoun: 1997: 3]. Ngai Tahu Whanui is an effective ‘institutional arrangement’ [Granovetter: 1985] which organises and manages dispersed, heterogeneous, shifting and often competing South Island Maori identities. I argue that what has resulted from the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act and a series of events both leading up to and following the Act, is a new ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ of registered citizens – Ngai Tahu Whanui members - as governed by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

In an article in the Christchurch Press [January 26, 2002: 3], Dr. Te Maire Tau referred to the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’. During a lecture by Sir Tipene O’Regan to the New Zealand Historical Association [December 2, 2001], Dr. Te Maire Tau challenged O’Regan’s reference to Ngai Tahu Whanui as a corporate body, arguing that Ngai Tahu Whanui represents a new nation. In an interview in August 1999, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Kaiwhakahaere Mark Solomon referred to Ngai Tahu Whanui as effectively a ‘Nation of Ngai Tahu citizens’. This dissertation addresses how Ngai Tahu Whanui is framed in a public narrative as a national identity. While apart from these examples, the public narrative does not refer to Ngai Tahu Whanui explicitly as a ‘nation’, this research considers the new legal-political identity as a ‘nation’.

The public narrative frames Ngai Tahu identity as such, by using a range of rhetorical tools to shift traditional hierarchies of collective Maori identities to those based on new institutionalised arrangements and conceptual categories. Historically these identities were based in connections to whanau and hapu.

---

6 For Giddens, the development of states or administrative bodies organised in a bureaucratic manner is convergent with the formation of modes of discourse which shape what state power is [1988: 209]. He adds that, ‘the expansion of state sovereignty means that those subject to it are in some sense…aware of their membership in a political community and of the rights and obligations such membership confers’ [1985: 210].
through whakapapa and its knowledge (whanaungatanga and whakawhanaungatanga). In contrast, the contemporary emphasis is on membership of individuals in a collective body by way of registration of individual whakapapa as part of a collective and held in a centralised place. The smaller units of relationship and association that were once implicit in the uses of whakapapa (such as whanau and hapu) are subsumed and the embodied knowledge of whakapapa and identity are replaced by intellectual knowledge, in which presence among the people and places significant to the whakapapa is no longer necessary.\(^7\) This idea is developed in detail in Chapter Four.

Corresponding to this is a supporting public narrative that emphasises the privileged identities that are fundamental to a notion of nationhood – as an individual and collective whole. The dissertation adopts Benedict Anderson’s consideration of nations as at least imagined by their members as providing ‘deep, horizontal comradeship….regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail’ [1991: 7]. Calhoun espouses a similar approach where he asserts the defining characteristic of nationality as ‘identification by similarity of attributes as a member of a set of equivalent members’ [1997: 42].

The history of South Island Maori identities is characterised by heterogeneity, fragmentation and contestation. The lives of contemporary Ngai Tahu are embedded in settings of place and culture that are more urban and global than traditional. Given these contexts, there is a need for the new Ngai Tahu Whanui to integrate its members into a form of community. As Craig Calhoun identifies:

> Recognition as a nation clearly requires social solidarity – some level of integration among the members of the ostensible nation, and collective identity – the recognition of the whole by its members, and a sense of individual self that includes membership in the whole. [1997: 4]

\(^7\) Giddens suggests that abandonment of ‘traditional’ modes of information storage and communication in favour of new modes alters the nature of the social relations this helps to organise [1984: 262].
For Ngai Tahu Whanui this integration and solidarity is achieved through the management of *whakapapa* by the Ngai Tahu roll and the supporting public narrative. Benedict Anderson identifies the role of narrative and discourse in the construction of nations or national communities:

In an anthropological spirit, then, I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community — and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.

It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. [1991, 1983: 6]

‘All that I can find to say is that a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation, or behave as if they formed one.’ [Seton-Watson in Anderson: 1991: 6]. We may translate ‘consider themselves’ as ‘imagine themselves’. [1991, 1983: 6]

For Anderson, ‘a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation, or behave as if they formed one’ [1991: 6]. It is not blood relationship as recorded by *whakapapa* that unites contemporary members of the Ngai Tahu Whanui collective; it is the management of registered *whakapapa* and of the metaphorical associations of *whakapapa* with actual blood and kin relationship, along with corresponding representations about time, place and ‘The Claim’ in the form of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative that unites.\(^8\) As Anderson puts it, ‘The nation was

---

\(^8\) According to Giddens, the following three substantive aspects also influence the formation of ideology in modern organisations:

1. The definition of what is to count as ‘political’ and, therefore, in principle open to intervention or control on the part of the state.

2. The definition of practices, programmes and policies that are in the ‘general interest’, as opposed to those that favour the sectional interests of groups or classes. The more the state becomes administratively unified, the greater the degree to which government must appeal to the ‘general interest’ ... in order to sustain a basis for its rule.
conceived in language, not in blood' [1991: 145]. The organization of Ngai Tahu Whanui also illustrates the way that information about blood relations is not given, it has to be worked out through forms of inscription collected and represented in a roll.

Integral to this consideration of nation is Anderson's concept of 'meanwhile' [1991: 24]. His use of the term 'meanwhile' encapsulates the idea of a sociological organism moving 'calendrically' through homogeneous, empty time, which he describes as 'the precise analogue of the idea of the nation', which also is conceived as a solid community moving steadily down (or up) history. Unlike the historical condition of South Island Maori kin relations, many 'new Ngai Tahu' will never meet, or even know the names of, all his/her fellow Ngai Tahu Whanui members. As Anderson puts it, 'he has no idea of what they are up to at any one time. But he has complete confidence in their steady, anonymous, simultaneous activity' [1991: 26], reinforcing to Ngai Tahu Whanui members, the knowledge that the collective Ngai Tahu exists in some form.

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative also provides a cognitive place in history for contemporary members to embed their recently considered ethnic identities. Anderson identifies such a characteristic of nations – they 'always loom out of an immemorial past, and still more important, glide into a limitless future' [1991: 11-12].

Craig Calhoun contributes to the examination of nationalism in his argument that, while the content of different nationalisms may draw on ethnicity and history,

3. The articulation of 'historicity' in relation to planned or actual trends of social change. The reflexive monitoring of all states involves the invention of 'history' in some sense or another – the documented interpretation of the past that provides an anchorage for anticipated developments in the future. [1985: 211-212]

9 According to Giddens, 'some of the main dimensions of ideology in modern states are to be discovered in the nature and scope of discursive articulation of information available in the 'public' domain. In the context of the modern state, the capacity of different groupings to discursively formulate policies or programmes that express their interests and to make space in the public domain for printing them, are vital' [1985: 211].
contemporary nationalism is distinctive to the modern era, politically created and
transformed by discourses that may incorporate themes about ethnicity, tradition,
history [1997: 8]. I rely on Calhoun for his argument that 'nationalists commonly
present nations as large families sharing bonds of culture and descent' [1997:
29]. He writes:

The modern claim to nationhood is often evoked through the language of kinship
and descent.... People speak of their nation as being like a large family, or claim
blood ties, or talk of how their ancestors fought their ancient enemies in some long-
ago battle. [1991: 37]

Whakapapa management by way of the roll does not achieve this single-
handedly. The supporting Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative fulfils the function
of providing an 'imagined community' or nation. I also argue that in history,
whakapapa has encompassed this narrative role in its form of oral recitation at
the marae. In the absence of this traditional function, and with the introduction of
whakapapa management through the roll, a new 'calling card', inviting new
members to integrate into the new collective identity, is necessary. It is also
necessary that this public narrative incorporates all the metaphorical associations
historically made with whakapapa and the meta-themes of time, place and 'The
Claim'. These meta-themes are also fundamental to identity in the personal
narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals. Calhoun refers to Brass, who states:

The leaders of ethnic movements invariably select from traditional cultures only
those aspects that they think will serve to unite the group and that will be useful in
promoting the interests of the group as they define them. [Brass: 1979: 87 in
Calhoun: 1997: 32-33]

Craig Calhoun [1997] acknowledges the role of stories and their telling in the
reproduction of traditions within the development of ethnic national identities:
...traditions are not simply inherited, they have to be reproduced: stories have to be told over and again, parts of traditions have to be adapted to new circumstances to keep them meaningful, what seem like minor updatings may turn out to change meanings considerably, and the 'morals' to the stories – the lessons drawn from them – sometimes change even while the narratives stay the same. [1997: 50]

The themes of history and significant ancestral places are what I refer to as meta-themes in the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals about contemporary identity. The public narrative about nationalist identity therefore, incorporates particular versions of the meta-themes of history and significant place. Calhoun states that 'we should understand the ways in which nationalism invoke (and sometimes manipulate) history' [1997: 8]. He argues that a fundamental feature of the rhetoric of nation is 'temporal depth', i.e., 'a notion of the nation as such existing through time, including past and future generations, and having a history. Anderson also considers the role of time in narratives about national identity: awareness of being embedded in serial time, which implies continuity, yet of 'forgetting' the experience of this continuity, engenders the need for a narrative of identity [1991: 205].

Calhoun identifies two other fundamental features of the rhetoric of nationalism. These are: 'boundaries, of territory, population, or both' and 'special historical or even sacred relations to a certain territory' [1997: 4-5]. Anderson argues that imagined nations need to present clearly delineated boundaries to correspond to the political or economic resources that they seek to manage. He identifies the introduction of the map as a tool used to reconstruct 'the property-history of their new possessions' [1991: 174]. Yet in some senses, Ngai Tahu are not bound by place. People of Ngai Tahu descent born in Australia may still legitimately claim membership in the 'Ngai Tahu Nation', i.e., the collective tribe is bound to place – Te Waipounamu – but individual members are not. So, in some senses, place troubles whakapapa.
Calhoun points out that the construction of narratives about nationalism, although often framed in stories of ethnicity are embedded in political practice. In the case of South Island Maori, these practices have been around longstanding land claims issues since 1840. The settlement of the Ngai Tahu Claim forms a meta-theme in the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals and in the public narrative.

While the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll registers and manages the governance of otherwise historically, geographically and culturally dispersed Ngai Tahu Whanui members, the public narrative presents the new legal-political national identity in a story of common descent and shared kinship. In order to replace the relational categories of traditional Maori society, as these have been lived and experienced on the marae, the public narrative 'encourages seeing individuals as linked through their membership as a set of abstract equivalents rather than their participation in webs of concrete interpersonal relationships, a phenomenon identified by Calhoun [1997: 44]. It promotes categorical identities over relational ones, partly because nationalist discourse addresses large-scale collectivities in which most people could not conceivably enter into face-to-face relationships with most others' [1997: 46]. The management of whakapapa information is crucial to the development and maintenance of these categorical identities, to both include and exclude [Brubaker: 1992].

While Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership has introduced a 'Ngai Tahu Citizenry' by legislation in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996, how Ngai Tahu individuals, whanau and hapu experience and practice these rights is a dynamic process. As Harrison White argues, identities become salient when actors encounter inconsistencies between their narrative constitutions of self and the social contexts in which they find themselves [1992]. As Somers states, 'rather than a body of rights granted "ready-made" by the state and attached to individual persons, citizenship rights are only one potential outcome of a configuration of national membership rules..... Whether or not these rules are converted into actual universal rights depends fully on the local contexts - the social and political
place - in which they are activated.' [1993: 588-589]. According to Somers, 'citizenship practices emerge from the articulation of national organisations and universal rules with the particularisms and varying political cultures of local environments.' [1993: 589]. That is, citizenship rights are unevenly achieved.

My observations reveal that in the narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu', Ngai Tahu Whanui membership is acknowledged but has little saliency among the multiple whakapapa-identities experienced prior to its introduction. Ngai Tahu Whanui identity is considered by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' within the context of history and political practice within which it was introduced. As Somers suggests, citizenship identities cannot be simply assumed as uniform but need to be investigated by looking at actors' places in their relational settings [1993: 595]. Calhoun agrees that within the nation there exists a range of categorical identities and experiences of these identities for individuals [1997: 38-39].

National and Individual identity through narrativity

The following extracts from Margaret Somers and Howard S. Becker point to the importance of an 'eventful' sociology for social analysis:10

Narrativity demands that we discern the meaning of any single event only in temporal and spatial relationship to other events. [Somers: 1994: 616]

Things don't just happen, but rather occur in a series of steps. [Becker: 1998: 31]

An eventful sociology would not simply concentrate on significant historical events but would consider as equally important individual stories about how everyday things happen. The treatment of the role of narrative in this

---

10 This phrase is taken from William H. Sewell Jr. (1996), 'Three Temporalities: Toward an Eventful Sociology'.
dissertation, particularly from Chapters Six to Ten, draws heavily on the works of Margaret Somers [1999, 1994, 1993], Corrine Kratz [1993], Russell Bishop [1996], Craig Calhoun [1997], Benedict Anderson [1991, 1983] and to a lesser extent, Ken Plummer [1995] and Nigel Rapport [2000]. These theorists are brought together from their separate disciplinary and theoretical backgrounds. Margaret Somers is a social theorist interested in 'identity politics', particularly in the 'social construction of identity' through narrative. Corrine Kratz [1993] is an anthropologist who has developed a set of methodological tools for her own research into Okiek understandings of tradition. Russell Bishop [1996] is a New Zealand educational researcher interested in issues of the kaupapa of Maori research and the traditional role of whakapapa as narrative. Plummer [1995] is also concerned with developing a sociology of stories. Rapport is an anthropologist interested in the methodological issues of presence and immersion in field research.

Somers warns against approaches that rigidify identity by placing it within categorical entities. Her own research in the field of historical understandings of identity examined through network analysis the relational settings through time in which identity formation is embedded [1994: 605-606]. Plummer analysed

---

11 Plummer's work here develops out of the collection of personal experience narratives of the intimate - sexual stories [1995: 19].

12 Rapport's article, 'The narrative as fieldwork technique: processual ethnography for a world in motion' includes both biographical and autobiographical narrative excerpts from his ethnographic research into the experiences of residents from a small U.S. town who had settled elsewhere and had come back to visit their former homes with variable frequency [71-95 in Amit: 2000].

13 Somers set out in 1993 to apply a relational network analysis to reconsider tacit assumptions underlying current sociological debates about modern citizenship and social class. In her article, 'Citizenship and the Place of the Public Sphere: Law, Community and Political Culture in the Transition to Democracy', Somers examines T.H. Marshall's (1949, 1964) sociological work, Citizenship and Social Class. She examines Marshall's thesis in an analysis of varying patterns of institutional relationships among law, communities and political cultures in eighteenth century England, identifying that these varying patterns were central factors in shaping modern citizenship rights. She focuses on regional variations in citizenship practices among eighteenth-century English working-class communities, to suggest that the political identity of citizen should
sexual stories, not for the underlying life experiences or themes they represent, but to develop a theory of the social role of stories: 'the ways they are produced, the ways they are read, the work they perform in the wider social order, how they change, and their role in the political process' [1995: 19]. Where Somers' concern is with the development of theory about the social construction of identities as constituted through narrative, her theoretical approach does not develop out of the use of narrative as an analytic or methodological tool. Plummer is interested in narrative as a methodological tool. For Somers, 'ontological narrativity' is basic to agency and the construction of 'self', but neither is a priori or unchanging, both develop in time and spatial relationships [1994: 618].

In her 1994 article, Somers develops her theory of the embeddedness of identity in politics, history, and community association in order to consider narrative identity. While previous interpretations of narrative limited it to mere representational form, the new approaches were beginning to posit that narrative is much more than 'mere representation' of social life [Somers 1994: 613]. Therefore, her endeavour to link narrative analysis to identity and action research

---

be redefined as an instituted process rather than a status dependent on class, as T.H. Marshall had argued [1993].

Somers posits that the 1960s and 1970s saw the beginning of a debate within the discipline of history about the value of narrative as a representational form. Other social science disciplines at this time adopted and reconceptualised the narrative concept.

Somers does not come from a cultural or an ethnic studies approach. However, she attributes this theoretical shift in understanding about the politics of identity to the vast array of new social movements that have risen to prominence in the last twenty years, resulting from the extraordinary challenges that have confronted social theory. She identifies that these have arisen in part from external political and social transformations. She includes in these, the aspirations of ethnic minorities and the politics of multiculturalism [1994: 608-609]. She states that the various expressions of this new 'politics of identity' all share the common feature of being constituted by people who previously felt marginalised from both dominant political channels and mainstream social movements and who have also been marginalised by prevailing social and critical accounts for why people act the way they do. She adds that these expressions of identity do not necessarily take a universal form [1994: 608-610].
directs attention to the ontological dimensions of narrative and away from the traditional approach to narrative as solely research method or a form of representation [1994: 615]. It was through moving away from observation at meetings of the centralised Ngai Tahu leadership, to the marae, and listening to the personal narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' that I began to see the rigid categorical entities within which contemporary Ngai Tahu collective identity was being framed by the contemporary leadership. Through observation and recording of narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals and their assertions of identity at the places of local and historical significance I began to see the complex, multiple and shifting understandings of identity for individuals.

For Somers, it is through the narrative form that we actually come to understand and make sense of the social world, and it is through the act of narrative - telling stories - that we constitute our social identities [1994: 606]. We actually come to be who we are by being located or locating ourselves in social narratives - hence the relationship between social agency and the social, historical and political construction of identity. Based on this link, 'everything we know...is at least in part a result of numerous cross-cutting relational story-lines in which social actors find or locate themselves' [1994: 607]. The goal of the theoretical exercise is to bring together narrative and identity in order to better understand social action [1994: 607].

For Somers, the process by which the self incorporates narratives is not direct. Narratives are mediated through the spectrum of social and political institutions and practices that constitute our social world [1994: 625]. Somers argues that the social narratives within which we locate our individual identities are rarely of our own making. Her work on the public narrative of citizenship provides an example of this [1993]. Somers argues, for example, that social actors cannot create and present any narratives at will. There is only a limited repertoire of available representations and stories: 'Which kinds will socially predominate is contested politically and will depend in large part on the distribution of
power....The extent and nature of any given repertoire of narratives available for appropriation is always historically and culturally specific' [1994: 629-630]. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative is positioned in a history of institutional, political and cultural practices and events that contribute to its consent by contemporary Ngai Tahu.

Some stories work well because they fit easily into the major rituals of storytelling; they find a congruence with the world, both socially and personally [Somers: 1994: 629]. The 'core story' of the new 'Ngai Tahu Nation' - Ngai Tahu Whanui - maintains its presence and function because due to its themes about whakapapa, history and territory, it imposes a sense of origin, order, authenticity and hence legitimacy on what might otherwise be unmanageable, unpredictable, unstable disorder that has historically characterised South Island Maori identities and relations. Plummer makes the same valuable point:

Imposing a sense of order on the world means constructing and organising a symbolic system in which stories come to play an important role - in the naming of parts, the creation of a cosmos, the making of a 'natural order', the assembling of a world taken for granted, the creation of characters and plots. A process of ordering and organising becomes necessary for human life, and stories are part of this order. [Plummer: 1995: 177]

For Ngai Tahu individuals, narratives about their identity are embedded in wider political institutions and practices, such as whakapapa management by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and the corresponding public narratives of their membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui, as well as the significance of personal experiences of relationships at local places of ancestral significance. My analysis also demonstrates that the members of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and its supporting administrative and management structure, the gatekeeping structure of membership into the collective, frame personal narratives about their Ngai Tahu identities that in some ways concur with Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative while differing in other ways, acknowledging factors of temporality,
embeddedness and heterogeneity within South Island Maori identities. Ngai Tahu leaders draw on their own lives and the lives of their kin (across place and time) and memories of experiences of political activity in this century to make sense of these shifts. For Somers, 'choosing narratives to express multiple subjectivities is a deliberate way of rejecting the neutrality and appearance of objectivity typically embedded in master narratives' [1994: 630]. The circulation of counter-narratives has the power to challenge master narratives that encompass and dominate individual identities.\textsuperscript{15}

Somers introduces a key concept for this dissertation – empotment - which I see as the embedding of identities in multiple, cross-cutting networks of politics, time, place, communities, relationships, and the personal and public stories that we tell about these. For Somers empotment is significant to the constitution of identities. In the narratives of Ngai Tahu, contemporary identities are embedded in these cross-cutting networks and in the stories Ngai Tahu tell about these experiences. The chief characteristic of narrative is that it renders understanding by connecting parts (or events) to a constructed configuration or a social network of relationships (plot). This is achieved through empotment. Empotment gives significance to independent instances, not their chronological or categorical order. It is empotment that allows us to construct a significant configuration of relationships [1994: 616-617].

Somers also identifies the primary role of themes in the act of framing narratives. The primacy of the narrative theme or themes will be used to prioritise events and give them meaning [1994: 617]. Themes like 'Maori society has always been tribally organised' and 'the unity of the tribe through time forms the basis of Ngai Tahu identity today' will selectively appropriate the happenings of the social world, arrange them in some order, and normatively evaluate this order. Ngai

\textsuperscript{15} Somers also argues that, since social actors do not freely construct their own private or public narratives, we can also expect to find confusion, powerlessness, despair, victimisation and even madness as some of the outcomes of an inability to accommodate certain happenings within a range of available cultural, public and institutional narratives [1994: 630].
Tahu public and personal narratives arrange a history of political event, *whakapapa*, and contemporary identities around a series of key themes – metatheMES - which are addressed in this dissertation.

Like Somers, Plummer argues that life story is identity: 'we tell stories about ourselves in order to constitute ourselves' [1995: 172]. Like Somers, he also recognises that stories help us to 'emplot' our lives in time, place, cause and sequence [1995: 172] and within the context of a collective past. He concurs with Somers that texts are not just hyperrealities, representations for textual analysis: 'story-product and consumption is an empirical social process involving a stream of joint actions in local contexts themselves bound into wider negotiated social worlds. Texts are connected to lives, actions, contexts and society' [1995: 24].

For Plummer, 'the task is to see stories in two linked and critical ways: as symbolic interactions and as political processes' [1995: 19]. From his symbolic interactionist perspective, all cultural construction and political process arises out of a vast flow of ever-changing symbolic face-to-face interactions. Social actors make the world and reflect upon the world through symbols and languages: 'Storytelling can be placed at the heart of our symbolic interactions' [1995: 20]. He recognises also that this is not always in conditions of our own choosing, which concurs with Somers' consideration of the role of 'public', 'ontological' narratives and 'metanarrative'.

Plummer points out that stories do not float around abstractly but are grounded in historically evolving communities of memory, structured through age, class, race, gender and sexual preference [1995: 22]. He acknowledges the contextual nature of storytelling but sees it as production/representation for which groups of actors are either producers or users. Plummer argues that story-telling plays a key role in community: stories need communities to be heard, but communities are also built through telling stories. Stories gather people around them, they
have to attract audiences. Once these audiences have been gathered, they may then start to build a common perception, a common language, a commonality [1995: 174]. It is through this representation of commonality over time that 'core stories' develop which then come to perform constitutive or preservative roles by representing preserving patterns, i.e., giving contemporary identity and cultural practice a sense of a continuous link to the past [1995: 176]. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative can be seen as such a 'core story' that gathers an audience of otherwise geographically disparate actors — Ngai Tahu Whanui — and gives its members, not only a sense of a link to a collective whole, but also a link to history, significant ancestral places, and hence, original identity. This is a role that knowledge and recitation of whakapapa has traditionally fulfilled. From 1996 to 1998 the collective Ngai Tahu Whanui community was built to an extent by the adhesive of its public narrative. From 1998 the task of the public narrative continues as the building of community and commonalities to bind together its approximately 30,000 registered members, offering a connection from each registered member through forms of inscription and storytelling to the whole 'Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation'.

Plummer expresses an interest in questions about the nature of stories, what gives some stories more credibility than others; what strategic spaces allow some stories to be told and others to be silenced; who has access to the stories; strategies involved in storytelling and how stories sit with the wider frameworks of power relations. Like Somers, he shows interest in how oppressed people resist by identifying themselves as subjects, by defining their reality, shaping their new identity, naming their history, telling their story [1995: 29-30]. Plummer links the process of storytelling to the wider cultures within which individuals exploit their lives. Chapters Six to Ten of this dissertation identify the political and historical contexts within which both 'experienced Ngai Tahu' and the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership embed their stories about their cultural identity.
Plummer points out the role of narrative in linking a life to a culture [1995: 168] and Plummer's 'core stories' [1995: 173] sound like Somers' 'public', 'social', and 'ontological' narratives and 'metanarrative'. Unlike Somers, however, Plummer suggests that 'communities' of memory develop out of 'ceaseless negotiation' between actors and that 'social order is a vast negotiated web of dialogue and conversation'. For Plummer, all stories and communities emanate from the starting point of face-to-face symbolic interactions that spread outward to develop wider cultural patterns and in turn feed back to the individual. So, while Somers argues that narratives are incorporated into the self 'through the spectrum of social and political institutions and practices that constitute our social world' [1994: 625], Plummer attributes less explanation to the role of these wider contexts and more to 'the stream of joint actions' of storytelling between individuals. Plummer does not consider the wider power resources that contribute to the development of ontological stories, nor does he consider the contexts within which those who gatekeep the framing and circulation of stories, maintain the power to do so.16

Nigel Rapport argues the necessity of the narrative form for both fieldworker and ethnographic subject as they both seek 'a place cognitively to reside', a place to continue to be.17 My dissertation is less concerned with this emphasis on autobiographical account by a field researcher into the varying experiences of movement in and out of the field, and more with Rapport's treatment of the role and function of narrative. Like Somers and Plummer, Rapport considers that identity is constituted, not simply represented, by narrative [2000: 72]. Responding to the exhortation by Clifford Geertz [1988: 4-5] that the

16 For Giddens, building on Weber's theory of rationalization [1922, 1930], power within any organization or nation, depends on the mobilization of allocative and authoritative resources [1981: 50, 1984: 33]. The achievement of power through mobilization of authoritative resources includes the definition and circulation of what is to count as 'political'; the definition of practices that are in the 'general interest'; and the articulation of 'historicity' – the documented interpretation of the past that provides an anchorage for anticipated developments in the future [1985: 211-212].

17 Rapport relies on his findings developed through this narrative process to call for a blurring of the distinction between 'native' and 'anthropological perspective' [2000: 13].
displacement upon which anthropological research is based requires 'being there', Rapport argues that physical movement between settings is not necessary in order to encounter another form of life because 'forms of life are forms of inventing the world through language' [2000: 72]. For Rapport, the 'movement' espoused by Geertz is 'a cognitive one' [2000: 72]. Narrative employment constructs individual identity through its facilitation of 'cognitive residence', a role once held by physical residence (in a gemeinschaft/gesellschaft type picture):

What is sought...is an accounting for anthropological fieldwork...which takes account of social and cultural boundaries in continuous flux and of distance between people continually foreshortened by technologies of communication.... the practice of anthropological fieldwork in a world in motion.... when 'there' is not a place. [2000: 73]

Like Somers and Plummer, Rapport points out the role of narrative for individuals to embed their lives within some larger context, offering individuals a perceived order and meaning to their lives [2000: 74]. Unlike Somers and, to an extent, Plummer, Rapport does not try to explain of the relationship between personal narratives and the wider political, cultural, and ontological narratives in which individuals construct their experiences and hence, identities. What Rapport adds to the argument about the function of narrative to embed lives is his insight that narratives are 'inherently sequential', supplying individuals with an evolutionary context within which to embed their lives and to place new episodes and events: 'Hence, narratives posit an ongoing order, and meaningfulness, between distinct moments or sites of experience' [2000: 76]. Whether or not these are sets of meanings imposed by wider political, cultural or ontological narratives, he does not address.

Rapport, drawing on Barthes and Bruner [1982: 252, 1990: 45], also argues that narratives constitute the privileged medium for understanding human experience
because there appears to be a 'human readiness or predisposition' to organise experience into a narrative form [2000: 75].

Rapport makes a distinction between inter-generational genealogy and narrative. He argues that, while chronicling blood connection is a way of situating the self within a context of space, time and relations to others in order to know one's identity, narrative accomplishes this still further by also providing a flexibility of self-presentation that the chronicling of blood connection alone cannot [2000: 75].

Rapport refers to reliance on narratives to embed self identity by individuals who are otherwise geographically dispersed as the need for a cognitive place to reside [2000: 74, 78]. Most contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui members do not experience the face-to-face relationships with other members of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation', at the places of significance to their ancestors. Management of whakapapa through the Ngai Tahu roll and the supporting public narrative provides such a 'cognitive place' for dispersed members to embed their sense of individual ethnic identity within a wider collective 'nation'.

Rapport's thesis is also useful for what it offers to the consideration of the role of the public narrative for the large number of Ngai Tahu Whanui members whose knowledge and experience of whakapapa and identity is now through 'intellectual knowing' rather than 'embodied knowing' – 'new Ngai Tahu'. For the majority of new members, knowledge of whakapapa and identity comes through registration of whakapapa in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Whanui and publications about history, identity, cultural and political practice.

While this dissertation acknowledges treatment by Plummer and Rapport of narrative as the connection between individual identity and community and culture, I tend to rely on Somers for her contribution of the multiple layers of narrative – from personal to public to metanarrative -.
Whakapapa as narrative and metanarrative

Somers identifies four different layers of narrative: ontological, public, conceptual, and metanarrative [1994: 617]. Personal ontological narratives are 'the stories that social actors use to make sense of their lives' [1994: 619]. These narratives process events into episodes, giving our lives meaning. Public narratives are 'those narratives attached to cultural and institutional formations larger than the single individual', such as social scripts and stereotypes [1994: 619]. Conceptual narrativity is a term Somers uses to refer to 'the concepts and explanations that we construct as social researchers'. These are macro theories and analytic categories, for example, 'society', the 'actor', and 'culture' [1994: 620].

Public narratives differ from master-narratives. Public narratives are those narratives attached to cultural and institutional formations that transcend the individual - the "mainstream plots" we rely on to 'selectively appropriate events to construct stories' about personal issues. Public narratives are the larger narratives attached to any network or institution that is larger than the individual, from family to nation, through which stories circulate. As examples, Somers offers stories about American social mobility, the "freeborn Englishman", the working-class hero. Somers suggests that the mainstream media use such public narratives to connect events in order to create "mainstream plots" [1994: 619]. Master-narratives are those wider ontological presuppositions within which even the macro public narratives, such as national narratives, are embedded [Somers: 1994: 619].

Metanarrative is a term Somers adopts to refer to 'the master-narratives in which we are embedded as contemporary actors in history'. These are the contemporary master-narratives of social life and historical explanation that transcend natural origin – biology as destiny. Somers offers the following examples: 'Progress, Decadence, Industrialisation, Enlightenment; the epic dramas of our time – Capitalism vs Communism, the Individual vs Society,
Barbarism/Nature vs Civility' [1994: 619]. Somers' introduction of the term metanarrative, as this fits into the levels of narrative form from personal to public, is central to my dissertation. For Ngai Tahu and Maori in general, I argue that whakapapa constitutes such a metanarrative.

Somers defines the concept 'metanarrative' as a cultural form that has been epistemologically and ontologically naturalised by conjoining narrative with a form of social naturalism embedded in an immemorial past. Metanarratives are the most potent type of master-narrative because they are not accountable to the same standards of rigour that apply to empirical claims; their legitimation is not by empirical evidence but by the givenness of their seemingly naturalistic, 'preconstructed' or 'pre-suppositional' qualities. They are thus insulated from serious challenge. When such narrative structures are arranged into public narratives, they reasonably can be called metanarratives [1999: 130-1].

She argues that a metanarrative is attributed power and authority to define the conceptual basis for established hierarchies of power and the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion for collective identities [1999: 136]. The untouchable and privileged place that whakapapa holds for both Maori and non-Maori, sheltering it from critical investigation, is perhaps the most significant factor in its potency as cultural resource. It allows for unchallenged gatekeeping of both the definitions and the uses of whakapapa as a resource. Those who manage the storage, dissemination and uses of South Island Maori whakapapa also manage access to membership in the collective identities for which it forms a basis.

Whakapapa holds a privileged position as metanarrative in all stories about identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu. Identities, as these are formed through whakapapa and narrative, are also embedded in contexts of time, place and political purpose. Hence, time, place and the history of South Island land claims constitute key themes in all narratives about identity. These themes are
embedded in the metanarrative of whakapapa, so I refer to them as meta-themes.

Methodological tools of narrative analysis – Howard S. Becker, Corrine Kratz and Russell Bishop

The methodological approach to this dissertation borrows from Becker's Tricks of the Trade, which adopts the perspective that events or activities, such as the historic Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu Whanui at Onuku in November 1998, should form the starting point for analysis. This is in order to focus analysis on the situation the event occurs in, and on all its connections with all the other things around it, with its context. According to Becker, activities only make sense when you know what they are a response to, what phenomena provide inputs and necessary conditions for the activity or event [1998: 41].

In my analysis of the framing of the meta-themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, I rely on the work of Corrine Kratz. Kratz draws on her ethnographic research [1993] to examine how the Okiek people who, together with neighbouring Maasai and Kipsigis people, occupy Kenya's forested highlands, sharing a long history of hunting, honey gathering, and trading with their Maasai and Kipsigis neighbours. Her theoretical argument is that to categorise identity and cultural practice without exploring local concepts and understandings denies the knowledge and self-reflection that these can offer. Like Somers and Plummer, she is interested in the role of counter-narrative. She examines Okiek imaging of ceremonial tradition, through both discourse and performance, to critically engage wider understandings and uses of the concept of tradition in the English language, as used by 'scholars, administrators and others'. Like Somers and Plummer, she is interested in the use of personal narratives to critically engage wider ontological narratives, exposing the multiple meanings that become apparent. As she states: 'Though often used to characterise other cultures as if the concept were transparent and unproblematic, the existence and
meanings of tradition in other languages and cultures must be investigated, not assumed' [1993: 31].

Kratz’s approach encourages consideration of the role of individual narratives in challenging wider ontological narratives that encapsulate power. She also develops a range of techniques of ‘rhetorical analysis’ which she utilises in her ethnographic analysis to illustrate the multiple meanings around ‘tradition’ for Okiek. This dissertation will adopt some of Kratz’s categories of rhetorical technique to analyse the presentation of the meta-themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative.

Russell Bishop is a New Zealand educational researcher who uses story as a methodological tool to consider issues of power in research into Maori issues, advocating a ‘kaupapa Maori’ approach to research. His book, Collaborative Research Stories: Whakawhanungatanga, comprises the recounting and reflection by five members of an educational research group on their experiences of doing research in Maori contexts. Woven through his 'story' is a sub-plot about the rediscovery through this process of his own whakapapa and, hence, his Maori identity. His study was undertaken over a fifteen-year period and comprises what he refers to as 'a multiple life history of a family diaspora' [1996: 19]. The stories examine how the positioning of researcher challenges a methodological and theoretical framework for research within Maori contexts in Aotearoa/New Zealand today [1996: 11].

Bishop identifies an ethnic revitalisation movement that developed in New Zealand following the rapid urbanisation of Maori after World War. Somers also acknowledges the ethnic revitalisation that occurred internationally over this period and which has contributed significantly to a new sociology of identity through narrative.¹⁸ For Bishop, it is out of this context that a ‘kaupapa Maori’

¹⁸ Hauraki Greenland also refers to the ‘Maori cultural revival’ which occurred over this period in which a crucial consideration was, ‘the ‘dovetailing’ of politics and culture... [which] frequently
emerged in concerns about research methodology. More recently, in the late 1980s and early 1990s, 'this consciousness has featured the revitalisation of Maori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices as a philosophical and educational stance and resistance to the hegemony of dominant Western discourse' [1996: 11].

Similar to Kratz's consideration of Western understandings and uses of 'tradition', Bishop advocates a 'kaupapa Maori' ontological and epistemological approach to research [1996: 13, 25, 64]. According to Bishop, kaupapa Maori critically addresses what Foucault [1980 in Olssen: 1993] refers to as the 'modernist mission of the human sciences, with their beliefs in truth, objectivity, linearity and inevitable progress, which have constituted normality for some and...marginalisation of others.... Kaupapa Maori can be seen as the deconstruction of those hegemonies which have disempowered Maori from controlling and defining their own knowledge within the context of unequal power relations in New Zealand' [1996: 13]. Bishop identifies that marginalisation has been the result of the pursuit of definitions and experiences of unity and generality through the production of 'grand narratives'. He considers how 'kaupapa Maori' approaches to such 'grand narratives' have provided challenges, advocating, like Kratz, that understanding of local perspectives must be investigated, not assumed. Bishop goes the furthest of any author I have found to identifying and investigating the narrative qualities of whakapapa as constitutive of identity.19

---

19 Hauraki Greenland goes some way to acknowledging the role of whakapapa in the constitution of identities for Maori. He identifies that for Maori, Maori political development has been embedded in the interweaving of tradition, whakapapa and dramatic presentation at the marae:

The tenor of Maori politics is more conducive to a study of mood and metaphor, of cultural values and leadership style, rather than to a conventional study of political thought or institutions. For the mode and the circumstance of Maori politics are, respectively, largely oral and frequently marae-situated (Salmond: 1975, Ritchie: 1965) or referenced, either
Bishop uses the metaphor of the *koru* (borrowed from Heshusius: 1994) to describe the process of 'kaupapa Maori' in research, where 'reality is no longer to be understood as truth to be interpreted, but as mutually evolving', in a process which involves the researcher [1996: 28]. This reflects Somers, Plummer and Rapport, all of whom argue that narrative is more than mere representation; it is constitutive of power and identity and shifts according to contexts of wider discourses. For Plummer, Rapport and Kratz, the researcher plays a role in collecting stories and, hence, is part of these wider discourses. Without it, narrativity can be confused with mere chronicle or annals, mere representation of events. The life histories in Bishop's work illustrate how research participants are able to explain their own experiences, not in terms of 'grand theories' or sociological laws about the organisation of the world, but rather in a flax roots approach [Bishop: 1996: 55].

Like Somers, Plummer and Kratz, Bishop also acknowledges the need to listen to counter-narratives, but, he adds, we should not consider individual narratives in terms of binary opposition to colonial narrative, because to do this leaves out as much detail as it includes, 'flattening out' the possibilities for complexity and diversity of human motivations [1996: 58].

Bishop argues that *whakapapa* is an integral cultural medium for Maori to experience knowledge and identity. Historically, *whakapapa* was storytelling as

---

procedure being based on kawa (customary etiquette) and local group consensual decision-making when in non-traditional settings (Walker: 1979). These constitutive elements define the grassroots of Maori politics as drama (vide Goffman) in which participants weave a web of meanings established by tradition and legitimated by common consent. Accordingly, ascribed criteria such as whakapapa (or, briefly, genealogy), age, gender, mana (status in Maori terms), and acquired criteria such as fluency in oratory, demeanour and status, are used by the actor and this combination is frequently decisive for the outcome. Because significant political action proceeds in this expressive (in contrast to a purely instrumental) manner within a cultural frame of reference, it is particularly important to situate the process of politics within its specifically cultural context. Jackson's (1969) study of the selection of candidates for Maori electors, for example, presents a convincing statement on the social 'facility' of whakapapa, te reo (fluency in Maori) and mana tangata (influence by virtue of being male). [1991: 92]
well as mere genealogical chronicle. As Rapport would argue, narrative is more than the 'more superficial details of genealogy' [2000: 84]. The whakapapa of generational figures is often inseparable from the stories and events surrounding these figures [Bishop: 1996: 25]. The whakapapa (tables, chronicles) and the narratives surrounding the characters recorded in whakapapa, become rolled together, blurred, indistinguishable and subject to embellishment.

For Bishop, whakapapa is the paramount narrative for the embedding of identity in time, place and surrounding. As Bishop puts it, as we learn our whakapapa, we learn of our total integration, connectedness and commitment to the world and the need to let go of the focus on self [1996: 236]. Bishop also acknowledges the multiple forms of storytelling in Maori: whakapapa, oral history, raranga korero, hui [1996: 192]. This dissertation addresses the role of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative as it performs this traditional function of whakapapa to embed individual identities and unite these to the collective Ngai Tahu nation, by incorporating particular versions of whakapapa and other meta-themes, in turn adding to the potency of whakapapa as cultural resource.

Summary

This dissertation draws upon a mosaic of theoretical backgrounds as these are applied to the roles of whakapapa management and narrative in the formation of personal and national identities for contemporary Ngai Tahu. What I take from all of these writers is their acknowledgement that narrative is more than mere representation of events. Narrative is constitutive of identity for individuals and for collective national identities. Story and the narrative function of whakapapa are critical to the multiple experiences and understandings of identity. Narrative constitutes identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu. Personal narratives help Ngai Tahu individuals make sense of their own lives. Individuals also locate their own narratives, and indeed their lives, in wider ontological, cultural and public
narratives, and particularly as addressed in this dissertation, in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. Narratives and counter-narratives can also provide a point of resistance to the metanarratives employed by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership. These issues are addressed in Chapters Nine and Ten.

Somers, Plummer, Rapport and Bishop all acknowledge in some way the role of narrative to embed, rather than to simply describe, lives. What Rapport brings to the argument about the function of narrative to embed lives within wider social, historical and cultural plots, is his consideration that the genre of storytelling requires narratives, thus supplying individuals with an evolutionary and chronological context within which to embed their lives and to place new episodes and events: 'Hence, narratives posit an ongoing order, and meaningfulness, between distinct moments or sites of experience' [2000: 76].

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative provides a sequential, traditional story about a history, whakapapa, identity which is united, original, authentic and tribal, as the primary story within which contemporary Ngai Tahu can embed their Maori identities. For some Ngai Tahu, there are multiple hapu and tribal whakapapas and narratives about South Island Maori identities within which their individual lives are already embedded. For others, Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative forms the first and primary story. Plummer, like Rapport and Bishop, also acknowledges that storytelling has not decreased from its oral form in history; it has simply changed form [1995: 23].

In analysing the key themes in contemporary personal and public Ngai Tahu narratives (Chapters Six to Ten), I will rely on the methodological tools of rhetorical analysis offered by Kratz [1993]. Kratz introduces five 'rhetorical techniques' in her own field research in order to consider some ways in which Okiek talk about ceremonial history.
Somers acknowledges the political and economic resources that feed into the construction of wider narratives within which individuals constitute their identities - narratives that are rarely of their own making [1994: 606]. Somers, Plummer, Kratz and Bishop acknowledge the role of counter-narrative to assist individuals to challenge the wider narratives that are imposed upon their lives and identities.

Somers' consideration of the construction and place of metanarrative in the constitution and management of identities forms a central framework for my argument about the key place of whakapapa in the constitution of contemporary Ngai Tahu identities. Just as whakapapa is more than mere representation of essentialist biological identity, so is narrative more than mere representation of identity. Like narrative, whakapapa is omnipresent. Both are representative and constitutive of identity, and, for Ngai Tahu individuals, both indicate multiple levels of complexity that are not found in the wider public narratives about Ngai Tahu Whanui identity.

Where I find Bishop particularly useful for my argument is in his attention to whakapapa as the key within Maoridom to unraveling stories of family history within which individuals embed their lives [1996: 40, 63, 64]. I also draw upon Bishop's acknowledgement that individual narratives are not set in terms of binary opposition to the wider power narratives. The narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals in my research reveal a history of complex and diverse strands of whakapapa and hence identity, as well as the political practices that have often set whanau against whanau, hapu against hapu, and iwi against iwi, something Bishop acknowledges [1996: 50].

For Maori, the key place of narrative is tied up in the privileged place of whakapapa, which is indistinguishable from the range of narratives and raranga korero in which it is embedded [Bishop: 1996: 25, 64]. In the understandings and experiences of Ngai Tahu, whakapapa is more than genealogy.
It is through representation of the meanings attached to history, *whakapapa*, places of ancestral significance, and political purpose in the narratives of contemporary Ngai Tahu, that I have been able to contextualise the wider public narratives presented by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership in the understandings of identity for individuals.
Chapter four

Blurred entities: Whakapapa as (meta)narrative and metaphor

| whakapapa | genealogy, cultural identity  
|           | Book of Chronicles, family tree |
| whakapapa | tete-a-tete, intimate talk  
|           | [T. Ryan: 1995: 305] |

From time immemorial, the whakapapa of our people has been the essence of our whole being. We are deeply aware of this and of the nature, the confidentiality and the spirituality of our work. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 20]

*Whakapapa is the essence of our identity; the DNA of our bloodline.* [Ngai Tahu individual: Crown Apology *Hui, Onuku marae*: November 28, 1998]

*Whakapapa is DNA. It is the adhesive that binds us.* [T. O'Regan: September 1998]

Introduction

This chapter examines whakapapa, the omnipresent and most potent cultural resource for contemporary Ngai Tahu. Whakapapa is fundamental to all 'framing' of identity for Ngai Tahu.¹ Whakapapa is the resource that determines

¹ ‘You can’t be a Ngai Tahu unless you have whakapapa’ [Cath Brown in H. O'Regan: 2001: 53].
membership and in turn, manages and governs Ngai Tahu Whanui. It is used to set up boundaries of inclusion and exclusion into the new legal-political identity. In their narratives about history, place, political practice and identity, 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals frame whakapapa in diverse and complex ways. At any given time and setting that I have observed, a range of framings of whakapapa are called into play by contemporary Ngai Tahu in order to assert a range of identities. Management of whakapapa by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership incorporates the complexities associated with this concept in order to frame, manage and govern contemporary South Island Maori identities. Which identities come to be most salient for Ngai Tahu individuals and for Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership depends on a range of historical and political factors and understandings of whakapapa. Subsequent chapters will trace the themes of time and place and the political practices within which framings of whakapapa are interwoven by individuals and the leadership.

This is my story of what I have observed as the multiple, complex and contingent understandings and practices associated with this potent cultural resource - whakapapa - how I see whakapapa implicated both in understandings of identity (individual and collective) and in political practice for contemporary Ngai Tahu. For Ngai Tahu whakapapa is metanarrative.

What was whakapapa historically?

Traditionally, whakapapa was stored in the memories of selected individuals - enscribed in the actual 'bodies' recorded in the whakapapa. It was passed on by the process of sharing oral narrative at the marae, hence known by all connected to one another at the level of whana, hapu, pa.\(^2\) It was knowledge not meant to be circulated beyond the marae, as the following authors outline:

---

Hana O'Regan writes, 'If you don't have the whakapapa you can't be Kai Tahu in terms of descent.... whakapapa is a necessity - the crucial factor to be Kai Tahu' [2001: 55].

\(^2\) There are many other tangible symbols of whakapapa found at the marae. For Ngai Tahu the wharenui and panels of weaving, takutu are both central to the symbolism of whakapapa.
Not only did all Ngai Tahu families ensure that their family whakapapa was retained, and therefore that all individuals had a whakapapa, but all senior members of the families attended whare wananga to ensure the retention of tribal whakapapa and its continuance into the future. [T. Tau: 2001: 18]

From a Maori perspective whakapapa is not just knowledge to be collected and maintained for oneself, but for the betterment of the group, for the knowledge belongs to the group. [Bishop: 1996: 63]

In tribal hui (meetings) Tawhiao’s vision of salvation and interpretation of the history of the Kingitanga gave strength to generations. The belief system and values of the Kingitanga were enshrined in their own oral narratives, transmitted on the marae (traditional tribal meeting grounds); here knowledge was owned by the people, it could not be appropriated by outsiders. In Land Court narratives, there is little hint of the political and spiritual significance of the Kingitanga to the people of Waikato-Maniapoto. [Parsonson: 2001: 40]

Eruera Stirling, a Ngai Tahu kaumatua remembers the process in the following excerpt from his life history, as recorded by Ann Salmond:

At night the older children were allowed to lie down in the meeting-house and listen to the elders telling stories of the past, but one child from each family was chosen especially by his grandparents to take the family whakapapa and to carry on the history of his ancestors....

In my young days the tohungas, the last old men of the schools of learning still came to our marae and talked with the people about land, genealogies, boundaries and the works of the ancestors. They were the survivors, the men of senior descent who had been chosen to carry the tribal treasures and pass them down to future generations, heke haere, heke haere, on and down...

In each generation young men were dedicated in the Kirieke School of Learning to take the history of the ancestors of Te Whanau-a-Maru, and the elders taught them to share their knowledge with others, not to hide it away.

When the people gathered in the whare runanga - grandparent, parents, children and grandchildren - the chosen men came to discuss those things that could rightly be shared with all the tribe, and the work of our ancestors was remembered, and their mana and mauri were passed down. Today our people are forgetting the customs of
the old world, and yet the day will come when they will search in every place for their tribal background! That is why I have written some of the teachings of my great-grandpeople in this book, so that future generations can find them and say... [1980: 226-228]

Whakapapa knowledge was a person's way of knowing their identity in terms of connection to the ancestors and kin one lived with. In order to know the place of one's whanau and associated rights to land and mana, one had to know about one's linear connection to ancestors and lateral connections to other individuals and whanau. Identity was relative to the identities of others and dependent on knowledge of relationships. One knew the relational networks by living within them and by listening to the knowledge of ancestors passed on through generations - one knew one's place with respect to whanau, hapu, pa, kainga, other hapu, and the surrounding environment; and one remembered and maintained both a sense of identity and of relationships through memorising whakapapa:

In this way the language reminds us that we are part of each other. [Bishop: 1996: 216]

Its uses were very much about keeping track of kin relationships, i.e., relationships to others who shared descent with common ancestors, and with the surrounding natural environment - whanaungatanga:

The recantation and recitation of whakapapa can be seen most simply as the ritual which realizes the Maori world view and places people in that world...

the way in which the Maori world is ordered stems from whakapapa and, as such, it is imperative that an individual can connect by kinship through this method to the world around them. As in most other cultures, the Maori world begins with a creation myth and, by extension, so too does whakapapa.

The creation myth is designed for the sole purpose of giving the individual a context and place in the world. [T. Tau: 2001: 8, 18]
In traditional narratives, the prime purpose was to record relationships among the people, to tie everyone in by whakapapa, and to honour the mana of the great ancestors of the past. [Parsonson: 2001: 27]

Relationships among people remain the key to narratives of the years of the nineteenth century in which the lives of those who spoke in court and those of their senior relatives had been lived. [Parsonson: 2001: 34]

*Whakapapa* and associated narratives were also used to identify and manage hierarchies of power within collectivities such as *hapu* and *whanau*. From this stored knowledge, individuals knew about the distribution of land rights, leadership rights and speaking rights - seniority and status as aspects of identity. These were the instrumental uses associated with *whakapapa*:

As all things in the Maori world are ordered by whakapapa, the way in which our people behave follows accordingly. Essentially, whakapapa is the system that orders knowledge and behaviour in the Maori world. [Tau: 2001: 8]

As Atholl Anderson writes:

If whakapapa constituted the trellis of traditions, then growing over it was the foliage of incident and narrative, trimmed as each generation, each hapu and many individuals saw fit. Since the late nineteenth century, a simplistic extermination model of southern Maori history has been encouraged to flourish, at least in the popular literature; Ngati Mamoe wiped out Waiataha and then Ngai Tahu exterminated Ngati Mamoe. In more recent times, as the study of traditional history has cut further into its rootstock of primary documents, the competing aspirations in the past (and the present) of the different regions and of the many iwi and hapu of Ngai Tahu Whanui, have become exposed once more to view... [A. Anderson: 1998: 62]

As Evison writes,

---

3 Evison provides a historical example of the adjudication of land dispute based on the hierarchy of *whakapapa*:

Mautai, veteran of the Ngati Toa wars and leader of the Wairewa community, had signed Hamilton’s Akaroa Deed in 1856. But he had never agreed to sell Kaitorete. He had not
...the tribal elders adjudicated on matters of dispute, largely on the basis of whakapapa (genealogy) and precedent. Thus the memorising of whakapapa and tribal history was of vital importance in safeguarding land rights and in the dispensation of justices. [1993: 8]

Ann Parsonson writes about the uses of whakapapa to determine land rights in the Maori Land Court in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries:

In court each group of claimants was obliged to establish the nature and the history of their own relationship with the land .... Take tupuna (rights to land passed on through whakapapa (genealogies)) was thus the main take (basis of rights transferred from one generation to the next) brought before the court, linked always with noho tuturu (‘continuous occupation’, as the court put it, over many generations), and with mana and kaha or atete (‘power to hold’ or, as Wahanui expressed it, ‘the power I have held to maintain my position’).

Take tupuna required the naming to the court of particular tupuna (ancestors) from whom land rights were derived. This itself meant that claimants had to consider how to interpret their past to the court.... Then, as the lands came before the court for further division, claimants and various counter-claimants each gave the names of tupuna under parts of the land whose rohe (boundaries) they gave, supporting their take (basis of claims) with whakapapa....

All those who stood before the court gave a great deal of evidence about their ‘occupation’ of the land.... Only those entitled by descent had such knowledge. [Parsonson: 2001: 25-31]

Hence, storage of whakapapa in memory was for relational and instrumental purposes. The same applies today, although the forms and purposes have altered with shifts in social and political practices. The relational of citizenship

signed Kemp's Deed, or Mantell's receipts, or accepted money from either Kemp or Mantell. He recited his whakapapa from the time of Mako. "Kaitorete is mine," said Mautai. He claimed the same right that Metehau had asserted at Tuahiwi - to hold on to his own right to the land despite the fact that others had sold their rights. Mautai's position had been described by Edward Shortland in his advice to Berard in 1844 -

Individuals and families will be found to have a peculiar claim to those parts which are in occupation of, or have at any former time been in possession of, or made tapu to, an ancestor. [Shortland: 1851: 290-1 in Evison: 1993: 419]
has replaced the relational of kin. The building up of written ‘files’ of whakapapa and associated information about land ownership began in the 1920s for Ngai Tahu, with the writing of South Island Maori whakapapa lists, and continued through the twentieth century culminating in the building up of archives in the 1980s for the Ngai Tahu claims to the Waitangi Tribunal. Prior to this, the practical uses associated with whakapapa knowledge relied on its storage in the memories of a selected few rangatira [Walker in King: 1992: 23, Stirling in Salmond: 1980].

Whakapapa still functions to order relationships, hierarchies of leadership and land rights, but for contemporary Ngai Tahu, whakapapa is understood, organised and used in different forms. These new forms correlate to uses of whakapapa information embedded in political developments, particularly around land claims issues and the development of the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’. Who is included and who is excluded from membership in this nation is dependent on the proof, registration and storage of individual whakapapa. This information is not given. It has to be collected and represented in a roll. The gatekeepers of South Island whakapapa information have shifted from the rangatira of whanau, hapu and iwi of nineteenth century, to the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and the Crown, as outlined in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. These issues are to be addressed further in Chapter Five.

So...what is Whakapapa?

...the mandate of a historical sociology of concept formation [is] to challenge the power of a metanarrative by revealing its social naturalism to be itself nothing

---

4 According to Andrew Erueiti and Alan Ward, ‘In the Ngai Tahu claims of 1987-89 the practice was developed of hearing Maori elders present their arguments and assertions, largely based on traditions passed by word of mouth, but of not subjecting them to detailed cross-examination. This practice, adopted largely out of respect for the elders, allows communities to express their long-held grievances and deep feelings but it tends to limit opportunity for the oral tradition to be fully explored and tested, including the elders’ understandings both of their particular group’s experience and of their connections and common interests with other groups’ [2001: 170].
more, and nothing less, than a cultural schema constructed by historical practice. [Somers: 1999: 136]

According to Ryan's 'Revised Dictionary of Modern Maori', 'whaka' is a prefix which gives the meaning of 'to do' or 'cause to do' a particular action. 'Whaka' means 'towards', and 'papa' means earth mother. For Williams, 'whaka' is 'towards, 'in the direction of', 'causative prefix; probably connected with the previous word.' [Ryan: 1989]. Williams' dictionary does not contain a definition for the word 'whakapapa'. 'Whaka' is defined as 'causative prefix; probably connected with the previous word' and 'papa' is defined as 'a name for the Earth, generally used in relation to Rangi' [1989]. Evison defines whakapapa as 'genealogy, cultural identity' [1993: glossary]. Ryan's most recent 'Reed Dictionary of Modern Maori' defines whakapapa as 'genealogy; cultural identity; Book of Chronicles; family tree' [1995: 305]. Ryan also defines whakapapa as 'tête-à-tête, intimate talk' [1995: 305].

I will use these definitions as a starting point for my analysis. Whakapapa for non-Maori is quite simply, genealogy: the listing/recording of family descent in a linear fashion through time 'toward' the common ancestral father/mother, in the case of Ngai Tahu toward one of the kaumatua listed in the 1925 'Blue Book', recorded as alive in 1848. The ancestry shared by all contemporary Ngai Tahu is to the eponymous ancestor, Tahu Potiki. Contemporary Ngai Tahu do not share whakapapa to one another through the 1925 lists, what they share is a right of each member to claim whakapapa to at least one of the kaumatua named in the 1925 'Blue Book'. Since whakapapa as genealogy is the representation of a

---

5 A Dictionary of Maori Language by Williams does not include 'whakapapa'. However, Williams defines kautilumi as 'recite, proclaim, declare aloud old legends, genealogies, etc'.

6 Genealogy is defined in the Oxford dictionary as 'list of ancestors; study of family pedigrees'.

7 Genealogy is particularly complex for Maori, as descent and associated rights follow both male and female lines [A. Anderson: 1998: 57].
direct descent line, contemporary Ngai Tahu share only one _whakapapa_ – to Tahu Potiki. As a Ngai Tahu _kaumatua_ put it:\(^8\)

_Traditionally, the thing that you do is to make contact, and the enquiry is to who do we belong? You trace back to a common ancestor.... We are becoming a mob until we start comparing notes and work out who we are; relationships, our links with each other. but when we call ourselves Ngai Tahu, we know if we go back far enough, we'll find a common family tie, or hapu tie, or whatever, we go back to Tahu Potiki himself who is the Ngai Tahu ancestor who links us all together._ [Life History: August 1997]

The goal of my dissertation is not to define _whakapapa_. Its omnipresence and multiple and contextual understandings and uses by Ngai Tahu actors make it impossible to define in absolute, timeless terms. So, just as Heshius argues, the realities represented by _whakapapa_ should not be understood as truths to be interpreted but should be recognised as mutually evolving in the forms, understandings and uses brought to it by the individuals involved, in this case members of Ngai Tahu Whanui [1994 in Bishop: 1996: 28]. Just as Kratz argues of tradition, I have found that _whakapapa_ is at once absolute and differentiated in perspective, personal and collective, part of ethnic identity and individual identity. Not summarised in a single word or phrase, it combines temporal representation, shared and personal experience, and existential attribution into a potent and variable cultural resource.

_Whakapapa_ is a resource, subject to a variety of usages and understandings in the achievement of outcomes. Its uses do not stand alone, like nature, irrespective of the peculiarities of time, space, political practice, or the understandings individuals bring to these. Therefore, because both its uses and its understandings are embedded in shifting and dynamic contexts of time, place and political practice, it defies singular definition. The particular and varied

\(^8\) Another 'experienced Ngai Tahu' man, very involved in the political activities of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and of his own _runanga_ reiterates this point in an interview [December 2001].
definitions and understandings associated with whakapapa for contemporary Ngai Tahu are themselves outcomes of particular conceptual authorities - gatekeepers. Whakapapa, by its strategic and situated uses, is attributed the power to define\(^9\) the conceptual basis for established hierarchies of power and the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion for contemporary collective identities, while these situated uses are sheltered from critique by the existential attribution associated with whakapapa by Ngai Tahu individuals. For contemporary Ngai Tahu, whakapapa is metanarrative, ontological and epistemological gatekeeper [Somers: 1999: 136], that is, it is central to a world view and to all philosophies and processes of management of identities for contemporary Ngai Tahu.

Finding out about the potency of whakapapa – my story

When I began my doctoral research in 1996, I already had some understanding of the role of whakapapa in the facilitation of kin-based cohesion for Ngai Tahu toward the political goal of mobilisation as an iwi for the negotiation of a land claims settlement and achievement of a legal identity. My 1991 research introduced the possibilities for whakapapa to be utilised as what Giddens defined as a 'non-allocative' resource open to political usage. I found that access to whakapapa knowledge made possible a binding together of past and present, allowing for more knowledgeable management of a projected future by way of access to stored and codified information pertaining to the members of the tribe and their distinction from other tribes. I suggested that if this knowledge of whakapapa is accumulated, stored and disseminated in a clear and rational manner, the possibility of efficient administration of matters concerning the iwi is increased if asserted as part of a case about historical rights, duties and claims.

\(^9\) According to John Law, knowledge is 'a material matter but also a matter of, organising and ordering those materials' [1992: 381]. This applies to whakapapa.
as separate from the rights, duties and claims of other tribes. These issues will be addressed further in Chapter Five.

At that time, my knowledge and understanding of whakapapa as a cultural resource was limited. Apart from the role of whakapapa as chronicles of descent, in the form of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board list of beneficiaries and in the recitation of whakapapa that was presented in the Waitangi Tribunal claims, I was unaware of the omnipresent nature of whakapapa, of its metanarrative properties. Yet, when I began my doctoral research, I knew there was some form of adhesive that bound contemporary Ngai Tahu to one another. I was also aware that shared history, cultural practice, key places of ancestral significance and 'The Claim' played significant roles in this binding together of contemporary Ngai Tahu.

At this point I was intent on the task of listing and defining contemporary Ngai Tahu cultural practices. However, I eventually abandoned this exercise, as the list became exhaustive. I began to strike difficulty in quantifying cultural practices but always, the omnipresence of this concept whakapapa, was something I could not escape, as the following excerpt from my field notes sums up:

In every setting, every discussion, whakapapa is referred to or exists in the networks connecting individuals and collectivities. [Field notes: June 1999]

I knew there was something at play, holding and often facilitating the complex interplay of political action and 'Ngai Tahu culture' - a 'connective tissue' that seemed to be part of both 'traditional' identities and ways of doing things as well as part of the new 'corporate Ngai Tahu' – the Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation; on some levels, shifting, while on other levels, staying the same.

This became more apparent to me each time I attempted to explain my thesis question to any Ngai Tahu individual. I would only need to suggest that I was
looking at whakapapa as it is utilised as a resource, with political and situated uses and understandings, and I would meet a 'freeze'. The following excerpts from my field notes illustrate this:

In a brief conversation with [a young male (30-something) employee of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu] today I outlined to him what my thesis was attempting to look at. As soon as I mentioned that I am looking at the role of whakapapa in contemporary Ngai Tahu political structures, he quickly responded, 'the problem with the current political structure is precisely that it is not based on whakapapa'. What does this mean? Blanket assertions like this are made by individuals: something either has whakapapa or it doesn't; it is either new, corporate and somehow devoid of whakapapa, or it is based in tradition and therefore possesses whakapapa. Once again, there was no attempt to stand outside the analysis and define exactly what is meant by whakapapa or which aspects of whakapapa might be there, and which might not; how whakapapa's uses may have changed from some original, historical time in which whakapapa was perceived and used differently. [Field notes from Waitangi Day, Onuku: February 2000]

In my meeting with [another young, educated Ngai Tahu male (30-something) employee of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu] today, he reasserted that he sees the problem with the contemporary structure is that it is devoid of whakapapa. He stated, 'the real power of Ngai Tahu's corporate structure lies in Pakeha hands'; implying that those with whom the power actually lies are non-Ngai Tahu, non-Maori working within the financial arm of the structure, making the structure lack whakapapa. Therefore, he feels that there is no longer a tribe. What exists now is a corporate body. [Notes from interview: March 2000]

As I have found, Ngai Tahu individuals do not consider or identify whakapapa as cultural resource, embedded in political practices through time. My participant observation made abundantly clear the extent of challenge from Ngai Tahu individuals, whanau, hapu and runanga to how the new legal-political structure and governing body were operating. The new structures were often viewed by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' as detached from their 'grassroots' - the runanga and marae.
All Ngai Tahu who have contributed to this research believe that membership in the new structure has its basis in whakapapa. This implies that the requirement for membership is whakapapa to one of the kaumatua alive in 1848, as listed in the 1925 'Blue Book'. Hence, all contemporary members are joined to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and to one another through whakapapa. Yet while many displayed overt criticism of the administrative infrastructure of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, when I would ask why, the response would often be that the new structure is detached from, or not built upon, whakapapa. While there was acknowledgement that whakapapa is the common denominator, linking all members to the whole and to one another, this response framed whakapapa as inseparable from all its metaphorical associations with the natural world.

These associations link whakapapa with spiritualism, naturalism, and kin relationships, framing these as qualities that are lacking from the culture of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. In such statements, whakapapa is never actually defined; it is attributed all the qualities of its metaphorical associations. Individuals imply the contemporary leadership and management structures are devoid of these qualities. Often my suggestions about the positioning of whakapapa in political practice would be met with pitying looks by individuals whom I felt perceived me as another white academic in need of understanding that whakapapa is beyond investigation; something that I cannot possibly understand because I do not possess it. These reactions by Ngai Tahu individuals reinforce my analysis of whakapapa as metanarrative.

This understanding of whakapapa as cultural core is so incredibly strong among all Ngai Tahu individuals I have come across - pervading across all other distinctions of identity - geographic place, degree of involvement in corporate settings, age, education, gender. The unshakeable belief among Ngai Tahu individuals that whakapapa encapsulates blood, body, lateral and historical networks of relationship and the blood and body of those one is related to, as well as whakapapa as connector to place and natural environment is the
strongest cultural resource. Culture constitutes those patterned ways of thinking and acting that are so taken for granted that they become part of one's being, a being that is attributed essential biological origins.

The young educated Ngai Tahu who work within the management structure - the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu -, are particularly interesting to talk to about the political uses of whakapapa. While they are able to stand outside and evaluate other aspects of historical and political developments for Ngai Tahu, whakapapa is still tapu - outside the realm of academic investigation, at least by a non-Ngai Tahu academic. They do not question that the present outcomes for South Island Maori, have been because of a united, homogeneous tribal whole of members united by whakapapa. At the mere suggestion of my attempts to place whakapapa within the realm of investigation, to problematise it, I would receive the same 'freeze'. I am reminded of a conversation I had with one young 'experienced Ngai Tahu'. In this interview I explained where my thesis topic was moving at the time, how I was coming to the point of identifying whakapapa as possibly the most potent cultural resource, used strategically to achieve political outcomes and to set up new categories of identity. He just looked at me blankly and replied, 'Whakapapa is pure biology' [Interview: August 1999].

But even while the omnipresence of whakapapa continued to be evident in my participant observations, for a long time I was still puzzled by the complex relationship between whakapapa, history, key ancestral places, political practice and the construction and understandings of identity. I could not place whakapapa in a box and quantify it or compare its uses and understandings across settings because I somehow realised, although I was unable to articulate it for a long time, that, while whakapapa seemed to pervade every setting, it also evaded any singular shape or definition. My inability to pinpoint an absolute shape or definition was due to the way that Ngai Tahu individuals incorporate whakapapa into their actions and narratives in such an unquestioned and
omnipresent way. The following excerpt from my field notes describes this stage in my research:

So, it has finally occurred to me that my dilemma of grappling with complex events and networks is precisely a mirror of what whakapapa, history and identities is about for contemporary Ngai Tahu. What I am attempting to do is to rationalise, linearise, democratise that which cannot be by the individuals involved. This is precisely what Ngai Tahu Corporate has been attempting to do since the mid-1980s. The corporate leadership has been attempting to clearly document and delineate whakapapa to order its blurred and messy history for the purposes of surveillance, tidy administration to in turn, meet Crown requirements to present a Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens in order to achieve a settlement with the Crown; to impose order on chaos, to routinise whakapapa for management purposes. But the clear lines of whakapapa always get undone by personal histories, and this poses problems. [Field notes: February, 2000]

**Whakapapa as metanarrative**

In my observations, whakapapa is everywhere for Ngai Tahu. It is fundamental to identity, implicated in understandings of past, present and future, incorporating all time, interwoven with understandings of kin relationship, significant ancestral places, and utilised as a resource in political practice. As Ngai Tahu academic, Whakapapa is congealed social arrangements. Te Maire Tau writes:

> ...whakapapa makes utilitarian the concept Pakeha know as myth. Whakapapa is essentially the paradigm of the Maori world view. Time, space, emotions, plants and animals are all understood by way of whakapapa. [2001: 8]

**Whakapapa** for Ngai Tahu is both spirituality/belief system and the process of connecting to kin, ancestors, the natural world and the world of the gods. It holds the preeminent position as ontology for contemporary Maori, as the following quotations articulate:
The knowledge of whakapapa was protected as the essence of each iwi. It gave iwi their link with atua, whenua and tipuna – it is the very source of our mana. ['Te Karaka': Summer 2000: 12]

Whakapapa is the whole basis of the Maori culture. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

Whakapapa is time from beginning to end: places, resources, irrespective of time. [lit] comes from our ancestors. [Ngai Tahu kaumatua: Interview: April 1997]

Despite language loss and cultural deprivation, we have been able to hold together a cultural core of whakapapa and identity. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 25-26]

Whakapapa is fundamental to a Maori world-view. [Bishop: 1996: 63]

Because ours is a reality in which we must face the past to find answers to the future.... Every Maori has a sense of history, of whakapapa. [Ihimaera: 1993: 17]

As a resource, whakapapa is omnipresent, which contributes to its potency as cultural resource. This is encapsulated in the following statement from Te Maire Tau. Te Maire acknowledges that key to whakapapa, are debates and differences of opinion, but that underlying this is the omnipresent 'framework of whakapapa'. Whakapapa is always the underlying ontology. This statement parallels those of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' whom I have observed challenging the uses of a particular management of whakapapa to unite historical territorial claims, while in turn claiming that their own family whakapapa is special, to be used by no one else – tapu:

Differences of opinion always occur, but the key point in whakapapa is that the differences occur on agreed assumptions. One may argue over the specificity of descent lines, but the debate occurs within the framework of whakapapa and, as such, whakapapa implies the discussion of descent and the notions of tuakana and taina. [2001: 18]
Whakapapa is at the centre of all definitions, uses and understandings of identity, history, place and political practice for contemporary Ngai Tahu.\textsuperscript{10} Yet, it seems to escape any singular definition. I have observed however, that while it is omnipresent and defies singular definition, its forms, understandings and uses vary across time, place and political context, to play into multiple, shifting and complex considerations of identity for individuals. It is for these reasons that I identify whakapapa as metanarrative, the most potent cultural resource [Somers 1999, 1994]. As Te Maire Tau [2001], Atholl Anderson [1998], Russell Bishop [1996] and Sir Tipene O'Regan [1993, 1991] identify, whakapapa cannot be separated from the contexts within which it is defined and used.

As outlined in Chapter Three, Margaret Somers defines a metanarrative as a cultural form that conjoins narrative with themes of naturalism; that is, a metanarrative is rhetorically and metaphorically associated with forms of biological determinism in the way that gender is associated with biology, for example. Metanarratives are then the most potent type of knowledge culture because they are not accountable to the same standards of proof that apply to empirical claims; their legitimacy is not based on empirical evidence but on the givenness of their seemingly naturalistic, 'preconstructed' or 'pre-suppositional' qualities. They are thus insulated from serious challenge [1999: 130-131].

\textsuperscript{10} As the following excerpts from two Ngai Tahu women illustrate:

The kaikorero all affirm the strength and sense of security that whakapapa gives them. It provides them with protection, it is a safeguard, their poutokomanawa. Whakapapa is the untouchable, steadfast element of their Kai Tahu identity. It doesn't matter what anyone does to you, or what you may do to yourself - the whakapapa will always be there to connect you to your people and place [H. O'Regan: 2001: 54].

Whakapapa is inalienable - it's not like money, it's not like land - it's not like anything else ... You are born with it and you die with it. It's special. It's very special. [Mahanara Walsh in H. O'Regan: 2001: 54]
In both understanding and presentation by contemporary Ngai Tahu, the metanarrative of whakapapa is removed, from any temporal, political or spatial locales to 'an ontological condition of being natural and thus unquestionably "given in the nature of things"' [Somers: 1999: 130-131].

In both its framing and uses by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership and its Ngai Tahu individuals, whakapapa is framed within themes of naturalism, blurring the social and political with the biological. As Te Maire Tau writes:

In a wider sense, whakapapa is an attempt to impose a relationship between iwi and the natural world. Individuals within iwi are able to link themselves to flora, fauna, minerals and celestial elements by whakapapa. Thus, whakapapa is also a metaphysical framework to place oneself within the world....

As in most other cultures, the Maori world begins with a creation myth and, by extension, so too does whakapapa.

The creation myth is designed for the sole purpose of giving the individual a context and place in the world.... In Pohuhu’s account, Rangi and Papa represent the heavens and earth. The two copulate and beget the principal gods known to all iwi. These gods take control of particular domains such as the seas, forests, stars, volcanic activity and other realms intrinsic to the Maori world belief.

It is from these gods that all Maori elements, both tangible and intangible, spring. Moreover, humanity descends from the copulation of Rangi and Papa, and as such, enables the claim of kinship by humankind to the gods. The vehicle employed to trace kinship to the gods is through an individual’s whakapapa. [2001: 8-9]

Because 'papa' means earth, in association with the original earth mother, 'Papatuanuku', whakapapa means descent from earth [Ryan: 1989, Williams: 1985]. The following excerpts illustrate this association. The first, a published narrative about the history and origins of Ngai Tahu whakapapa, illustrates whakapapa's deep associations with history, the origin of all species, nature, biology and spiritualism. The waiata parallels genealogies of 'begats' characteristic of the Bible:11

11 I am reminded of an excerpt from Benedict Anderson:
Raki had several wives, one of which was Papatuanuku, the Earth Mother. From Raki’s marriages came animals, birds, the mountains and people as well as numerous departmental gods. So through genealogy humans were linked to all of the natural world; its creatures and its elements as well as the divine. [Barr: 1996: 3]

Kai Tahu’s eponymous ancestor is Tahu Potiki. This well-known tribal waiata traces his ancestry back to the divine parents, Raki and Papatuanuku:

These are the children of Rangi and Papatuanuku
Some now inhabit the world of light
Some have descended
To live in the human realm
You have released
The heavens which stand above
The four winds which draw
Towards you
And the descendants of Haere mai tua

These narratives, like... novels and newspapers..., are set in homogenous, empty time. Hence their frame is historical and their setting sociological. This is why so many autobiographies begin with the circumstances of parents and grandparents, for which the autobiographer can have only circumstantial, textual evidence; and why the biographer is at pains to record the calendrical, A.D. dates of two biographical events which his or her subject can never remember: birth-day and death-day....

Nothing affords a sharper reminder of this narrative’s modernity than the opening of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. For the Evangelist gives us an austere list of thirty males successively begetting one another, from the patriarch Abraham down to Jesus Christ. (Only once is a woman mentioned, not because she is a begetter, but because she is a non-Jewish Moabite). No dates are given for any of Jesus’s forebears, let alone sociological, cultural, psychological or political information about them. This narrative style (which also reflects the rupture-in-Bethlehem become memory) was entirely reasonable to the sainted genealogist because he did not conceive of Christ as an historical ‘personality’, but only as the true Son of God....

As with modern persons, so it is with nations. Awareness of being imbedded in secular, serial time, with all its implications of continuity, yet of ‘forgetting’ the experience of this continuity – product of the ruptures of the late eighteenth century – engenders the need for a narrative of ‘identity’. Yet between narratives of person and nation there is a central difference of employment. In the secular story of the ‘person’ there is a beginning and an end.... Nations, however, have no clearly identifiable births, and their deaths, if they ever happen, are never natural. Because there is no Originator, the nation’s biography cannot be written evangelically, ‘down time’, through a long procreative change of begettings. [1991: 204-205]

Benedict Anderson also writes, ‘Out of this estrangement comes a conception of personhood, identity’ [1991: 204].
Who descended into the earth
To our ancestors Hounuku
Houraki, Houtea, Houmea
And Uenuku, who lived in Hawaiiki and begat
Paieka, who rode the whale
To the shores of Aotearoa
And bore Whatiua Te Ramarama
Who died at Tokatikititi
But who bore Porouraki
Of the Ngati Porou
Whose son was Tawhiri ki te Raki
Who begat Raki Papa kia Tane
Who begat Rakitane who coupled with
The great chieftainess, Hine Matiora
From who comes Hinekaitaki
The weeping daughter
From whom comes the supreme head of the Kai Tahu people
Behold the birth of life!
[T. Tau et al, in Barr: 1996: 3-5]

The following waiata, recently compiled, 'is one of the most complex waiata composed for the purpose of informing the child of its origins and whakapapa'. This version was penned by Te Aritaui Pitama in the 1950s and was revived by Ms Aroha Reriti-Crofts during the 1980s as a waiata to be used by Ngai Tahu. Again, the citing of whakapapa encapsulates considerations of history, original identity, kin with the physical landscape and the gods:

My darling child, my jewel, precious and beautiful
A jewel whose lines stem from afar as Murihiku
We, this party of travellers in time and space,
Have journeyed to you
We are descendants of the lines of Hounuku,
Houraki and Houatea who eventually begot Uenuku,
father of Paieka. Paieka, it was who bore Tahu Potiki,
ancestor of Ngai Tahu.
My mountain that stands supreme is Aorangi
And these are the canoes from which our descent lines allows you and I to claim:
Uruao, of Rakaihautu,
Taiera, of Tama Ahua,
Mahaanui, for the descendants of Maui
and Takitimu, canoe of the descendants of Kahungunu.
[‘Te Karaka’: Spring 1997: 58]
The following consideration of the fundamental place of *whakapapa* for identity comes from a Ngai Tahu *kaumatua*. He identifies the interweaving of *whakapapa*’s meanings and uses with history, kin, spirituality and power:

The *whakapapa* that ties me to my tupuna is also the structure that orders my history and that of my people. It is the conduit that carries their spiritual force - their *wairua* - to me in the present and by which I pass it forward to future generations. [T. O’Regan: 1993: 338]

Bishop, an academic who has recently come to know his own Ngai Tahu *whakapapa*, demonstrates the integral and complex interweaving of *whakapapa*, physical environment, original identity, the biological determinism of one's physical self, language and kin in an understanding of Ngai Tahu identity:

Identity is part of us. Our mountain, our river, our island are us. We are part of them and they are part of us. We know this in a bodily way, more than in a recitation of names. More than in the actual linking of names, we know it because we are blood, bodily related. We are of the same bones (*iwi*), of the same people (*iwi*). We are from the same pregnancies (*hapu*) and are of the same sub-tribe (*hapu*). We are of the same family (*whanau*), the family into which we were born (*whanau*). We were nurtured by the same lands (*whenua*), by the same placenta (*whenua*). In this way the language reminds us that we are part of each other. So when we introduce ourselves as whanaunga, we are introducing part of one to another part of the same oneness. Knowing who we are is a somatic acknowledgement of our connectedness with and commitment to our surroundings, human and non-human. [Bishop: 1996: 216]

The following excerpts from what I refer to as Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, highlight the associations of *whakapapa* with physical and essential being, as well as spiritualism and kin relationships in the considerations of identity for Ngai Tahu:

Our tipuna knew of the power of DNA. It is the physical manifestation of *whakapapa*. ['Te Karaka': Summer 2000: 12]
Once the speaker has established his or her identity, the next stage is to evoke one's ancestors from one's whakapapa and from the various groups gathered upon the marae or the area in which the whaikorero takes place. Why does one turn to the dead? Because Maori make no distinction between the spiritual and secular worlds... whakapapa is a conduit from which all orators must draw the ihi and wehi of their tipuna into themselves, thus allowing an orator to communicate between both zones. [T. Tau: 1997: 49]

To those who work within whakapapa, it is the heart, the soul, the very being of the new structure, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. [Manager of Whakapapa Unit: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report 1996: 25]

Ereura's Teachings came out of a chiefly tradition, centred on genealogy and politics and shaped by the powers of the ancestors - mana, ihi, wehi and tapu. [Salmond: 1980: 245]

Many academics in the context of research into Maori issues have categorised whakapapa along with a range of cultural concepts such as tikanga, tradition, and tino rangatiratanga as somehow spiritual and hence, tapu. Therefore, whakapapa and its study are viewed by many of those who possess it and those who study it as things that should be accessible only to those who hold it - Maori - and never to be used for the purpose of knowledge for knowledge's sake, hence, beyond the purview of academic investigation. Te Maire Tau espouses this approach to the study of whakapapa:

The oral traditions known as whakapapa have suffered as a result of this particular perspective or “gaze”. Western historians and scholars have continued to analyse whakapapa as if it were subject to the same constraints and understandings as a written genealogy, and as if it served the same purpose....

Acknowledging that the Western gaze is severely limited in its application to whakapapa is extremely important.... The distortion of whakapapa, and all oral histories, created by the Western gaze is hard to dispel. The question has become one of proving the validity of whakapapa in an academic context. [2001: 8-9, 17-18]
Somers identifies this feature of metanarratives as protected from the rigours of objective academic investigation [1999: 130-131]. The following examples illustrate the privileged place of whakapapa in academic research:

Its ihi (power) was such that it was regarded as tapu. ['Te Karaka': Summer 2000: 12]

When you learn anything Maori, it has to be taken seriously. It involves the laws of tapu: Genealogies, history, traditional knowledge, carving, preparing flax, in fact, nature itself. Tapu is something that teaches you to respect the whole of nature. [Ngai Pehairangi of Ngati Porou' in King: 1992: 8]

I have learned from Eruera that matauranga in the Maori concept of learning is a difficult and dangerous thing, guarded by sacred restrictions but a blessing to those who approach it in the right spirit. It is tribal and ancestral knowledge, discovered by the gods and passed down the descent lines forever. [Salmond: 1980: 249]

...our kaumatua, Tukawekai Kereama warned me not to 'pollute' my whakapapa. He said that its use in this context was acceptable but 'make sure that you don't throw it away to just anyone'. Whakapapa is tapu. [Bishop: 1996: 63]

...each story, if handed on from an ancestor, will carry the mana of that ancestor. It will therefore be tapu, not to be trifled with by being told by an academic researcher seeking to form generalisations or for some other purpose. However, as the researcher in this case was part of the whanau and was accountable to the whanau, the tapu nature of the stories was protected. [Bishop: 1996: 45]

The untouchable and privileged place of whakapapa, sheltered from critical investigation by both Maori and non-Maori academics, is perhaps its most significant trait in terms of its potency as cultural resource. It allows for unchallenged gatekeeping of both the definitions and the uses of whakapapa. Its cultural potency shelters its political and strategic uses and the actors involved from critical consideration by most Ngai Tahu individuals and academics.

The most 'experienced Ngai Tahu' involved in this research demonstrated finely tuned analyses of the positioning of their contemporary identities in historical and
political events [Chapters Nine and Ten]. However, critique of the embedded uses of whakapapa as cultural and political resource almost always escaped consideration. Even 'experienced Ngai Tahu' do not tend to consider the multiple political uses of whakapapa by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership to organise, manage and govern contemporary South Island Maori identities. This reinforces the strength of whakapapa as 'cultural core' - as given, original and timeless, situated in ancestral places. While other aspects of political practice exercised by the contemporary leadership are challenged, as discussed in Chapters Ten and Eleven, the framing and uses of whakapapa are accepted beyond question or critical investigation.

As I argue in Chapters Five to Eight, it is the framing and uses of whakapapa in the management of contemporary identities by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership that gives political actions legitimacy, sheltering these from criticism. When one begins to trace the settings in which whakapapa is used and understood, its complexity becomes clear. As Becker suggests, when studying an event, it must be remembered that 'things don't just happen, but rather occur in a series of steps' [1998: 31].

As a resource, whakapapa is defined and then acted upon in a range of ways, all consented to by individuals and the contemporary leadership. The framings, forms, processes and uses of whakapapa vary according to contexts of time, place and political purpose. Only two 'experienced Ngai Tahu' who have contributed to this research have in some measure indicated what I would read as recognition of some of the embedded usage of whakapapa as resource. In an interview with an 'experienced Ngai Tahu' woman, who had been very involved in the political practices of both her runanga and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and its predecessor (Te Runanganui o Tahu) for many years, she stated:

You can't put whakapapa into wee [little] boxes. [Interview: July 1999]
I read this as recognition that a collection of *whakapapas* to distinct Ngai Tahu places have been actively brought together and managed for a particular political purpose by the leadership. But this reading is challenged by another blanket statement about the all-encompassing powers of *whakapapa* to 'drive the claim' as if *whakapapa* had some active life whereby 'The Claim' is the resource and *whakapapa* is the actor who acts upon 'The Claim'.

_It was whakapapa that actually drove it ['The Claim']._ [‘Experienced’ Ngai Tahu woman: Interview: July 1999]

Sir Tipene O'Regan, Ngai Tahu’s most recognised leader and academic over the period of this research, is the only ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ contributing to this research who indicates awareness of *whakapapa* as a resource that is subject to strategic use to achieve political ends:

I...challenge those who believe they can safely wallow in mysticism because ancient tradition is so far removed in the past that it is not, as a consequence, susceptible to rigorous and proper scholarly examination .... On the basis of the evidence and the methodology involved, the examination of Maori traditional history does not require a deep esoteric knowledge or the deep spiritual insights of the guru.... One has to recognise, as with any history, that a document or a recorded tradition has been recorded in its particular frame for a particular purpose.... The mode of presentation of evidence is always driven by a purpose, and that is particularly so in the case of whakapapa. Whakapapa is not a mystery - it is essentially a task of intellectual management. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 169, 1991: 24]

However, when it comes to his own or his family's *whakapapa*, he considers it in the sense of all its metaphoric associations with naturalism, the spirit of his ancestors, hence sacred and beyond investigation. This shift is apparent in the following excerpts:

...to reduce the past and all it contains about who you are to the skeletal rigours of science, and to set aside the warm flesh of tupuna and their deeds is even less appealing. The methods and approaches of Pakeha scholarship tend to be seen as
anti-social and un-Maori, which is sufficient reason for simply ignoring them or, more positively, accepting that they are different.

A tension arises, though, when it is the Maori past that is the subject of Pakeha inquiry, particularly by archaeology but most especially when areas such as whakapapa (genealogy) and mythology are subjected to the systems and processes of academic study. the psychological base of a Maori view of the past is both personal and tribal. It is intimately related to one's notion of self. To inquire into my history or that of my people, you must inquire into my whakapapa. To me, that is all quite straightforward and not a bit contrary, but it does seem to pose difficulties for Pakeha scholarship. In essence it denies scholars any absolute right to study my past without my consent. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 338]

This comment is in keeping with Te Mair Tau's reference to the severe limitations of 'the Western gaze' [T. Tau: 2001: 8-9, 17-18]. Framing attempts by Pakeha academics to examine whakapapa as 'anti-social' and 'un-Maori' raises tensions for Pakeha scholars. There is an assumption here that only those in possession of whakapapa can study it. This caution is circulated without clear definition of which strand of whakapapa should prevail - individual, whanau, hapu, iwi or Maori -. This contributes to the potency of whakapapa as protected cultural resource - metanarrative -. As one 'experienced Ngai Tahu' woman stated in an interview, 'Whakapapa is not just a Maori thing. Pakeha have whakapapa'. There are also many Ngai Tahu who claim whakapapa to other iwi and to non-Maori and as Terry Ryan, Whakapapa Unit Manager exhorted at the 1998 Crown Apology Hui at Onuku marae:

Be proud of all your tipuna. Don't choose one over the other. [T. Ryan: November 1998]

Whakapapa as process and state of being

From my observations, whakapapa is framed by Ngai Tahu individuals, not simply in terms of its definition as records of genealogical descent, but as both activity and outcome, verb and noun, human agency and its product.
Whakapapa is seen as a mechanism to record and establish familial connections, biological descent. As well, it means the actual tangible tables (Book of Chronicles) of these familial networks. And, it means the biological bodies, blood and bones represented in the names of the whakapapa, the relationships between the names of the whakapapa and the stories about the characters of the whakapapa. Whakapapa is both process (verb) and outcome (noun). The following definition and descriptions from both Ngai Tahu individuals and from the public narrative illustrate this:

[Whakapapa is] the mechanism used by Maori people to establish familial relationships, with whom one has these inescapable, bodily links. [Bishop: 1996: 215]

The histories of Ngai Tahu migration from the North Island, conflict and later intermarriage with local people, settlement, and population growth, followed their human courses and are known through the mechanism of whakapapa. [Ramsden: 1998: 287]

[Whakapapa is] a conduit from which all orators must draw the ihi and wehi of their tipuna into themselves. [T. Tau: 1997: 49]

[Whakapapa is] the conduit that carries their [my people's] spiritual force - their wairua - to me in the present and by which I pass it forward to future generations. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 338]

[Whakapapa is a] database [which] has evolved in conjunction with the prosecution of our tribal claim. [Whakapapa Unit Manager, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 20]

[Whakapapa is] the tribe's 'Blue Book'...through which all modern Ngai Tahu can trace their ancestry. ['Te Karaka': Spring 1997: 7]

[Whakapapa is] a solid rock of information which gives full meaning to any Ngai Tahu's connections to whanau (family), hapu (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe). ['Te Karaka': Spring 1997: 7]
The first Irihapeti in our whakapapa appears in 1842. [Ramsden: 1998: 289]

I felt at peace with my whakapapa. [Ramsden: 1998: 289]

E tamariki ma - study your whakapapa, and learn to trace your descent lines to all your ancestors, so you can join yourselves together. [Stirling in Salmond: 1980: 241]

It is both verb and noun: process and outcome, mechanism and product, as the following excerpts from the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals interviewed indicate:

_I whakapapa to Wairewa._

_My whakapapa is to all eighteen runanga._

_No, that's my own [whakapapa]._

_Having whakapapa at many runanga means…_

_Whakapapa_ for Ngai Tahu is both act and outcome - an act of human memory and oral recitation as well as in its physical form as an enscription onto a piece of paper, the historic 'Blue Book'; now on CD Rom. An individual or _whanau_ both _whakapapas to_ his/her ancestors and _has whakapapa_. It is about how connections to the past, to geographical places of birth and to kin is collected, recited, enscribed and finally stored in permanent documented form as a singular entity – a _whakapapa_.

_Whakapapa_ is a process of doing and becoming – a metaphor for being -. Chapter Five will address the forms of storage of _whakapapa_ for contemporary Ngai Tahu and how these have shifted through history.

12 'If your whakapapa is Ngai Tahu and it takes you back through those others, then that's what makes you Ngai Tahu ... no matter where you are, here in Murihiku, or in London - you are still Ngai Tahu' [George Te Au in H. O'Regan: 2001: 54].
In the previous extracts *whakapapa* is variously described as spiritual, historical, bodily, DNA, familial, spoken, a conduit, an adhesive, information and a database. *Whakapapa* is represented as spiritual origin and as the mundane (computerised records). In this sense it is both traditional and modern, simultaneously of science (DNA) and beyond scientific investigation. *Whakapapa* encompasses the actions of tracing, memorising, recording, reciting descent lines of blood relationship - genealogy. *Whakapapa* also describes the written tables or chronicles that record these descent lines.

In my observations the position of *whakapapa* as ontology generally shelters its uses from critique. Often the place of *whakapapa* as ontology is rhetorically interchangeable with its epistemological processes/uses/understandings, attributing animate qualities to *whakapapa* to act, rather than identifying *whakapapa* as a resource requiring action upon it by individuals or collectivities towards the achievement of outcomes, as the following excerpts illustrate:

The whakapapa that ties me to my tipuna is also the structure that orders my history and that of my people. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 338]

*It is whakapapa that binds us together.* ['Experienced Ngai Tahu’ woman: Interview: July 1999]

...she discovered that whakapapa actually confirmed her Maori identity and gave her back the whanau which had been wondering why it had taken her so long to find them. [Harawira: 1998: 202]

This blurring between ontology and epistemology in turn deflects attention from both the gatekeepers of *whakapapa* and the contexts of time, place and political purpose, contributing to its potency as metanarrative.
No author better clarifies the blurred understandings and uses associated with *whakapapa* than Bishop [1996]. He distinguishes between *whakapapa* as genealogical record and as the kin relationships represented by descent lines in his treatment of relationship between *whakapapa*, *whanaungatanga*, and *whakawhanaungatanga*. By doing this, he distinguishes between *whakapapa* as recording of genealogy and the actual individuals and relationships encapsulated in the *whakapapa*:

Whanau means extended family. Whanaunga are relatives/relations, those members of your whanau with whom you have an inextricable, bodily link. *Whakapapa* is the mechanism used by Maori people to establish familial relationships, with whom one has these inescapable, bodily links. *Whanaungatanga* literally means relationship by whakapapa, that is, blood-linked relationships.... *Whakawhanaungatanga* is the process of establishing relationships, literally by means of identifying, through culturally appropriate means, your bodily linkage, your engagement, your connectedness and therefore (unspoken) commitment to other people.... For Maori people, the process of whakawhanaungatanga identifies how our identity comes from our whakapapa and how our whakapapa and its associated raranga korero link us to all other living and inanimate creatures and to the very earth we inhabit. [1996: 215]

*Whakapapa* as narrative

Historically, wrapped around *whakapapa* was *raranga korero*, storytelling: intricately tied up in ‘the stories and events surrounding the generational figures’ signified by the *whakapapa* [Bishop: 1996: 25]:

In traditional Maori society korero pakiwaitara (stories), waiata and whakapapa transferred knowledge and wisdom. The korero added flesh to the bones of whakapapa and gave our people a sense of their history but also lessons in how to act and interact with the world around us. These korero have relevance for today. [‘Te Karaka’: 2000: 12]

Bishop also distinguishes between *whakapapa* and associated *raranga korero*:
There are strong cultural preferences among Maori people for narrative. Historically, Maori as an oral culture devised methods to pass on the multiplicity of knowledge that any culture gathers and constructs about itself. Story was one of the common ways of imparting knowledge. Particular messages and proverbs were told in narrative form, or in waiata (song), moteatea (poetry), pakiwatara (folk talk, legend) and kauwhau (moralistic tale). Some stories had to maintain strong criteria of accuracy, for example whakapapa (genealogy) and associated raranga korero (stories of genealogical figures and events). Others did not have such restrictions. [1996: 25]

In framings of whakapapa by the Ngai Tahu individuals in this research and by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership, raranga korero and whakapapa seem inseparable. In turn, this contributes to the potency of whakapapa as metananarrative because it extends the metaphoric associations of whakapapa and its possible uses to unite disparate individuals [see Chapters Six, Seven and Eight]. In my observation, in both the public narrative and the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals, whakapapa is framed in a way that blurs it with whanaungatanga, whakawhanaungatanga and associated raranga korero. By this rhetorical blurring, whakapapa comes to be framed and considered as not simply the recorded names of one's ancestry, but the actual bodies represented by these names and the stories and the metaphors associated with them. Even Bishop at times blurs these concepts in blanket references to the significance of whakapapa. He identifies whakapapa as 'holistic, where your descent and your relationships to others is paramount' [1996: 51].

As Bishop argues, narrative is the preferred cultural medium for Maori. This dissertation, both in its methodological approach and in theoretical considerations of the role of narrative – from the personal to the public to metananarrative, considers the role of whakapapa in understandings and presentations of identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu. I argue that contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative takes the place traditionally held by raranga korero. The uses of the contemporary public narrative are privileged in the same ways as all the historical metaphoric associations that have been blurred with the
definitions and understandings of whakapapa for the individuals recorded in its chronicles.¹³

While chronicling blood connection is a way of situating the self within a context of space, time and relations to others in order to know one’s identity, narrative accomplishes this further while also providing a flexibility of self-presentation that genealogy alone does not [see also Rapport in Amit: 2000], again adding to the metanarrative properties of whakapapa. Particularly in narratives about identity by Ngai Tahu Whanui and ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ individuals, whakapapa is embedded in key themes – meta-themes – about time, significant place, and political practices around land claims issues. Whakapapa and the stories about the characters listed in these tables become interwoven, blurred, indistinguishable, and subject to embellishment and strategic use for political purpose [see also A. Anderson: 1998].

Whakapapa as metaphor

The parapara is a tree that produces clusters of leaves. Each cluster has a set of five leaves which symbolise for me my Maoritanga. The five leaves lead into a stem, me. The stem is attached to a branch, which for me represents the Maori people. The whole tree, as I see it, is humanity itself.... The five leaves represent the dimensions that influence me. The first leaf depicts spirituality.... The second leaf symbolises for me ancestral ties, the dimension that determines my physical and psychological existence and heritage. My ancestors have passed on beliefs and

¹³ According to sociologist Anne Kane:

…the locus of meaning and therefore the condition for meaning construction is symbolic structures. More specifically, I assert that the autonomous quality of culture rests on the metaphoric nature of symbols and the patterned relationship of symbols within a structure, and that this characteristic of symbols is a fundamental key to how meaning is constructed and why it can change. As metaphors, symbols strongly but ambiguously signify social relationships, conditions, and experiences through associations of similarity and difference between separate entities. Symbols connote multiple meanings and evoke various emotions associated with particular meanings. Because they are polysemous, symbols are transformable. The particular power and specific use of symbols is dependent both on their relationship to other symbols in a symbolic structure and on how people interpret them. [1991: 250-251]
traditions that enable me to know who and what I am in terms of New Zealand, and indeed in terms of the world community. I regard myself as a universal person with a strong tap root that reaches back to the Urewera, the home of my Tuhoe ancestors. From this root comes my language and the blood line that helps me to understand my own institutions and the way they influence my approach to life. The genealogy - the rope of people that links up each generation - the rope that gives me my history also helps to give me a better understanding of myself as a person... The third leaf symbolises kinship ties, the dimension that deals with the group of people who have the same ancestral and historical ties as my own. The survival and well-being of the kinship group is of prime importance to me.... The marae within the tribal group gives me my turangawaewae - a place where I have the right to stand in terms of my ancestry, so I feel I am able to stand up with pride anywhere in the world. The survival and well-being of the kinship group brings out the best qualities and values of each individual in the group because the main concern is for all humanity....The fourth leaf symbolises humanity.... the fifth leaf symbolises Papatuanuku, the earth, and the way I relate to her. The land for me has the same significance as the placenta that surrounds the embryo in the womb - the Maori word 'whenua' is the term used for both the land and the placenta. [Pere: 1993: 275]

Although this excerpt comes from a woman of Tuhoe, not Ngai Tahu, it signifies strong associations that whakapapa holds with metaphors of history, ancestry, kin, and physical environment for Maori. One of the ways whakapapa maintains its primacy as metanarrative for contemporary Ngai Tahu is that its meanings and understandings elude precise definition. One reason for this is that whakapapa is often blurred with a range of other concepts, in turn extending its meanings, uses and hence potency, beyond a single meaning. The use of metaphor is very significant in the history of Ngai Tahu culture and identity. According to Irihapeti Ramsden, a Ngai Tahu woman:

According to Irihapeti Ramsden, 'the loss of metaphors is a serious business for any culture. The orderly world of metaphors is understood implicitly by all members. It makes each culture unique. [1993: 348]

Whakapapa as metanarrative yields conceptual authority to create boundaries of exclusion and inclusion for contemporary Ngai Tahu. One way it does this is by
giving symbols and metaphors the power and authority associated with *whakapapa* [Kane: 1991: 251, Kratz: 1993: 53]. Then, just as *whakapapa* (in whatever form it is presented) is insulated from the standards of empirical proof that apply to other cultural claims, so too particular metaphors associated with this primary cultural concept become insulated from rigorous investigation and critical analysis. This attributes *whakapapa*’s metaphoric associations with the same powers to create boundaries of exclusion and inclusion [Brubaker: 1992], in turn enhancing the power of *whakapapa* in the consideration by individuals. This extends the uses of *whakapapa* for political purposes.

From my observations, the metaphors most commonly associated with *whakapapa* are:

- blood, bones, body\(^{14}\)
- placenta, birth, womb
- tree, branch

\(^{14}\)In her book *Kai Tahu Tribal Identity* [2001], Hana O’Regan identifies ‘blood’ as a determinant of *whakapapa* and identity, where these terms seem interchangeable. *Whakapapa* as interchangeable with ‘blood’ and hence determinant of Ngai Tahu identity is a common theme. Hana O’Regan also writes of an incident in her childhood when she had an accident and one of the first thoughts to enter her head when she woke up in hospital was panic that she may have lost her Maori blood.

Another example: ‘I know that there are lots of other folk from other tribes who resent Ngai Tahu. And they resent that we are fairer, and we have lots of Pakeha blood in us’ [Cath Brown in H. O’Regan: 2001: 63].

Foucault identifies the role of ‘blood’ as metaphor and as resource in the manifestations and rituals of power in what he refers to as society before ‘we...entered a phase of juridical regression’:

The blood relation long remained an important element in the mechanisms of power, its manifestations, and its rituals. For a society in which the systems of alliance, the political castes, and the value of descent lines were predominant; for a society in which famine, epidemics, and violence made death imminent, blood constituted one of the fundamental values. It owed its high value at the same time to its instrumental role (the ability to shed blood), to the way it functioned in the order of signs (to have a certain blood, to be of the same blood, to be prepared to risk one’s blood), and also to its precariousness (easily spilled, subject to drying up, too readily mixed, capable of being quickly corrupted). A society of blood - I was tempted to say, ’of *sanguinity:* - where power spoke through blood: the honour of war, the fear of famine, the triumph of death, the sovereign with his sword, executioners, and tortures; blood was a reality with a symbolic function’. [1978: 147]
• earth
• web, spiral, weaving
• waka
• book
• history, culture, tradition, tikanga
• tipuna, ancestors, descent
• biology; DNA.
• hui [Bishop: 1996, Salmond: 1985]

For individuals, these metaphoric associations are also embedded in understandings of history, place, and identity as addressed in Chapters Nine and Ten. As Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Ten address, Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative uses rhetorical techniques to associate these whakapapa metaphors with history, place and identity in ways that support contemporary political practices and structures, while in turn blurring the incremental political embeddedness of contemporary management of whakapapa. Since its pursuit of 'The Claim' in the mid-1980s and particularly since the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership has relied extensively on the strategic use of whakapapa metaphors through a range of rhetorical techniques [Kratz: 1993] in order to achieve political aims. This is accomplished by rhetorical association of the leadership's activities and goals with concepts that represent tradition, origin, and hence nobility and legitimacy. Rhetorical treatment of whakapapa underlies this power, while simultaneously facilitating consent. If it happened or is happening in the name of whakapapa, it must be noble.

Summary

This chapter has considered the most potent cultural resource for contemporary Ngai Tahu – whakapapa – which is seen as metanarrative. I have attempted to introduce the complexity and range of definitions, uses and understandings associated with whakapapa, as I have read these in the course of my participant observation. Both Evison [1993] and Ryan [1989] define whakapapa as
genealogy and 'cultural identity'. For Ngai Tahu, whakapapa is more than genealogy. Laid over or wrapped around whakapapa as genealogy are complex and embedded understandings and uses. It is identity, origin, place, body, blood and kin. It is both epistemology and ontology, both a way of viewing the world by individuals and a practical tool for management to achieve outcomes for collective Ngai Tahu. It is narrative and metaphor. It is metanarrative.

It is through its metaphorical associations with spiritualism, naturalism and origin that its uses and understandings come to be so extensive. It is often defined in a functionalist manner, i.e., in terms of the functions it serves to unite the contemporary collective, to the point where it becomes inseparable from what it is used for. The omnipresent place it holds in framings of Ngai Tahu culture and identity is so rich that, in my observations, it is used to explain both that which is and that which is not, without clear or critical analysis by Ngai Tahu individuals of just how its metaphorical associations are blurred with its simple meaning as the recording of genealogical descent.

If the range of meanings and uses associated with whakapapa - from the personal to the political - were reducible to mere genealogy, the images of naturalism, spiritualism and mysticism conjoined with whakapapa as a cultural concept would be transparent. Whakapapa would then be open to critical analysis and identified as constitutive of nothing more than records of genealogical descent. While in some contexts, Ngai Tahu recognise whakapapa as simply genealogy, in others it is attributed much more cultural power. It is within its wider attribution - whakapapa as cultural identity - that the metanarrative properties and uses of whakapapa are possible. The cultural properties associated with whakapapa blur its definitions and understandings. Whakapapa takes on the properties of its metaphorical associations, so that it is considered to be much more than genealogical records of linear descent.
Subsequent chapters of this dissertation will argue that, while whakapapa is understood by Ngai Tahu as synonymous with nature, spirit, or essential being, this conceptualisation of whakapapa is itself historically and politically embedded. This is not to detract from the important place whakapapa holds in the lives of Ngai Tahu individuals as essential to their being and their identities as part of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation'.
Chapter five

Whakapapa management: The Ngai Tahu roll

Whakapapa is not a mystery - it is essentially a task of intellectual management. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 169, 1991:24]

Introduction

This chapter looks at management of whakapapa in the organisation of contemporary South Island Maori identities. The Ngai Tahu roll held in the Whakapapa Unit of the offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu in Christchurch is a key tool in this management. It is an institutional tool that uses whakapapa to realign historically disparate South Island Maori to regulate membership to the 'Ngai Tahu Nation'. To do this it organises these historical identities into new legal-political identity categories privileged by the Crown in legislation: Ngai Tahu Whanui as equivalent to Ngai Tahu iwi with eighteen papatipu runanga, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and Ngai Tahu Whanui members.

These privileged identities in turn are granted manawhenua status in relations with Crown and other iwi, as tangata whenua of the South Island. As a result, other historical collective identities: hapu, whanau, Waitaha, Ngati Mamoe, other iwi and Pakeha, have been excluded or subsumed within Ngai Tahu Whanui. The roll and its management establish and privilege gatekeepers who, by managing the roll, control membership into the legal-political South Island Maori identity. Integral to the management of identities by the roll, and consent to this, are the metanarrative potency of whakapapa as cultural resource, and entrenchment of the roll in legislation – the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act.
Ngai Tahu Whanui and the roll entrenched in legislation

In 1996, the management of South Island Maori whakapapa that had since 1944 been carried out by the Ngai Tahu Trust Board and the Crown, was passed to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, with final appeal and dispute mechanisms for membership continuing to rest with the Crown through the Maori Land Court. This was established by the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. With the passing of the Act, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board list of beneficiaries was passed to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to form the basis of membership into the new identity – Ngai Tahu Whanui:

Roll of members of Ngai Tahu Whanui—-(1) Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu shall cause to be prepared a roll containing the names and addresses of all adult persons who are members of Ngai Tahu Whanui, and shall, from time to time, make all such additions and corrections to the roll as may be necessary. [s8(1), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu shall include on its initial roll of members of Ngai Tahu Whanui the name and address of every adult beneficiary of the Ngaitahu Maori Trust Board whose name and address are, immediately before the commencement of this Act, on the roll of beneficiaries prepared by the Ngaitahu Maori Trust Board under section 42 of the Maori Trust Boards Act 1955. [s8(5), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

Information about the whakapapa of registered members is stored on CDRom in the Whakapapa Unit of the Office of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, centralised in Christchurch. Additional powers around the determination of membership have been allocated to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu under the 1996 Act. These powers include the authority to decide membership in cases where there is a question as to a person’s whakapapa to the 1848 lists:

Where any question arises as to whether or not a person is a descendant of any of the persons who are referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) of subsection (1) of this section, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu shall have authority to determine that question.
Any person who is not a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui by virtue of that person being a descendant of any of the persons mentioned in paragraph (a) of subsection (1) of this section and who claims to be a descendant of a member of the Ngai Tahu iwi who was living in the year 1848 may apply to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to have that member determined to be a member of Ngai Tahu iwi living in the year 1848. [s7(2), (3), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

The Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board never held this same power. Prior to the arrival of Ngai Tahu Whanui, questions or disputes around Trust Board beneficiary status unresolved by the Whakapapa Unit, would have to go directly to the Maori Land Court. But, according to Whakapapa Unit Manager, Terry Ryan, in practice there has been little change; the Whakapapa Unit is still the first gatekeeper of membership and possible challenge. In the case of an unresolved challenge, the Kaikwhakahaere of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu would be brought in to consider [Interview: June 2002]. The Maori Land Court continues to hold the right to decide on such issues in the situation of an appeal:

If Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu rejects an application made under subsection (3) of this section, the person making the application may, within 6 months after the date upon which that person is notified of the decision of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, apply to the Maori Land Court to hear and determine the question.

The Maori Land Court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the question and any determination made by the Maori Land Court shall be final and conclusive. [s7(5), (6), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

However, the Whakapapa Unit Manager came from the Maori Land Court in 1976 and possesses the most experience in issues of Ngai Tahu whakapapa. At hui I have attended, the question has been raised of why the eighteen papatipu runanga that are officially created by the Act, do not have the power to accept whakapapa registrations. This proposal was rejected by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu in the name of efficient organisation and management and which collective body holds the mana to determine such questions [Onuku Crown Apology Hui: November 1998]. For example, from my field notes:
[Ngai Tahu Whanui member]: 'I went to enrol at Koukourarata Runanga and was told that as my Tipuna Putihuka was on the half caste roll they were extinguished from belonging to Koukourarata. Felt that this was very unfair. Putihuka and her descendants have their right to be there at Koukourararata.'

Charles Crofts [Kaiwhakahaere, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu]: 'That question is for back home. I understand the concern however it should be raised at home [Koukourarata, which is also Charles Crofts' runanga].'

[Ngai Tahu Whanui member]: 'It has gone beyond a hapu level. We are talking about iwi level.'

Sir Tipene O'Regan agreed with Ngai Tahu Whanui member: 'The point is that if we allow our representation and membership to be governed by MLC [Maori Land Court], uninvestigated and unexamined applications made back then we do ourselves and our whakapapa an injustice. These allocations were uninvestigated and have denied people their rights. It is an iwi issue [Sir Tipene believes Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu has been misguided]. Unless we have some competent management on the question of representation of Ngai Tahu we will be in serious difficulty before too long. It is the exclusion of opportunity. Need to have serious debate about it. Ahi Kaa principle should apply but it is the exclusion of others with Ngai Tahu whakapapa that needs straightening out. Control of our affairs should rest with nga Runanga but need to deal with issue of representation.'

Charles Crofts: At the end of the day perhaps the iwi does need to be involved but be careful Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

Terry Ryan [Whakapapa Unit Manager]: 'It is a common theme. One of the issues I am strong on is to stop the hurt. There is a need for the table to revisit and include me in discussions on our whakapapa files.'
[Notes from Hui a Tau, Kaikoura, November 2000 in 'Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 meeting Index of Information Papers']

At a runanga meeting I attended at Te Taumutu in 1996 a letter sent from Arowhenua runanga to the Whakapapa Unit was discussed. This letter requested that Arowhenua runanga hold the power to register the whakapapa of individuals with whakapapa to this particular marae.
Centralisation of whakapapa registrations strengthens the hand of Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership whereas decentralization of this power would strengthen the hands of the papatipu runanga. Chapter Nine will discuss how ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ individuals feel about this issue of shifting mana that was historically decentralised and local to the new centralised leadership.

Ngai Tahu Whanui and the Ngai Tahu roll – political events in the history of management of South Island Maori identities

The current Ngai Tahu Whanui roll of members has arisen out of a history of negotiation between South Island Maori and the Crown since the mid-nineteenth century around South Island Maori land claims, as summarised in Chapter Two of this dissertation. The power of whakapapa as a resource to achieve outcomes is dependent on its relationship to surrounding historical and political relations and the particular actors involved in its assertions [see Somers: 1999: 129, A. Anderson: 1998, T. O'Regan: 1993: 1991]. As this dissertation argues, these uses and framings for Ngai Tahu are embedded in historical and political practices. Becker [1998: 31] identifies the need for social research to look beyond the surface of an event to understand the history of events and narratives that went before it. The land claims issues of the nineteenth century facilitated a series of ‘official’ and ‘unofficial’ censuses by Crown representatives. These were introduced by the Crown to survey the extent of eligibility for South Island Maori land claims [A. Anderson: 1998, Bellara: 1998]. They formed the precursor to the contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui roll.

As summarised in Chapter Two, the first decades of the twentieth century saw a continuation of the process of South Island Maori vying with the Crown for satisfactory outcomes to the claims that had been left unresolved from the previous century. The Maori Land Court completed a report in 1918 setting out those able to qualify for a grant of land under the 1906 South Island Landless Natives Bill. The findings of the 1921 Royal Commission into Kemp’s Purchase
required an official list of eligible claimants. It was out of these Crown requirements that the icon of contemporary Ngai Tahu identity, the 1925 'Blue Book' of South Island Maori kaumatua alive in 1848, was compiled. From this time until the introduction of the Ngai Tahu Trust Board in 1944, South Island Maori families independently negotiated their allocations with the Maori Land Court.

There was a revised list made in 1929 due to the large number of complaints from individuals to the Maori Land Court after the 1925 list was published. According to 'Whakapapa Ngai Tahu: A Guide to Enrolment and Research', published by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu:

All the lists [1925] were extensively debated and checked before final inclusion. The Court on the 12th March 1925 made an order determining that 1551 persons were entitled to varying shares to participate in the settlement of the Claim. Subsequent to the completion of the list, people not included began to petition the Court. The number of complaints was so great that an inquiry was set up to ascertain the validity of these Claims.

The confusion over the 1925 lists brought the Ngai Tahu issue once again into the political arena. Again the court was authorized this time under the mantle of Judge Michael Gilfedder to examine the question of identifying who exactly were the Ngai Tahu beneficiaries....

Because the 1925 Court had been restricted to the boundaries of the Kemp's Purchase, the Judge and committee had used as a reference almost exclusively the names of the kaumatua appearing on Mantell's first 1848 list. During the 1929 hearings at Kaiapoi, Temuka, Dunedin and Invercargill a combination of both censuses [Mantell's 1848 and 1851 lists] were used as a reference. The final lists of 1848 kaumatua and recommendations were furnished to Judge Gilfedder on 29th of August 1929. Although the 1929 applicants were successful in persuading the Court to draw up a new list of kaumatua, the Chief Judge was not prepared to amend the original 1925 list....

Once the Trust Board was in place the issue of the 1929 Court list soon came to the forefront of tribal affairs. Because the Court had not recognized the 1929 list, the Trust Board influence did not extend to all Ngai Tahu people. Those who descended from the kaumatua living outside the boundary of Kemp's Purchase were not legally recognized as being Ngai Tahu. The unrest amongst the tribe caused the Maori Land Court to again reassess the situation.
Then in 1953, the Maori Land Court published the Census Committee’s 1929 list in a special notice, which received fairly wide distribution and called on persons claiming rights under kaumatua in that 1929 list to file claims with the Registrar of the Court in Wellington by the end of August of that year. However, the Maori Land Court received no applications. The reason for the publication of this list was misunderstood. The general feeling and interpretation was that the list had been published to publicise and give belated official recognition of the 1929 list. In 1955 the Maori Trust Boards Act reinforced the 1925 lists and reaffirmed the requirement of beneficial right derived from them. [1996: 11-13]

The 1929 lists were not given recognition until 1966. This recognition was granted under s16 of the Maori Purposes Act. This Act also transferred the powers of the Land Court in determining beneficial interest to the Trust Board.\(^1\) According to ‘Whakapapa Ngai Tahu: A Guide to Enrolment and Research’, published by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu:

Almost immediately the Trust board published a combined version of the 1925 and 1929 lists. This book was given the title of “Ngai tahu Kaumatua Alive in 1848 as established by the Maori Land Court in 1925 and the Ngai Tahu Census Committee in 1929”. Again, due to the colour of its cover this is commonly referred to as “The Blue Book”. [1996: 14]

From 1944, the Ngai Tahu Trust Board was introduced to the collection of South Island Maori identities - the Ngai Tahu Trust Board.\(^2\) The 1925 ‘Blue Book’

---

1 The 1925 Maori Land Court roll was revised in 1929 by the Ngai Tahu Census Committee. According to the Ngai Tahu Executive Officer in an interview held with her in 1990, the Maori Land Court Order of 1925 was revised by the Ngai Tahu Census Committee in 1929 [in Kelly: 1991: 5-6]. Then in 1963 and again in 1967, the Trust Board managed to have the Crown recognise the Ngai Tahu Census committee numbers with respect to beneficial rights. This request was made on the basis that the Maori Land Court Order of March 12, 1925 was inadequate and incomplete [Ngai Tahu Trust Board Annual Report 1967: 7]. According to Koa Mantell, as a result, parliament enacted s.16 of the Maori Purposes Act 1966. This measure allowed for (i) the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board to determine who its beneficiaries would be on the basis of proof of the Ngai Tahu Census Committee roll over that compiled by the 1925 Maori Land Court.

2 Angela Ballara points out that the first Ngai Tahu Trust Board was actually formed in 1928, comprised of the appointees of the 1920s committee recognised to assist the Land Court in
shifted from being the basis of proof of independent whanau land allocations under the 1906 South Island Landless Natives Bill and the findings of the 1921 Royal Commission Report, to becoming a tool used to determine membership in this new political body, with gatekeeping of this membership shifting from the Maori Land Court to the Trust Board in 1966. This in turn shifted the entire field of South Island land claims allocations. Membership as a Trust Board beneficiary entitled one to apply for educational and kaumatua grants. Registration of whakapapa began also to entitle one to vote for Board members.

This political event introduced new uses of whakapapa in the construction of new collective South Island Maori identities - Ngai Tahu beneficiary and Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board - whose membership comprised individuals with registered whakapapa, and a representative Board voted on by beneficiaries. Until 1976, these whakapapa records continued to be stored and administered by the Maori Land Court. In 1976, at the request of the Trust Board, Terry Ryan came from the Maori Land Court to work on the collection and collation of Ngai Tahu whakapapa, according to the lists of the 1920s. According to the 1978 Trust Board Annual Report, 'this job then focused on the listing of missing files, the listing of files which had been 'gutted' of whakapapa content, the location of missing whakapapa, and at a later date, bringing whakapapa contained in all the files up to date by including later generations' [1978: 10].

By 1976, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board had become a key player, as the keeper of whakapapa knowledge for all individuals who could show proof of descent to the kaumatua in the 'Blue Book'. From this point, beneficiaries had access only to their own individual whakapapa and any individual is entitled to a

---


The publication, 'Whakapapa Ngai Tahu: A Guide to Enrolment and Research' writes: 'During the 1920s, it was decided by the Government "that it was desirable to set up a Board representing the beneficiaries for the purpose of discussing and arranging the terms of any settlement".' [1996: 13].

When I asked Whakapapa Unit Manager, Terry Ryan, he had never heard of the existence of a Trust Board prior to 1944 [Interview: June 2002].
copy of the ‘Blue Book’. Registered beneficiaries were hence deemed ‘Ngai Tahu’ and collective ‘Ngai Tahu’ whakapapa was stored, managed and administered in the Christchurch offices by the Trust Board and its staff. The value of these records to the management, administration and governance of a tribe was recognised, and this was the reason the Trust Board was very careful to have all these records stored within its offices and therefore within its power of surveillance:

During the 1960s, the Board became increasingly concerned at the non-availability of certain of its whakapapa record from the Department of Maori Affairs. There was increasing evidence that substantial packages of the whakapapa resource had, in fact, been lost. After consultation with kaumatua about an appropriate process, it was agreed that the Board would prevail upon Terry Ryan, who had at one time been an officer of the Maori Land Court, to come and work for the Board with the specific mission of “restoring the missing files”. [Whakapapa Ngai Tahu: A Guide to Enrolment and Research’, published by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: 1996: 14]

This function continued until 1986, another key date in the shifting field of South Island Maori identities. In 1986, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, represented by its Deputy Chairperson, made a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal on behalf of its beneficiaries for acknowledgement of its Article Two rights under the Treaty of Waitangi. This shifted the legislated function of the Trust Board from recording whakapapa, expanding its powers to represent and act on behalf of collective South Island Maori in their independent territorial land claims. From the introduction of the Treaty of Waitangi Act in 1975, the Trust Board had been indicating an interest in pursuit of South Island land claims in this forum. When I interviewed the chairperson of the Board in 1990, he said that the function of the Board had changed since his election in 1976 and he saw that it would continue to change due to shifts in government policy.

---

3 In 1990, the Chairperson of the Trust Board warned registered beneficiaries that access to the Canterbury University archives of historic tribal information was restricted on the basis of permission from the Board [Kelly: 1991: 123].
The goal of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board prior to the mid-1980s was to achieve recognition of distinct 'South Island tribal identity and associated manawhenua rights. This was documented prior to the beginning of the Waitangi Tribunal claims:

The Trust Board has also recognised the necessity of surveillance for maintenance of tribal distinctions in the South Island, where Ngai Tahu is tangata whenua but not necessarily the majority of the Maori population. Surveillance will become even more important with devolution, because whatever group is chosen to represent the South Island as an iwi authority will be required to administer funds and programmes from government to taure here Maori (Maori in the South Island who are not tangata whenua, i.e., not Ngai Tahu). [1989 Annual Tribal Hui a Tau minutes: 5]

Proof, registration and storage of whakapapa in the Trust Board offices continued as the basis for membership as a beneficiary. From 1986, implicit in one's registration of whakapapa, was consent to the usage of collective registered whakapapa in the negotiation of a collective Ngai Tahu claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, by a collective body not originally established for this purpose. Issues of consent then became secondary to the way the roll began to be used as a management tool to manage the interests of tribal collective. This date therefore represents a key shift in power in the field of South Island Maori identities. This move eliminated the rights of individuals, whanau, and hapu to continue to negotiate territorial claims with the Maori Land Court and implied consent to this new use of whakapapa. As a Ngai Tahu kaumatua recounts:

The Claim has more or less been acknowledged since around 1920, had been quantified and left on the table of the government..., because they backed off and dived for cover, and that was the end of it.

The lands that were allocated were already held in ownership. The Claim had never been allocated, although... the 1848 kaumatua were named and listed in the Blue Book and given shares in the Claim if it ever eventuated. So shares were given against their names against the day when there would be a settlement. It was worked out through the Land Court system.
Those shares and whatever were handed in to the Ngai Tahu Trust Board when it was formed in 1946 for them to look after. Now, about ten or so years after, in the 1950’s, someone in their wisdom saw fit to cancel all those shares, thereby creating the basis for pan-Ngai Tahu rights in common by all members. [Life History: 1997]

This forms the basis of the new Ngai Tahu Whanui roll of members. It also facilitates implied consent by registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members to the legislated leadership, which developed from the Trust Board leadership, to manage its infrastructure.4

Who manages whakapapa manages the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’: privileged and excluded identities

The management of whakapapa is fundamental to the administration, management and governance of registered members – Ngai Tahu citizens. As Chapter Four demonstrated, whakapapa is metanarrative for Ngai Tahu. It is a structure of conceptual authority whose potency as cultural core legitimates this power. It is the resource, which through its particular uses and framings establishes hierarchies of power relations, in turn establishing boundaries of inclusion and exclusion of membership for South Island Maori individual and collective identities. Whakapapa is an epistemological gatekeeper, and those who manage its storage, dissemination and uses, manage access to membership in the contemporary collective identities. As Somers argues, a metanarrative is attributed power and authority to define the conceptual basis for established hierarchies of power and the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion for collective identities [1999:136]. The potency of whakapapa as a resource to simultaneously include and exclude membership is also embedded in understandings and uses of key dates and key places in the history of South Island Maori relations with the Crown. The roll enables the folding of historical

4 The Ngai Tahu Whanui roll acts as what Latour [1995] refers to as a bridging device between the individual, the tribe and the Crown.
time in the sense that in certain circumstances and for certain political uses, the roll enables 1848 to be brought to the present.

By way of the 1996 Act, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu has become one of a group of new privileged identities - Ngai Tahu Whanui which is interchanged with simply 'Ngai Tahu' to read as it is the same as the historic Ngai Tahu iwi, eighteen papatipu runanga (listed in the Act) as represented and governed by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and Ngai Tahu Whanui registered member. These identities have risen to a position of prominence over previous South Island Maori identities – individual and collective, their preeminence secured and managed by administration of the Ngai Tahu roll. The roll and its management establish Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu as the leadership body to act as gatekeeper of membership into the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' in order to manage and distribute land claims compensation from the Waitangi Tribunal settlement, to those South Island Maori included in the roll, while excluding other South Island Maori. The roll also entrenches the new legal-political privileged identities:

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 in turn created a legal entity, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, whose task is to represent the collective tino rangatiratanga of Ngai Tahu whanui, to create structures through which appropriate management of its development could occur and for the distribution of benefits to its people. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is the legally authorised voice of Ngai Tahu, able to enter binding agreements, and is accountable only to Ngai Tahu whanui. [Tribal Profile: 1997: 4]

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is sometimes referred to as the tribal 'parliament' of Ngai Tahu. It represents the tribal collective, but does not trespass on the rangatiratanga of its individual members, the Papatipu Runanga.... The members of Ngai Tahu Whanui who whakapapa to particular Papatipu Runanga elect committees which are responsible for appointing a Runanga Representative and an alternate Representative to the tribal parliament. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 51]
The Kaupapa whakahuaataka of this Charter is that all those entitled by whakapapa to the benefits of the House of Tahu shall be protected in their right to benefit [1993 Charter of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu]

The 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act defines 'Members of Ngai Tahu whanui' as:

the descendants of --- (a) The persons, being members of Ngai Tahu iwi living in the year 1848, whose names are set out in the list appearing at pages 92 to 131 [The Blue Book]...; (b) Any other person who may, pursuant to the provisions of subsection (4) of this section, be determined to be a member of Ngai Tahu iwi living in the year 1848. [s7(3), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

The members of Ngai Tahu Whanui are the descendants of---

(a) The persons, being members of Ngai Tahu iwi living in the year 1848, whose names are set out in the list appearing at pages 92 to 131 (both inclusive) of the book containing the minutes of the proceedings and findings of a committee (commonly known as the Ngaitahu Census Committee) appointed in the year 1929, the book being that lodged in the office of the Registrar of the Maori Land Court at Christchurch and marked "Ngaitahu Census Committee Minutes 1929". [s7(1), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act]

The 'Blue Book' has now been established in legislation. It has become an icon of Ngai Tahu identity – the symbol of whakapapa and history, folding Ngai Tahu whakapapa, history and place into one tangible symbol in the present. Over the period of my research, I heard continual references to the 1,333 kaumatua listed in the 'Blue Book', yet in an interview with Terry Ryan [June 2002] he pointed out that the number of kaumatua listed in the book has changed from the original 1,333 to 1,338. This indicates that this basis of Ngai Tahu identity is not immutable. This shift has not been acknowledged in the public narrative.

The governing body of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is made up of one Runanga representative and one Runanga alternate from each of eighteen 'papatipu runanga' listed in the Act:
The members of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu shall be each of the Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui from time to time in operation. [s9(1), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996].

The roll shall also show, in respect of each person whose name is on the roll, each Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui in respect of which that person has established his or her entitlement to be a member. [s8(2), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

Each of the eighteen *papatipu runanga* corresponds to a particular geographical territory, *takiwa*, in the South Island. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 sets out the *takiwa* of Ngai Tahu Whanui as 'the area of Te Waipounamu south of the northernmost boundaries described in the decision of the Maori Appellate Court in a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal by Henare Rakihia Tau, 12 November 1990'. The Act also sets out the names and *takiwa* of each of the current eighteen privileged *papatipu runanga*. Boundary dispute mechanisms and new membership applications outlined in the Act give Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu ultimate power to adjudicate on such issues.

The legislative requirements are formal as *whakapapa* is invisible in ordinary everyday interaction and as Brubaker puts it, 'visible only under the special lens of administrative scrutiny' [1992: 30]. Changes to the recording of *whakapapa* on the register require what Brubaker refers to as 'an administrative apparatus of classification and surveillance and a corresponding body of administrative knowledge' [1992: 30].

While the *rohe* of Ngai Tahu Whanui, and membership in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is carved up to correspond to eighteen *papatipu runanga*, an individual Ngai Tahu Whanui member has the right to membership in any number of them.

---

5 See map of Ngai Tahu Whanui *papatipu runanga*: Figure 2: page 365.
This is possible if a person can claim *whakapapa* to more than one *kaumatua* listed in the 1925 ‘Blue Book’:

Each member of Ngai Tahu Whanui is entitled to be a member of each Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui to which he or she can establish entitlement by descent. [s13(1), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

So the roll establishes entitlement and political participation in the same way as citizenship. Where prior to the introduction of the roll, Ngai Tahu was an identity ascribed at birth and therefore once established, unconditional, now legislation determines the rules for recording *whakapapa* and for recognizing subsequent ‘national’ tribal identities. The Ngai Tahu roll creates identity categories (national, tribal, papatipu runanga, individual member), establishes Ngai Tahu citizenship and allocates inheritance rights through establishing entitlement to settlement from the Ngai Tahu claim. The roll not only functions as a centralised mechanism for recording *whakapapa*, but it may also be used to smooth over competing claims within a contested field. The recording of an individual’s *whakapapa* on the Whakapapa Unit’s list, stored on CDRom and the paper given to the individual as proof of *whakapapa* confer a new identity as member and citizen. One of the functions of the Ngai Tahu roll is to establish legitimate membership to a local/national community and thereby confer rights associated with Ngai Tahu citizenship as equal to the rights of all other registered members.

The voting policies over the period of this research, however, as illustrated in the November 1997 postal vote to consider the proposed Crown settlement, followed the policy of ‘one person/one vote’.

Entitlement to membership in up to eighteen enacted *papatipu runanga* serves to entrench the lateral connections of *whakapapa* so that a person’s *whakapapa* to the widest possible category of South Island Maori is emphasised, while in turn,
these \textit{kaumatua} are framed as ‘Ngai Tahu’, rather than South Island Maori.\footnote{The 1848 Census was ‘the Census of the Middle Island Natives’, not specifically of ‘Ngai Tahu’.} This entrenches the argument that rather than a collection of historically disparate \textit{whanau} and \textit{hapu}, Ngai Tahu Whanui is a united homogeneous \textit{iwi}, whose members connect to one another through a complicated lateral web of \textit{whakapapa}, inhabiting the Ngai Tahu \textit{rohe} of Te Waipounamu. Also, it is Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu that has the power to determine membership and subsequently survey this membership in \textit{papatipu runanga}:

Where any question arises as to whether or not a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui is entitled, by virtue of his or her descent, to be a member of a particular Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu shall have authority to determine that question. [s13(1), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

Any member of Ngai Tahu Whanui may apply to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to have that member determined to be a member of a particular Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui. [s13(3), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu shall cause to be prepared a roll containing the names and addresses of all adult persons who are members of Ngai Tahu Whanui, and shall, from time to time, make all such additions and corrections to the roll as may be necessary.

The roll shall also show, in respect of each person whose name is on the roll, each Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui in respect of which that person has established his or her entitlement to be a member. [s8(1) (2), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

This asserts the wider legal-political collective identity – Ngai Tahu Whanui – over traditional identities. This also further entrenches the potency of \textit{whakapapa} as metanarrative (as addressed in Chapter Eight in the treatment of presentations about \textit{iwi} identity in Ngai Tahu Whanui ontological narrative). \textit{Whakapapa} in the strict sense of genealogical descent is through linear time, to one’s ancestors, through the descent lines of mother and father. If \textit{whakapapa}
were understood in this strict sense, ancestry to eighteen 1848 kaumatua would not be possible.  

The choice of *papati pu runanga* as the preferred representative identity to act as intermediary between registered members and the Ngai Tahu Whanui collective is entrenched in a history of political practice. The Runanga Iwi Act 1990 required that bodies setting up as *iwi* authorities define their internal representation and both internal and external boundaries on a *runanga* basis.

The choice of eighteen as the initial number of *papati pu runanga* acknowledged in the 1996 Act and represented on Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is a recent event in a history of political practice. Prior to the introduction of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu in 1996, there was an intermediary tribal council, Te Runanganui o Tahu. For some time this predecessor to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu consisted of nineteen members, including Otautahi urban *marae*. However, in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act Otautahi is not included. This was due to political challenges between Tuahuriri *marae* and Otautahi, over recognition of traditional *manawhenua* status over the *rohe* of Christchurch, and associated rights.

---

7 Te Maire Tau distinguishes between the lateral and linear interpretations of *whakapapa*, while attributing as much credibility to lateral as to linear connections, referring to a focus on strict linear connection as symptomatic of a 'Western gaze'. Yet in my participant observation research, many 'experienced Ngai Tahu' prefer to consider *whakapapa* in this strict sense, and if lateral connections are considered, it is still limited to connections to nearby *runanga* or *hapu* rather than to a wider tribal or legal-political collective:

Acknowledging that the Western gaze is severely limited in its application to whakapapa is extremely important. The scholar Apihara Ngata explained the technical terms applying to whakapapa in his "Nga Rauru a Toi" lectures [1972]. Ngata opened his lectures by explaining the basics of oral traditions, which is whakapapa. Ngata has been the only scholar to clearly explain the manner in which Maori recited whakapapa.

Ngata begins by saying that whakapapa tipuna is the act of laying one ancestor upon another. Ngata then lays out the following terms: "whakamoe", which describes whakapapa and states the intermarriages in the lines of descent; "taotahi" is recalling a descent line without listing a spouse; and "tararere" is to trace a single descent line without showing other kin. Ngata notes that tararere is used frequently. "Tahu" describes setting out the main lines or principal ancestors of a tribe. To recite one's connection to another line is "whakapiri". One can do this by reciting a line from the tipuna (ancestor) concerned. [Tau: 2001: 18]
Ngai Tahu Trust Board representation was carved up according to eight geographical regions. Angela Ballara identifies twenty-seven Ngai Tahu runanga throughout the South Island that were operating in the 1920s [1998: 315-316].

**Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act introduces Ngai Tahu national identity**

One of the shifts that has occurred in the field of South Island Maori identities and the relations of these to one another, has been the introduction by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership of what I would argue is a 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens'. The 1996 Act effectively introduces a nation of individuals – citizens. I rely on Somers' treatment of citizenship that stresses individual membership and universal rights and duties in a national community [1993: 589]. Calhoun espouses a similar approach where he asserts the defining characteristic of nationality as 'identification by similarity of attributes as a member of a set of equivalent members' [1997: 42]. As Somers identifies, modern citizenship is usually defined as a personal status consisting of a body of universal rights (i.e., legal claims on the state) and duties held equally by all legal members of a nation-state [Marshall: 1964, Brubaker: 1992 in Somers: 1993: 588]. As Minow puts it, it is a network in which 'membership helps constitute the 'I', and belonging is essential to becoming' [1985: 819, 894 in Somers 1993: 589].

For registered members citizenship identity in Ngai Tahu Whanui entails consideration of all relations to others that depend on the individual's relation to a particular state. Since the requirement for membership to the state for all members is based on registration of one's individual whakapapa, it is perceived that it is indeed whakapapa that unites all members. But as one Ngai Tahu person puts it,
Whakapapa does not bind us all, unless you count Tahu Potiki. I am not related to Tipene but we share a common tupuna. Whakapapa 'binds' us to the 'collective' called Ngai Tahu. [Interview, December, 2001]

At present, membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui could be referred to as 'thin' citizenship [Tilly: 1996: 8], i.e., it entails few transactions, rights and obligations. This nation privileges the united homogeneous tribal whole and the individual, with individual rights and responsibilities where emphasis is now on what Paine refers to as the 'qualified sameness of egalitarian individualism' [Paine: 1999: 105 in Cohen: 2000: 153].

It is not the purpose of this dissertation to evaluate the rights and responsibilities of Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members as 'citizens' of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation'. Chapters Six to Eight address the framing of a nationalist identity in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. How this new national identity comes to be practised by registered members and by the collective whole is an issue to be addressed as Ngai Tahu Whanui moves forward into the future. But in my observations over the period 1996 – 2000, this personal member status now applies in the case of Ngai Tahu Whanui. This is established and managed by the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll of members, entrenched in legislation by the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act and supported by Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. For the first time in history, the individual member – 'Ngai Tahu citizen' - is privileged above whanau. For the first time also, a collection of disparate registered members is connected to a wider collectivity through registration of individual whakapapa, rather than connection to kin relationships of a whanau or hapu as understood and maintained by recitation at the marae. The 1996 Act sets out requirements for the membership of 'persons' or 'beneficiaries', not collective kin groups.

---

8 Charles Tilly argues that citizenship is defined as a special sort of contract formed from particular ties connecting citizen with agent where there exist enforceable rights and obligations based on persons' categorical membership and agents' relation to the state. He refers to citizenship that ranges from thin to thick: 'thin where it entails few transactions, rights and obligations; thick where it occupies a significant share of all transactions, rights and obligations sustained by state agents and people living under their jurisdiction' [1996: 8].
Emphasis is on the sovereignty of the individual and the connection of the individual to the wider collective – Ngai Tahu Whanui.

As Somers argues, a metanarrative is attributed power and authority to define the conceptual basis for established hierarchies of power and the boundaries of inclusion and exclusion for collective identities [1999: 136]. While the current form of whakapapa management determines 'Ngai Tahu Whanui' identity, it simultaneously excludes or subsumes other whakapapa and hence other identities, including Waitaha, Ngati Mamoe and other iwi. It has also excluded hapu as the historic form of South Island Maori collective organisation, by privileging individual, iwi and papatipu runanga.⁹

⁹ Hana O'Regan addresses the role of hapu in South Island Maori history:

At different times in our history the tribal entity has played a significant role in Kai Tahu identity. During the wars with Ngati Toa in the 1820 and 1830s, the Kai Tahu Claim, the Waitangi Tribunal hearings, the fights over the allocation of fisheries, the legal identity of the tribe and settlement of the Kai Tahu Claim. Throughout these phases it has been politic for Kai Tahu to identify as a tribe. They represent times when the core of our identity, our land and resources and our culture, have been under threat from the Crown, the power culture and other Maori. The tribe has acted as a strong defence against those external threats and pressures.

There are other phases of Kai Tahu history where the tribe has not been the focus of that identity and these have generally been in times of comparative security. During these times the focus of identity has been centred at the regional and community level: on practising the local mahika Kai traditions, of learning the local histories and participating in the local communities. At such times the tribe might be seen as a piece of history, something which has no significant bearing on day-to-day lives. However, when that security has been shaken, the response has been to draw on the connections, the kinship, the shared historical experiences and the shared struggles of other communities, to unite under the tribal umbrella.

The tribe is the entity which is seen at the present time to be the best and most effective mechanism for Kai Tahu to achieve the dreams and visions of the people.... it is the tribal identity that the descendents of the ‘Blue Book’ have opted for to lead them through the new century. [2001: 172]

Another identity that is currently being considered by the leadership in terms of its rights of inclusion within Ngai Tahu Whanui is that of ‘whangai’ (adopted child). Hana O’Regan addresses this issue:

The kaikorero consistently return to the issue of whakapapa and the notion of permanence. They all voice their belief that whakapapa could and should be incorporated into the tribe
The whakapapa roll is used as a tool by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership to reorganise a history of complex multiple and heterogeneous South Island Maori identities, smoothing over competing claims.

The 1996 Act further entrenches these exclusions and subsumptions. Whanau and hapu are excluded from the statutory recognition and rights granted to eighteen papatipu runanga. Other South Island iwi are excluded from recognition due to the definitions of geographic boundary as these apply to Ngai Tahu Whanui. Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe, two South Island iwi with tangata whenua status in the history of South Island Maori settlement prior to the signing of the

in every possible way. The qualification on that inclusion was that it could only ever be a temporary state; the permanence inherent in whakapapa was something that could not be acquired or given away:

I think if the whangai has the bloodlines to Ngai Tahu, Kati Mamoe, Waitaha, Rapuwai - then they are Ngai Tahu ... They can never be unless they have that bloodline. They must have the bloodline. And if they are whangai - they are still Ngai Tahu. But if they are Russian, or Chinese - they can't be Ngai Tahu. They will always remain what they were in the first place [George Te Au in H. O'Regan: 2001: 56].

To me a whangai is someone who is a part of your whanau ... but you cannot give them what you cannot give them, you can't give them bloodlines ... They lose their own identity in order to become part of our whanau. Now, either we restore their identity to them, or we give them ours. I don't know how we do [that], but we cannot give them the bloodlines [Mahana Walsh in H. O'Regan: 2001: 56].

That does not mean to say, however, that whakai cannot be Kai Tahu in every other way; that they cannot grow up in a Kai Tahu cultural environment with a Kai Tahu world view, with a connection to place, and people, and tribe, but without the Kai Tahu whakapapa.

You are Ngai Tahu for the duration of your existence on this earth - no, your descendants are not Ngai Tahu - easy option - marry a Ngai Tahu if you're a whangai. Problem solved [Tahu Potiki in H. O'Regan: 2001: 56].

The importance of whakapapa as the determining factor in the succession to and allocation of tribal and local resources and rights... has brought the issue whakai within Kai Tahu to the fore. But succession to rights in resources is not the only area from which whakai are currently excluded. Because whakai [local South Island dialect] are unable to show their descent back to a kaumatua in the Blue Book they are also unable to enrol as a Kai Tahu beneficiary and will not therefore receive copies of the Kai Tahu magazine or any other information sent out to beneficiaries. Neither can they participate in personal benefit distribution from the tribe's assets. [H. O'Regan: 2001: 56-57]

10 See map of Ngai Tahu Whanui rohe (territory): Figure 2: page 365.
Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 are mentioned in the Act, to be subsumed within the new Ngai Tahu Whanui:

Meaning of Ngai Tahu and Ngai Tahu Whanui---

(1) For the purposes of this Act and any other enactment, unless the context otherwise requires, “Ngai Tahu” and “Ngai Tahu Whanui” each means the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapu of Waitaha, Ngati Mamoe. [s2: Interpretation, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

A witness for Ngai Tahu, Mr. Tipene O'Regan, cited the whakapapa (genealogy) of the Ngai Tahu people which linked the Waitaha, Ngati Mamoe, and Ngai Tahu as the three elements making up today's Ngai Tahu tribe. [Christchurch Press, June 23, 1990]

As the Act sets out, membership requires a 'person' to prove whakapapa to one of the South Island kaumatua recorded in the 'Blue Book', rather than to one of the five primary hapu identified as signatories to the Treaty. The South Island kaumatua who signed the Treaty of Waitangi were representatives from five primary hapu [Annual Tribal Hui a Tau 1997]. What each registered Ngai Tahu Whanui member holds in common is ancestry to one of the South Island Maori kaumatua recorded as alive in 1848, listed in the 1925 'Blue Book'. The 'Blue Book' and the recorded ancestry of contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui members to these names is the whakapapa. Contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui is a collection of disparate individuals who hold in common ancestry to one of the kaumatua, as recorded by their individual whakapapa. Neither these ancestors nor the recording of these connects individuals to one another. In its strictest understanding, whakapapa is the recorded ancestral lines back in time, not laterally. One reading is that cited by Sir Tipene O'Regan's thesis [Canterbury University: September 22 1998], that whakapapa unites all contemporary Ngai Tahu to one another. Another reading is whakapapa does not unite Ngai Tahu Whanui members, it simply records ancestry of each member to the 1925 lists – something all members hold in common. It is the management of whakapapa
and the presentation of a particular narrative about its history and uses that attempts to unite contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui members.

The five hapu were acknowledged in the 1925 'Blue Book' and in the 1993 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Charter as 'the five primary hapu of Ngai Tahu'. In fact, the 1993 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Charter defines 'Ngai Tahu whanui' as 'the collective of the individuals who descend from the five primary hapu of Ngai Tahu, Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha, namely Kati Kuri, Ngati Irahehu, Kati Huirapa, Ngai Tuahuriri and Ngai Te Ruahikihiki' [1993: 3]. According to Evison, signatures from the following five hapu were represented on Kemp's Deed: Kaiapoi and Kaikanui; Banks Peninsula; Taumutu; Kakaunui, Moeraki, Waikouaiti and Purakaunui; and Otakou [1993: 516].

Acknowledgement of hapu as a primary collective South Island Maori identity since the mid-nineteenth century is evident in s2, 'Interpretation'. Here, a historical connection from contemporary individual members to the five primary hapu instead of the status of a collection of individual members who share the right to whakapapa to one of the South Island kaumatua is emphasised:

In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, "Ngai Tahu Whanui" means the collective of the individuals who descend from the primary hapu of Ngai Tahu and Ngati Mamoe, namely, Kati Kuri, Kati Irahehu, Kati Huirapa, Ngai Tuahuriri, and Kai Te Ruahikihiki. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

However, this acknowledgement of the historic status of hapu identity does not extend in the Act beyond the 'Interpretation' section. No real powers are granted to hapu.

Hapu are also acknowledged in terms of the views they might have to contribute to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, but once again, this section does not attribute any rights to hapu to challenge the eighteen papatipu runanga whose representatives form Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, in terms of voting rights:
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, in carrying out consultation under subsection (2) of this section, ---

(a) Shall seek the views of such Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui and such hapu as in the opinion of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu may have views that they wish to express in relation to the matter about which te Runanga o Ngai Tau is being consulted; and

(b) Shall not act or agree to act in a manner that prejudices or discriminates against, any Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu or any hapu unless Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu believes on reasonable grounds that the best interests of Ngai Tahu Whanui as a whole require Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to act in that manner. [s15, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996]

The role of hapu as supporting the contemporary privileged identities rather than receiving privilege, constitutes a major shift in privileged collective South Island Maori collective identities, as these have arisen out of whakapapa, since 1840 and even before [see A. Anderson:1998, Ballara:1998].

Runanga began in the nineteenth century as small reserves that were created by the Crown to represent hapu, sometimes several hapu, and the runanga represented their concerns and negotiated with the Crown as the other partner to the Treaty. One past member of the Trust Board, Rakihia Tau, offers an explanation of the history of Ngai Tahu's runanga structure. He claims that runanga developed in the South Island in the mid-nineteenth century because of the Crown's refusal to adhere to the Treaty of Waitangi and its obligations to Ngai Tahu regarding land purchases, so that 'our people' were limited to small areas called reserves. Thus, in order to compete with the Crown for acknowledgement as a partner to the Treaty, South Island Maori had to develop another social structure. He claims, 'we needed people who could speak... for and on behalf of us' [R. Tau: Interview: 1990].

Angela Ballara [1998: 288] identifies several forms of runanga that began mid-nineteenth century. Some of these she identifies as Crown-created, and some
as ‘runanga-Maori’; their form and purpose varying across collectivity and place: ‘H Hanson Turton wrote that continuing institutions called runanga were first observed in Waikato in 1856. He visited various districts in 1861 and found two systems existing side by side, usually divided by descent group. For example, Ngati Maru had a ‘runanga-Maori’ and Ngati Whanunga a ‘Queen’s runanga’ [Crown-created runanga]. In the upper Waikato and Waipa districts each hapu had its own runanga. Their main functions seem to have been to act as courts, handing down fines for offences and deciding civil issues between individuals. Neither the ‘runanga-Maori’ nor the early ‘Queen’s runanga’ should be confused with the Maori King movement’s runanga system or the government’s official system, inaugurated in the Bay of Islands in 1862. All these systems contributed to some stages of developing tribal institutions.

Long-standing tribal runanga, soon in evidence, were the logical extension of these systems. Unlike the earlier komiti and meetings termed runanga but called for short-lived specific issues, these tribal runanga were ongoing institutions, reconvened whenever an issue involving the whole tribe arose. These tribal runanga were the first institutions – nascent tribal governments – of the modern tribes. Some tribal-government-style runanga derived directly from the government’s system. George Clarke reported from the Bay of Islands in 1862:

The great Runanga is a meeting of a powerful Tribe, consisting of small Tribes and Hapus in connection with the great Tribe. For instance, Ngapuhi would be represented by every Tribe and Hapu living in their territory, namely from Whangarei to the North Cape; and if called together on any great occasion, there would be Chiefs or Deputies from every place of importance. [Ballara: 1998: 288]

---

11 The Maori King Movement originated with Wiremu Kingi (c 1795-1882) who was a Te Atiawa (North Island iwi) chief. He became the victim of one of the most well-known injustices imposed on Maori by Pakehas over the land. He was also one of the first converts to Christianity. Injustices initiated by Governor Gore Brown to Te Atiawa Maori precipitated the war of Taranaki. [New Zealand Encyclopedia CDROM].
According to Butterworth, in the mid-nineteenth century Runanga were Crown-created meetings by which to devolve at least minimal power, i.e., to handle minor criminal matters and civil disputes between Maori in the nineteenth century, as well as management of native schools, hospitals, jails and local roads throughout their districts and to adjudicate land disputes. They were proposed by Governor Grey as the basis for an elaborate system of local and regional government. They were created and elected in acknowledgement by Grey that Maori had to be properly incorporated within the framework of government. His approach was an alternative to his predecessor's (Gore Browne's) promise of having regular conferences of Maori chiefs to discuss government legislation and policies. Maori interest in the structure waned, however, when it became apparent that the government wished to impose its own agenda on Runanga. The Runanga policy was formally abandoned by the government in 1866 [1989: 10].

The following excerpt points out definite distinctions between the respective roles of runanga and hapu in the nineteenth century:

If from each community's point of view [mid nineteenth century], management and use of local resources did not entail exclusive ownership then, conversely, from each hapu's point of view ownership of land and resources did not entail centralised control of use. Therefore, the structure was analogous to the runanga system of more recent times, in which families of different hapu cooperate in managing the affairs of their district, but continue to own and manage land according to whanau membership. [A. Anderson: 1998: 113]

The choice of runanga as the basis for the geographical carving up of Ngai Tahu's rohe was discussed prior to the claims. Runanga was chosen over other possibilities - hapu, marae, whanau:

Ngai Tahu hapu are unlike hapu of North Island tribes because they are not located solely in one region. Ngai Tahu has been characterised by a system of multi-hapu papakainga (traditional bases of Ngai Tahu people which were not separated along hapu lines), and the reason for this is that Ngai Tahu was originally essentially a
hunter-gatherer society moving from one region to the next in pursuit of 'traditional foods. Consequently, Ngai Tahu people rarely identify with only one hapu: 'It is enough for Ngai Tahu iwi to state that they are tangata whenua to Te Waipounamu, and they can walk from one end of the island to the other. Ngai Tahu are so interrelated that no simplistic definition of Ngai Tahu social structure will work. [Submission to the Royal Commission on Social Policy by the Ngai Tahu Social Policy Task Force: 1988: 16]

Runanga are primarily based upon genealogical connections to the people of a given area. Cross-referencing by Ngai Tahu people into other runanga is acceptable where it may not be in the North Island. [Interview with Koa Marshall: 1990]

At a special meeting called by the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board to discuss the proposed Ngai Tahu Act, in January 1996, the question was raised again by Ngai Tahu individuals present, as to why *papatipu runanga* had been chosen as the privileged intermediary collectivity. Sir Tipene O'Regan, then Chairperson of the Trust Board and Chief Claims Negotiator said that he clarified in discussions with Crown representatives that Ngai Tahu have always been 'multi-hapu' in character; that to develop a body which privileges hapu would be too complex, whereas a *papatipu runanga* structure is more straightforward for Ngai Tahu.

Chapter Eight will address the privileging of eighteen *papatipu runanga* and the collective Ngai Tahu Whanui over the five primary *hapu*, in the narrative perspectives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu'.

Management of contemporary identities further entrenched in key dates and places

As introduced in Chapter One, the privileging of the contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui identities is embedded in particular framings of key themes – meta-themes – about time, significant place, and political practice involving South Island Maori and the Crown over land claims issues since 1840. The Act
entrenches the South Island, Te Waipounamu, as the 'rohe' of Ngai Tahu Whanui. The year 1848 is established in both the 1996 Act and in the management of whakapapa by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, by establishment of the primary place of the 1925 'Blue Book', as the mark of original Ngai Tahu tribal identity. In turn, the exclusion of Ngati Mamoe, Waitaha, other South Island iwi, and North Island iwi, and Ngai Tahu hapu and whanau whose whakapapa are interwoven with the whakapapa of Ngai Tahu. Because the South Island is established as the rohe of Ngai Tahu and 1848 is established as the original date of Ngai Tahu manawhenua identity in the South Island, a Ngai Tahu iwi as tangata whenua since 1840/1848 is implied.

By emphasis on 1848 rather than other key dates in the development of relations between the Crown and South Island Maori outlined in Chapter Two and entrenchment of this date in legislation, other key dates in the management of South Island Maori whakapapa are excluded. As pointed out in Chapter Two, 1990 (Runanga Iwi Act) and 1991 (Waitangi Tribunal Report on the Ngai Tahu claims) are key dates in the development of the contemporary privileged identities, yet these are not entrenched in either the 1996 Act nor in any other form of whakapapa management by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. These dates,

12 Hana O'Regan identifies the key dates of the 1920s and 1848, as symbolised by the 'iconic' 'Blue Book', in the determination of contemporary Ngai Tahu identity:

In terms of determining a person's Kai Tahu whakapapa, Kai Tahu has a well-tested procedure in place. In the 1920s a census was conducted establishing the names of all those Kai Tahu alive in 1848. This document later became affectionately known as the Blue Book (because of its blue cover) and has since been the essential tool used to identify tribal members. To enrol as a beneficiary of Kai Tahu you must first be able to prove your descent back to a kaumatua in the Blue Book:

If you can do that, according to the Ngai Tahu prescription...then you are technically a Ngai Tahu beneficiary [Tipene O'Regan in H. O'Regan: 2001: 53].

The Blue Book is supported by a huge and systematic whakapapa file.... The accuracy of the records has been highlighted by the fact that since the Blue Book was first published there has only ever been one addition made to it. Kai Tahu are extremely fortunate to have had this resource available, as it has relieved a lot of the pressures placed upon the collective to define 'who we are'. Many other tribes are presently struggling with the problems of identifying their members, especially in the light of having to manage and organise post-Treaty settlement situations. [H. O'Regan: 2001: 53]
representing the introduction of the Runanga Iwi Act, and the Waitangi Tribunal's Report on the Ngai Tahu claims, further entrenched 'Ngai Tahu iwi' status in negotiations with the Crown. These dates were fundamental to eventual passing of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act.

Nine separate territorial claims were brought to the Waitangi Tribunal by the Trust Board in 1986 - the 'Nine Tall Trees' - corresponding to nine territorial areas in the South Island. Two key developments occurred at the beginning of the 1990s that shifted emphasis from smaller territorial collective identities to pan-territorial tribal collective identity. These were the 1990 Runanga Iwi Act and negotiations between the Ngai Tahu 'Chief Negotiators' appointed by the Trust Board and the Crown arising out of the Waitangi Tribunal's findings from 1991 to 1996. Both set the context for an emphasis on Ngai Tahu as a tribal collectivity with one all-encompassing claim to a distinct geographical area. The Runanga Iwi Act carved up the South Island into runanga as representative of the tribe's 'grassroots' traditional political organisation and set out the essential characteristics of iwi. The Runanga Iwi Act 1990 and the Waitangi Tribunal's findings in favour of the Ngai Tahu claims [1991] both facilitated the assertion of Ngai Tahu's identity as tribal and distinct from other iwi, geographically and in terms of manawhenua identity.

The Crown's representatives from 1991 increasingly indicated to the Ngai Tahu Chief Negotiators (the 'A Team') a willingness to reach a negotiated settlement, a package incorporating compensation, cultural redress and preemptive rights to purchase Crown assets. However, there was indication that this would take the form of a combined tribal settlement, for distribution in an equitable and democratic way equally to all registered members, not as the original territorial claims [see Chapters Two and Five]. This issue will be addressed further in Chapters Six and Seven. Chapters Six to Nine of this dissertation will address how these key dates and constructions of place are further secured in Ngai Tahu Whanui ontological narrative, which in turn, deemphasises other key dates,
places and, hence, identities. The same is the case for the choice to carve up of the Ngai Tahu rohe into eighteen geographic territories that correlate to the eighteen registered papatipu runanga, rather than some other form. This will be addressed further in Chapter Ten.

For Ngai Tahu living outside the Ngai Tahu rohe or away from their papatipu runanga, association with the tribe is required to take place through the papatipu runanga system [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999].

Two thirds of all Ngai Tahu live in urban centres, the majority now living outside the South Island of New Zealand, mostly in the North Island and the east coast of Australia [T. Ryan: Interview: June 2002]. Yet, the expectation by Ngai Tahu Whanui continues to be that individuals must travel to one of the privileged 'places' identified by the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act as the takiwa of the papatipu runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui. Participation requires either travel to attend runanga meetings or the development of mechanisms of information circulation, including the postage of the quarterly tribal magazine and annual reports and the following:

The Runanga Development Manager also maintains contact with Ngai Tahu networks outside the rohe, usually known as whanau groups. The whanau groups are a good way for Ngai Tahu living away from their papakainga to keep closer links with tribal issues and events. One Papatipu Runanga has taken the step to establish satellite groups for their members who are looking for regular input into Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu discussions. This is a very good way of ensuring wider participation in runanga decision making. If you are interested in being part of a Ngai Tahu network in the area that you live in, please contact the Runanga Development Manager at Ngai Tahu Development Corporation.

Suzanne's work involves the Papatipu Runanga, Ngai Tahu in various areas and individuals or groups who seek information about Ngai Tahu. If you would like to know more about what is happening with the Papatipu Runanga, Ngai Tahu culture, heritage or communication... [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 29]

---

13 See map of Ngai Tahu Whanui papatipu runanga: Figure 2: page 365.
Prior to 1840, Ngai Tahu *whakapapa* connected farther back in time to Waitaha as the original South Island Maori identity [Evison: 1993, A. Anderson: 1998].\footnote{Waitaha is acknowledged by historians and by Ngai Tahu as the original *iwi* inhabiting the South Island of New Zealand prior to the arrival of North Island *hapu* and *iwi* in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries [A. Anderson: 1998, Ballara: 1998, Evison: 1993]. The issue of the place of Waitaha in contemporary South Island Maori identities is addressed further in Chapters Eight and Nine.} Prior to 1840, Ngai Tahu *hapu whakapapa* also connected laterally to other *iwi* [T. O'Regan: 2002; 1993; 1991, A. Anderson: 1998, Ballara: 1998, B. Solomon: 2000, Evison: 1993]. This includes Ngati Mamoe. In fact, according to Atholl Anderson [1998], Ballara [1998] and Cormack [1997] and Evison [1993], Ngati Mamoe was still the preeminent tribe in some parts of the South Island in 1840 and even up to the turn of the twentieth century. While the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840, it is 1848 that has recently been privileged by contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui. In fact, according to Ballara [1998], no official census took place until the 1860s:

No official lists of tribes existed until 1862 and later, and then they were put together from the collective, limited but widely varying knowledge of local resident magistrates and other officers. From the late 1840s government land purchase officers took notes on local chiefs, tribal names and territories claimed and reported these as they understood them in official correspondence to the officers and ministers of the colonial governments. At times, censuses were attempted..., but the questions asked of Maori were neither systematic nor consistent. Accumulation of information about Maori social organisation was a haphazard, ad hoc affair.

The various official tribal lists published from 1862 were framed in terms of a spurious social structure derived from the opinions of the 'experts' of the 1840s. They formed the basis of European understanding of Maori tribal organisation for the next century and more. The notion grew of large 'tribes' or 'nations' of which smaller tribes were dependent parts; these smaller groups were called 'hapu', 'clans' or 'subtribes', or sometimes 'subdivisions' or 'branches' ....This notion was especially attractive to officials looking for a comprehensible and comprehensive hierarchical body politic with which to negotiate land purchases.

This process can be traced amongst those officials purchasing in the South Island. Knowledge of the South Island peoples was not acquired evenly or progressively. Each successive officer, as he followed his predecessors in attempts to straighten out the South Island 'Land Question', went on a personal voyage of discovery.... Although the only tribal groups mentioned in the southern Maori signatures to the
Treaty of Waitangi had been 'Ngatirangiamoa' and 'Ngai te kahukura, there was a
growing tendency from the 1840s to see Ngai Tahu as the dominant tribe in the rest
of the South Island. But since each government official was at a different stage of
'expertise', traces remained in some of their reports of the older,
explorer/missionary system of small, independent 'tribes' - the followers of the chief
in a settlement or district. This earlier system was only gradually ousted as the
contagion of official consistency spread through their ranks. The new model
presupposed one large tribe subdivided into subtribes, but inconsistencies remained
which demonstrated the officials' continuing confusion. [1998: 70-71]

1848 became a prominent date only with the introduction of the 'Blue Book' in
1925. The 'Blue Book' emphasised lists of kaumatua developed by Mantell in
1848. But, why these particular lists were emphasised in the 'Blue Book', and
not later 'official' censuses or earlier lists from 1840 to 1848 is outlined in this
excerpt from Ballara:

Edward Shortland... reported to J.J. Symonds in 1844 that Ngati Mamoe were the
'admitted proprietors' of the southern half of the South Island.... In southern
Canterbury and Southland Ngati Mamoe were the 'first class claimants'. He
recorded that other Maori then living on those lands had been invited to settle there
by the chiefs of Ngati Mamoe at the time when Te Rauparaha's [feared North Island
chief] attacks on Kapiapoi led to a general move south. They had come from
Kapiapoi and Hakaroa or Akaroa (Banks Peninsula) and did not pretend to have any
right to sell at this time, but merely had rights to occupy and cultivate the land.
Now that peace was established many of them were returning to their former homes
at Kapiapoi and Hakaroa.  Shortland listed these visitors, the second class claimants;
the list included contemporary Ngai Tahu chiefs Taiaroa, Karetai, Tiakitai, Tikao,
Tuhawaiki, Patuki and Koroko. The conclusion must be that for Shortland in 1844
Ngai Tahu were not tangata whenua from Taumutu south; Ngati Mamoe were....

Shortland published his book on South Island Maori, The Southern Districts of New
Zealand, in 1851. It was based on information he had gathered from July 1843 as
protector of aborigines and interpreter to Colonel Godfrey, who was charged with
investigating land purchase claims in the South Island. By 1851 Shortland had
changed his stance. His new version of Ngai Tahu traditional history was based on
information from contemporary Ngai Tahu chiefs; naturally they assigned much
more mana to their own people....

He confirmed that the most southern part of Ngai Tahu's newly acquired territory
was at Taumutu in central Canterbury.... Shortland maintained that Ngati Mamoe
retreated south from Taumutu, but after this, peace was made, marriage alliances
were formed and 'the two races became incorporated into one tribe, which was generally called Ngaitahu, or Kaitahu.' ('Kai' and 'Kati' are South Island dialectal variations of 'Ngai' and 'Ngati'.) The perhaps unconscious progression in Shortland's mind from two 'races' to one tribe was to be mirrored in the work of other officials.

Shortland's book was not published until 1851 but his official reports from 1844 must have been available to the next government officer to deal with South Island Maori. However J.J. Symonds, supervising on behalf of the Crown the New Zealand Company purchase of the Otago block in July 1844, and H. Tacy Kemp in June 1848, made their purchases from the 'Chiefs and People of Ngaitahu'. What had happened to the primary claim of Ngati Mamoe as the recent tangata whenua of the southern half of the South Island, in the intervening four years?

Harry Evison, who confirms the on-going survival of Ngati Mamoe, has traced what happened in his description of the background of Kemp's purchase in 1848. Just as Ngati Mamoe were numerically swamped by their Ngai Tahu guests after Te Rauparaha's attack on Kaiapoi, any primary tenure claim they might have had was smothered in the high politics and drama of events in the North Island in which Governor Robert FitzRoy had to placate the New Zealand Company and deal with the fallout from the 1843 Wairau 'massacre' and later Governor Grey was confronted with the necessity to contain Te Rauparaha, Te Rangihaaata and Ngati Toa in the Hutt Valley, at Porirua and Poroutahwao. One of Grey's chosen methods was to conciliate Ngati Toa [South Island iwi] by paying them for land they claimed was conquered from Ngai Tahu. He then had to extricate himself from the outrage of Ngai Tahu at his meeting with them at Banks Peninsula late in January 1848. Kemp was then instructed to conciliate Ngai Tahu by recognising them exclusively in his next purchase. This move, aimed at Ngati Toa, also excluded Ngati Mamoe.

In neither the Otago nor Kemp's purchase were any of the Europeans involved inclined to muddy the waters of already complex negotiations, in which the principal players were the Crown, the Colonial Office in Britain and the New Zealand company, by any strict inquiry into the identity, respective rights or needs of the sellers. Neither Symonds nor Kemp seems to have received instructions to make any inquiry, not even for the purposes of equitable distribution of purchase money. The Europeans concerned, Crown and Company, described the Maori of Otago and Canterbury collectively by such terms as 'the whole of the Natives' or the 'Native population' and specific groups by their locality, e.g. the 'Waikouaiti natives'.

Although there was no inquiry as such, censuses of the populations of the Ngai Tahu and Murikihu block areas were taken in 1848 and 1853. The Maori population within these areas was listed as belonging to 93 descent groups, including Ngati Mamoe and Ngati Tahupotiki, of which at least nine names were merely spelling variants of others. These descent groups were defined indiscriminately as 'Tribes or hapu'. These lists were probably intended to establish the names of all individuals whose rights had been extinguished by these purchases. [1998: 69 - 74]
The introduction of Ngai Tahu Whanui membership has shifted the form of whakapapa for South Island Maori

With the introduction of the registration of individual whakapapa in the Trust Board, there occurred a shift both in how and by whom whakapapa knowledge was stored - from collective to individual, stored by a centralised administrative body rather than in shared memory of members of a whanau or hapu. In the nineteenth century, whakapapa was communal knowledge. Individuals knew and lived their whakapapa relationships (whanaungatanga). In fact, as Ballara [1998] Cormack [1997] and Maaka [1997 in Cormack] point out, many of the 'unofficial' censuses of the nineteenth century contained inaccuracies either because Crown officials did not meet face-to-face with all those whose whakapapa they recorded or because of discrepancies in styles of the various census-takers:

The shorthand blanket labels of the Maori tribal system of the early 1840s were added to and expanded by the work of the officials of the early colonial government. Often, they accepted without analysis or checking the statements of Maori informants about districts other than their own...for example... Shortland, like Dieffenbach, had gathered that Ngati Kahungunu were the only people living from Poverty Bay to Porirua 'and farther westward', rather than just the most numerous and powerful group in that area.

Blanket tribal labels were often given by Maori informants discussing areas other than their own, whose genealogies they were unfamiliar with, and which they had not visited ... [Ballara: 1998: 69-70]

According to kaumatua, Syd Cormack:

Another thing, there was a lot of multiple names, and a lot of familiar names, and sometimes they're misspelled. And they got mixed up at times. There was one case with six different names in it - just a letter altered and that. They were all the same person, they had to be. That's the way I looked at it and that made sense. The shares that person got in different places, each had a different name. [Cormack: 1997: 140]
Roger Maaka adds:

At the time of first contact, Maori people were often known by more than one name. As well as their original Maori name, they had baptismal names - in English and Maori - and a familial 'nickname'. Many Maori women married very young, and often married more than once, so that they were known by different names at different times of their adult lives. Half-caste English surnames were often given Maori forms, and some children took names from different sides of the family. The resulting confusion was compounded by phonetic spelling and the poor literacy of many of the recorders of early days. [Maaka: 1997: 140]

As I identified in previous research, *whakapapa* information was not for dissemination to the Ngai Tahu people or to anyone else. Drawing on Paine [200: 153], I argue that the underlying assumptions of universalism and common citizenship of the contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui are little compatible with, and often in contradiction to, the assumptions of South Island Maori collective identities historically. Historically, the process of knowing one’s *whakapapa* was embedded in living the relationships at the places where one lived (*whanaungatanga*) and one’s ancestors had lived. Now the process begins with the individual and a sheet of paper. A person registers his or her *whakapapa* with the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit. This *whakapapa* is then known to the individual and to the employees of the Whakapapa Unit of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. For an individual with interest in registering his/her identity for membership into the collective, the process begins with a phone call to the Whakapapa Unit of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: '0800-KaiTahu'. The individual fills out the following form:

I .of .do solemnly and sincerely declare.... That I am a descendant of..who is the original "1848 Kaumatua" of the Ngai Tahu tribe, listed under No. ..in the booklet mentioned above: That the Whakapapa on the back hereof indicating my descent from the said "1848 Kaumatua" is true and correct.... HAVE YOU: Completed Whakapapa details on the reverse of the form ...Signed the Whakapapa on the back page. [Application for enrolment, Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 53]
Then, through research by the Whakapapa Unit, one's whakapapa is traced and inscribed on a piece of paper for the individual to take away, while it is also stored as one entry in the collection of registrations of individual whakapapas on the Whakapapa Unit's CDRom. Once this is done, the individual possesses his/her own whakapapa. This can be in a variety of forms - on paper, computer disk, CDRom, through the post or by courier. The newly registered member is duly entitled to access a range of rights and the tribal publications, as a registered member, or 'client' [according to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report 1999] of Ngai Tahu Whanui:

Individual members of Ngai Tahu Whanui are kept in the picture and can have their say by:

Attending the meetings of any of the Papatipu Runanga with which they have an association

Attending the regular meetings of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu

Attending the Annual General Meeting of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and/or the tribal Hui-a-Tau

Writing to or telephoning any of the Papatipu Runanga with which they have an association, and/or directly to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu itself

The provision of three tribal magazines per year at no charge, to all registered members of Ngai Tahu Whanui who are 18 years of age and over. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 53]

When newly registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members receive their whakapapa, they are not entitled to know the whakapapa of any other Ngai Tahu Whanui member. This contributes to the argument that Ngai Tahu Whanui introduces a Ngai Tahu Nation of independent citizens. Registered members may hold in common a whakapapa link to the 'Blue Book' but their identity is in terms of individual membership to the whole collective.
I attended a Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meeting in Kaikoura in 1997, where the Whakapapa Enrolments Officer (who had been in this position for nearly 30 years) commented that he was saddened that the whole nature of whakapapa had been changing with individuals now able to call up and demand the posting of their whakapapa ‘by the end of the week’. Face-to-face contact is no longer necessary. One Ngai Tahu kaumatua I interviewed referred to these individuals as ‘postage stamp Ngai Tahu’. In fact, there is now a 0800 number that individuals can call to find out about their whakapapa. One Ngai Tahu individual I interviewed jokingly referred to this number as ‘0800-Who Am I?’.

This compares with Russell Bishop’s personal journey, beginning with a clue of his Maori ancestry through his mother’s family, to researching the ‘lost whakapapa’ to travelling to initiate relationships with the kin represented in the whakapapa:

In 1982 I commenced researching the lost whakapapa of my mother’s family. I had grown up ignorant of my family’s Waikato Maori ancestry. Knowledge of our heritage was very sketchy, essentially consisting of a few stories passed on through my mother. It was also very difficult to find out much in the way of family details for there appeared to be a conspiracy of silence. It was very mysterious....

Persistent suppression of the Maori side of the family’s history was a common feature of family recollections. My grandfather had also taken part in this process, allowing the Pakeha lifestyle to be the dominant one for his children. However, upon the birth of his youngest daughter (my mother) when he was 65 years old, he relented. He gave her ‘the names’. My mother often told the story about how he had given her ‘all the names’. The fact she told it so often signifies the importance that he must have ascribed to them... These were clues that I was able to use in my search for the family....

In order to use these clues, I needed to learn about the culture that my grandfather had had to leave behind. Once I became aware of the importance of whakapapa to Maori people and of the depth of knowledge and information contained in whakapapa, I realized that these names were all the clues I really needed.... It was not possible to understand the importance of the clues until I understood that the names my grandfather had left were the keys to the family whakapapa and its context. They were the keys to the story that was to unravel. They led me to Waikato and to the Bay of Plenty, and there the pieces began to fit together. [1996: 35-40]
For an individual with no prior knowledge of his/her South Island Maori identity or for an individual who has experienced whakapapa relationships (whanaungatanga) but has not registered as a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui, there is a requirement to register in order both to benefit from the Claims Settlement and to 'connect' with Ngai Tahu Whanui. Connecting with one's kin – the relationships represented by whakapapa - was the traditional process of whakawhanaungatanga. Now there is a process to be followed as established by the current leadership and reinforced by the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996. This entails a particular management of whakapapa.

When one receives one's whakapapa, one then knows of his or her position as a member of 'Ngai Tahu Whanui', with the knowledge of the direct descent line, through one or both parents, to one of the '1848 kaumatua'. As Te Maire Tau said in a conversation, most Ngai Tahu individuals now are like me, on the outside looking in, i.e., meaning they all hold individual whakapapa but are not aware of their connections to either one another or to place. The relationships have not been established [May 2000]. This process of relationship-formation (whakawhanaungatanga) is now the endpoint, rather than the beginning, as it was. For most Ngai Tahu Whanui members, connection beyond registration and receipt of the tribal publications – the Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative – does not happen [T. O'Regan: 2001].

As Ngai Tahu kaumatua Jim Pohio put it to me:

... the Maori people, or my people, had no written records, they maintained those sorts of things orally rather than written. You can put essential details on a piece of paper and forget about it. Of course, the Maori approach is to carry these things around in memory or verse, they're more personal to you....

In the industrial society you're more individualised, you keep track of your personal assets, what you have is yours and what you haven't is of no interest.... It depends on what values you've been brought up to hold.... Among my own people that's always been something they've been careful
to maintain, is their links with other people in other areas. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Kaikwhakahaere, Mark Solomon, also acknowledges this:

...in the old days those histories were repeated publicly repeatedly, you went onto a marae and you recited your whakapapa links of how you interrelate with the people you’re visiting. Whakapapa were more a living thing that were spoken of all the time. Today they’re not. Very few people have that access. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

One Ngai Tahu individual who has spent a great deal of time at his local marae since the mid 1980s, worked in the Whakapapa Unit for several years in the early 1990s and who is now the administrator for his runanga, commented in an interview that those who come in [to the runanga meetings] who have had some relationships with Ngai Tahu just ring off names and connections but those more ‘Pakeha’ ones get hung up on having the proper documentations and certificates. [Interview: April 1997]

This is intellectual knowing, rather than embodied knowing. When an enscribed whakapapa is handed to its ‘owner’, relationship with other Ngai Tahu is not a necessary part of the process. The very act of registering creates a new identity - Ngai Tahu Whanui member, or as the 1999 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report cites, 'Ngai Tahu Whanui client'. The roll and the public narrative encourage, as Calhoun [1997: 44] argues about nation-building, ‘seeing individuals as linked through their membership as a set of abstract equivalents rather than their participation in webs of concrete interpersonal relationships. This replaces the relational categories of traditional Maori society as these have been lived and experienced on the marae. It promotes categorical identities over relational ones, partly because nationalist discourse addresses large-scale collectivities in which most people could not conceivably enter into face to face,
or tete-a-tete relationships with most others' [1997: 46]. The management of *whakapapa* information is crucial to the development and maintenance of these categorical identities, those that are established and those excluded.

This also shifts the holders of *whakapapa* knowledge - the gatekeepers - from individuals, *whanau* and *hapu* to an institution whereby access is individualised and *whakapapa* is stored as collective information. Historically, individuals knew their *whakapapa* connections to those in their *whanau* and *hapu* by the process of *whanaungatanga*, and a select number of *rangatira* knew *whakapapa* beyond those immediate relationships [Erutei and Ward: 2001: 161-182, B. Solomon: 2000, Cormack: 1997]. Now the holders of *whakapapa* have become the individual registered Ngai Tahu Whanui member and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. Any *whakapapa* knowledge beyond this comes about through the process of *whakawhanaungatanga* that an individual chooses to engage in. As the new keepers of Ngai Tahu *whakapapa* records, Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership can measure and present collections of individual *whakapapa* in the form of total numbers, subject to statistical measurement for the pursuit of particular purposes. As I addressed in previous research, the collection, storage and dissemination of information about the past, such as *whakapapa*, facilitates knowledgeable management of the future [Kelly: 1991].

For Giddens, access to devices that 'stack' past events as well as anticipating future ones, improve the possibility for profitability and power because these devices allow for the predictability of events and subject them to calculation. Giddens perceives control of time as fundamental to the optimum capacity to achieve outcomes [1984: 152]. For Giddens, 'storage' of knowledge and information is crucial to bureaucratic organisation.

As I have identified in previous research, the concentration by the Board on the building up of 'files' of *whakapapa* and other historical knowledge has increased since the time when it was recognised that such files could be used as 'proof' for
the settlement of rights over land and fisheries\textsuperscript{15} as set out in the Treaty of Waitangi. Modes of accumulation and storage had to develop to make recall easier and allow for dissemination within the Pakeha court system - before both the Waitangi Tribunal and the High Court. The roll is an organisational tool used by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and the Crown to gatekeep membership into the Nation and to administer, manage and govern civic, social and economic development of its members. This new form and use of whakapapa adds to its potency as cultural resource.

Up until the decision to take this claim to the Waitangi Tribunal, the number of registered Trust Board beneficiaries stood at approximately 800. The Waitangi Tribunal case required the Trust Board to ascertain the actual number of Ngai Tahu and their whereabouts. Efforts by the Trust Board then began to seek out descendants from the \textit{kaumatua} in the 1925 'Blue Book' and encourage these to register their whakapapa with the Trust Board. In 1989, the Trust Board carried out its own Ngai Tahu Census, attaching the Board's only full time employee, seconded from the Maori Affairs Department in 1989 to this role (apart from the full time Whakapapa employee) in order to argue against settlement for need rather than settlement by right in the claims. The process involved 'shoulder-tapping' those whose whakapapa had already registered for their knowledge of the tribal identity of others.

At that time there were approximately 800 listed as Trust Board beneficiaries. The census carried out by the Trust Board Executive Officer in 1989 revealed 25,000 Ngai Tahu and it was suggested at the time that this was a conservative estimate, that numbers could be as high as 50,000. However, when I interviewed members of the Iwi Transition Agency at that time, there was a suggestion that Ngai Tahu membership was less than what the Trust Board claimed. This suggestion was on the basis that many South Island Maori, who had the option to whakapapa to more than one tribe, chose other tribal

\textsuperscript{15} See Chapter Two [pages 56-57] for brief discussion of fisheries issues.
affiliations. The discrepancy between the number listed in the Ngai Tahu Census and the number of registered beneficiaries was also suggested by some Ngai Tahu at the time to be due to the stringent criteria for Trust Board beneficiary status [1991: 7-8]. Beneficiary status required proof of relationship to a current beneficiary, as well as proof of whakapapa to a kaumatua listed in the 'Blue Book':

Before any application for a grant will be considered it must be supported by documentary proof that the person for whom the grant is sought is a beneficiary. This necessitates supplying whakapapa details and these should go back in all cases at least three generations and should also show, if possible, blood relationship to some other beneficiary, who is receiving or has received a grant. [Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board Annual Report: 1961: 'Introduction']

Ngai Tahu Whanui membership status does not require proof of relationship to a current beneficiary, therefore making the burden of proof easier.

The Ngai Tahu claims dramatically affected the workload of the Whakapapa Unit as more and more people became aware of the claims process [T. Ryan: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Induction Wananga booklet: August 1995]. With the decision to pursue a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal in the mid 1980s, there came a move by the Trust Board, to pursue enrolments; to increase the number of individual registered Ngai Tahu whakapapas. Proof of whakapapa to one of the kaumatua in the 1925 'Blue Book' was set as the indicator of tribal identity - 'Ngai Tahuness'. In the claims process, the Ngai Tahu leadership then set out to establish that Trust Board registered members collectively constituted a tribe known as Ngai Tahu and had since 1840. They also set out to establish that this tribe constituted the tangata whenua of the South Island, with manawhenua rights to land, that the Trust Board constituted the representative leadership of these previously independent claimants, and that both the population of this collective group and its geographical rohe were larger than the population and rohe of any other tribe.
At the 1989 Annual Tribal Hui a Tau at Murihiku, which I attended, the Chairperson stated that:

Treasury are now budgeting for settlement of Waitangi cases and, with our case in particular, are doing this on a basis of number. The Crown has told Treasury that we're not large enough in number, and now the issue we are arguing is on a settlement as a basis of right.... What we want is a new census.... What we want is to say we have conducted a survey and this is the number of Ngai Tahu.... This is a task to get our numbers as fast as we can to arm our lawyers to argue against settlement for need rather than settlement of right. [Ngai Tahu Annual Tribal Hui a Tau minutes: 1989]

I refer also to the following statements made by the Chairperson of the Trust Board in 1993:

We industriously searched for every piece of evidence that would enlarge the numbers. We went to great trouble to produce carefully a raw census of Ngai Tahu living today. We pressured our scholars to produce defensible data on our past. The Crown produced witnesses, scholars all, to try and define the same question. None of us said why we were doing it, but we all knew.... There are statements by a previous Minister of Fisheries that to accord Ngai Tahu all the Moari fisheries quota off the Te Waipounamu coast would be grossly unfair to northern tribes. He thought that a small number of people should not have rights to a large amount of fish... fairness is an important popular idea and it is very much shaped by people numbers. The quality of demographic evidence may shape outcomes worth millions of dollars. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 155, 1991: 11]

I earlier described this as a 'political statement'.... If it cannot be sustained in certain important respects, Ngai Tahu lack a basis for regarding themselves as the manawhenua tribe of the traditional area described. They would have no rights under Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi. They would have no rights in fisheries, land and other properties. They would not even have the right to comment authoritatively on the authenticity of place-names within the area. They might exist as a group, but in modern New Zealand they could have no valid identity other than by the good will of the Registrar of Incorporated Societies, or some other such functionary. Moreover, Ngai Tahu would not have the standing to bring the Ngai Tahu claim before the Waitangi Tribunal and, perhaps, almost as important, the Crown would not have a basis for settling that claim in terms of the findings of that Tribunal. Whilst my statement is a statement of the past, it directly affects the present and the future. In that sense, it is an intensely political statement. It is an assertive statement. It rests ultimately on evidence....
The stakes are too high. The evidence of the conventional historian, the requirements of 'due process' and the whakapapa of the Maori are presented for one purpose, that of a substantial result, achieved or denied, in terms of money, resources or property....

The questions come:
'But who is the iwi?
Who is Ngai Tahu?
What are their traditional boundaries?
What is the basis for that statement?
How many of them were there anyhow?
The evidence now required is of a different order. Generally, it is to do with ancient history. It is not about what happened between Maori and the Crown, it is about who and what are the iwi, which tribe is the Treaty partner and what territory and resources are traditionally associated with that iwi. These are the questions that the Crown is anxious to have answered...One has to recognise, as with any history, that a document or a recorded tradition has been recorded in its particular frame for a particular purpose. Very few things stand alone and unsullied without any direction or preceding shape directing the subject of enquiry. The mode of presentation of evidence is always driven by a purpose, and that is particularly so in the case of whakapapa. Whakapapa is not a mystery - it is essentially a task of intellectual management... any one presentation of whakapapa has been assembled in a particular form for a particular purpose, to show a descent or a relationship. It is impossible to put all of the people involved and related and connected to one person in any one direct line of whakapapa. A critical task, therefore, in looking at a whakapapa, is to assess for what purpose it was assembled - what was it attempting to show. This is a critical tool of analysis, because no whakapapa stands alone. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 158-189, 1991: 14-25]

In October 1991, I attended a hui at Wairewa marae, which consisted of a small group of local Ngai Tahu representing the hapu Ngati Irahehu. The hui was organised by the hapu as an opportunity to invite and listen to members of Te Runanga's Chief Negotiating Team present explanations as to why the Banks Peninsula territorial claim had been omitted from the final negotiated Ngai Tahu settlement with the Crown. Two of the Chief Negotiators were invited to attend. Neither one turned up. At that meeting the Whakapapa Enrolment Officer stood up and spoke in firm and emotive words and he expressed displeasure with the current leadership for insistence that he abandon his ongoing work on the establishment of a Whakapapa Runanga Register in favour of actively seeking as
many enrolments of individual Ngai Tahu Whanui members as possible. He stated that emphasis was shifting to recruitment of overseas Ngai Tahu. This was in the period leading up to the postal vote of registered beneficiaries in November 1997. The postal vote was deemed the opportunity for registered members to have their say, by voting either in favour of or against the proposed pan-Ngai Tahu settlement. It was suggested that the reason emphasis was being shifted to recruitment of Ngai Tahu residing overseas was twofold: to increase the numbers in order to argue on a needs basis and to recruit a vote from as many of the least 'experienced' Ngai Tahu as possible. Later, in a Christchurch Press [November 17, 1997] report, the Chief Negotiator, Sir Tipene O'Regan, reported that an overwhelming majority (93.75%) of Ngai Tahu had voted in favour of the settlement that the Negotiators had proposed. In fact, another key to this issue was that Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu was given the final and deciding vote.

The Ngai Tahu roll sets out the position of actors vis a vis each other; who will comprise the institution responsible for distribution, administration, management of assets and programmes and who are the recipients of economic, social and cultural packages - the gatekeepers and the citizens.

The roll establishes specific kinds of networks that facilitate the organisation of actors vis a vis each other in ways that provide the means for certain things to become observable and therefore knowable. With the help of a computer and enscription on paper, the information made possible by the roll may be easily converted into diagrams, numbers and tables.

For example:

Looking back and acknowledging achievements is important but equally as important is the need for us to look to the future. A starting point for that future has to be defining where we are now. Statistics New Zealand produced a report in 1996 that focused on Ngai Tahu.
The report found that only 12% of Ngai Tahu could converse in te reo Maori. Thirty percent of Ngai Tahu had a post-school qualification. Twenty-five percent of Ngai Tahu children (0-14 years) lived in families where there was no employed parent. Eleven percent of Ngai Tahu in the labour force were unemployed, with Ngai Tahu in the younger working ages (15-24) having the highest rate of unemployment.

It is these statistics that we must use as a starting point to set objectives and to determine future priorities. From these disturbing statistics we have room for growth and improvement. A sound economic base is the key to addressing both economic and cultural concerns. The Settlement has given us that base. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 8]

What is life like for the face behind the 1996 census statistics?

To find out, Te Karaka interviewed several Ngai Tahu women that 'fit' the average statistics from the census and came up with a composite Ngai Tahu woman we've named Mere... ['Te Karaka': Winter 1999: 7]

Now from the registration of whakapapa, it is possible to know about Ngai Tahu Whanui citizens as a collection of demographic information, for the purposes of improved administration of 'Article three' Treaty rights to a Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens. This parallels the administration of Article three rights by the New Zealand government to New Zealand citizens. Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership utilised whakapapa information about South Island Maori in order to secure Article Two rights under the Treaty vis-à-vis the Crown and the New Zealand population. This has in turn, set up a new body of gatekeepers - Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu which utilises whakapapa to produce demographic information to administer what are effectively Article Three rights to a new 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens'. The potential potency of the metaphor of citizenship for Ngai Tahu is indicated was indicated in an interview I had with Kaiwhakahaere, Mark Solomon, in August 1999, where he referred to Ngai Tahu Whanui as a 'Nation of Citizens'.

---

16 See Chapter Two [pages 41, 57] for a discussion of Article Two and Article Three rights under the Treaty of Waitangi.
Summary

This chapter has examined the history of management of whakapapa in the organisation of contemporary South Island Maori identities, with particular emphasis on the key place of the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll of registered members as secured in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996. I argue that the roll is an institutionalised management tool which uses whakapapa to realign historically disparate South Island Maori actors into new legal-political identities privileged by the Crown in legislation: Ngai Tahu Whanui as equivalent to Ngai Tahu iwi, eighteen papatipu runanga, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and Ngai Tahu Whanui member. This effectively introduces a ‘Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens’ in which registered members share a right to membership in the collective with all descendants of the South Island kaumatua listed in the 1925 ‘Blue Book’. It is because the roll is based in the metanarrative of whakapapa and secured in legislation that consent to the privileged contemporary identities is maintained. Management of whakapapa by the roll also privileges particular key times and places. The roll and its management establish gatekeepers of membership into the now legally endorsed South Island Maori identity – Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. The establishment of this new legal-political identity and its associated leadership is situated in a history of events around the management of South Island Maori identities in order to secure manawhenua status and rights. As a consequence of the rise of these identities, others have been excluded or subsumed: ‘hapu’, ‘Waitaha’, ‘Ngati Mamoe’, other iwi, ‘Pakeha’. At other times and places, other identities have been privileged.

Chapters Six, Seven, Eight and Ten will examine how these new legal-political identities are further privileged in the presentation of key themes about whakapapa, time and place in Ngai Tahu Whanui ontological narrative since 1996. Chapters Nine and Ten will address the understandings of these key themes in the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals, bringing to light the political
embeddedness of particular uses of *whakapapa*, time and place that have silenced or deemphasised alternative South Island Maori identities.

While I argue that Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership has introduced a 'Ngai Tahu Citizenship', by legislation in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 and management by the roll, how Ngai Tahu individuals, *whanau* and *hapu* experience and practice these rights is a process continuously negotiated. As Somers states, 'rather than a body of rights granted "ready-made" by the state and attached to individual persons, however, citizenship rights are only one potential outcome of a configuration of national membership rules..... Whether or not these rules are converted into actual universal rights depends fully on the local contexts - the social and political place - in which they are activated.' [1993: 588-589]. According to Somers, 'citizenship practices emerge from the articulation of national organisations and universal rules with the particularisms and varying political cultures of local environments.' [1993: 589]. How individuals frame and act upon these rights and their newly introduced individual identity – Ngai Tahu Whanui registered member will be addressed in Chapters Nine and Ten. The personal narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' trouble attempts to construct a unitary *pan-īwi*, *pan-hapu* and *pan-whanau* Ngai Tahu identity, at the same time they do illustrate consent to the introduction and uses of these privileged identities. Consent is given due to the weaving of framings of *whakapapa* in particular versions of meta-themes about time, place and 'The Claim' in what I refer to as 'Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative'.
...traditions are not simply inherited, they have to be reproduced: stories have to be told over and again, parts of traditions have to be adapted to new circumstances to keep them meaningful… [Calhoun: 1997: 50]

I know the traditional stories and placenames of those regions and I love telling them to our young. They are more distant, not so personal in the sense of my grandparents' graves, but in telling the stories there is a sense of possession and of being possessed, of belonging. That sense is viewed through the prism of descent - whakapapa that goes back to the gods that made that landscape and the ancestors who dreamed them into existence as their way of coming to terms with it.

How then are Ngai Tahu going to walk through this ancient landscape in the new century - this landscape scarred by memory?

....If they are to know the memories and identify with the heritage. If they are to lock their identity to the old places with the chains of whakapapa, then it will only be because we in our time have been successful in delivering those memories and that whakapapa to them...

If we have been successful in our delivery they will look upon a river and know its name and who died there. They will look at a rock and know who was born there and where battles were fought and where peace was made. Most of all, they will care that it was so and cherish the knowledge that those memories are part of their being - of who and what they are as Ngai Tahu people...

If we have failed to ensure that they have the capacity to walk the coast and the mountains of our island, to fly over its chiefly cloak of snow and look upon our place and know and care that, that is the womb from which we spring as a people. That this is the source of who and what we are - Ngai Tahu...

The mountains will still be there, and the coasts will still thunder and the rivers will run and the rocks will stand. But the scars in the land will have no memory and there will be new names. The histories will sleep in catalogues and data banks and no one will sing to the land. [T. O'Regan: 1999: 15]
Introduction

In a lecture at Canterbury University on September 22, 1998, Sir Tipene O'Regan, former Chairperson of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and Chief Claims Negotiator for Ngai Tahu, identified the biggest challenge facing Ngai Tahu in its post-settlement era as identifying and building upon the factor that now bonds and unites Ngai Tahu Whanui membership - *whakapapa*, which he defined as 'DNA'. He identified *whakapapa* as the only bond that still exists to for the contemporary Ngai Tahu collective. Since 1840 Ngai Tahu have been united in their opposition to the Crown over 'The Claim'. 'The Claim' had become Ngai Tahu culture, binding Ngai Tahu individuals to one another. His thesis was that, since the Claim has reached a full and final settlement, Ngai Tahu will revert back to *whakapapa* as the tribal adhesive. He also asked whether this will be enough to take the membership into the twenty-first century in a united way. According to him, the key challenge for Ngai Tahu Whanui now is to find methods to unite a population that has grown significantly since the exposure of the Waitangi Tribunal claims.

I argue that it is not *whakapapa*, but rather the strategic management of *whakapapa* and the presentation of a supporting public narrative that constitutes the adhesive that holds together the new structure of individual members who are otherwise geographically, politically and culturally disparate. Ngai Tahu Whanui takes the place held traditionally by *raranga korero* (the telling of stories about the genealogical figures recorded by *whakapapa*) – one of the many layers of *whakapapa*. Chapter Five addressed *whakapapa* management as a political resource. Chapters Six to Ten consider *whakapapa* management as a cultural resource – as the metanarrative in all Ngai Tahu narratives about identity – personal and public.

Since 1996, Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership have circulated a public narrative to its registered members about contemporary Ngai Tahu identity. I refer to this as
Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. In this chapter I shall evaluate the context of political event within which the introduction of the public narrative has taken place and its functions for the management of contemporary South Island Maori identities. In Chapters Seven, Eight and Ten, I shall evaluate its key themes as these are presented in written publications and oral presentations at hui, meetings and 'roadshows', while in Chapters Nine and Ten I shall evaluate these as they are considered in the narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals.

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative utilises particular rhetorical techniques, presentations of whakapapa and meta-themes about time, place, and 'The Claim' to maintain complex associations in the minds of Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members. This privileges the legal-political identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui and its supporting management structure introduced by the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act – the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. Through a variety of rhetorical techniques utilised by Corinne Kratz [1993] and outlined in this chapter, these privileged identities are interwoven in presentations of the metanarrative of whakapapa, and the meta-themes associated with it.

In turn, these themes of the public narrative serve to legitimate an image of a contemporary 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens'. This national identity is based in a story about whakapapa and tradition - Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members united by common whakapapa - an iwi that is governed and represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. This is the image the public narrative creates in the minds of Ngai Tahu Whanui members. Alternative identities that Ngai Tahu individuals consider in their personal narratives are rhetorically deemphasised and even silenced in the public narrative. This in turn, serves to exclude particular historic South Island Maori collective identities from membership in the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' at a time when Ngai Tahu Whanui has asserted tangata whenua status in the South Island in order to assert manawhenua rights to Treaty claims.
Just as Somers argues for the properties of metanarrative [1999], I argue that Ngai Tahu Whanui leaders are not free to present any narrative. In order for its public narrative to socially predominate, for Ngai Tahu citizens to consent, key meta-themes of significance to South Island Maori – meta-themes - as I argue must be interwoven in a metanarrative of whakapapa and actual historical events. The public narrative incorporates the privileged place held by whakapapa and these meta-themes around history, significant ancestral places and 'The Claim' for Ngai Tahu. However, in the public narrative key dates and events are emphasised, while in turn, other important dates, whakapapa associations, ancestral places and approaches to claims settlement are deemphasised and in some cases, silenced.

‘Rhetorical Techniques’

In Chapters Seven to Ten I adopt five principal 'rhetorical techniques' utilised by Corrine Kratz to consider some ways in which Okiek talk about ceremonial history [1993]. She looks at how incremental changes in initiation ceremony are cast in the image of tradition through the following techniques: back-projection and concentration in time, canonisation through silence, shifts of emphasis and balance through selective attention, synecdochal encompassment, and assimilative generalisation.

Back-projection is referred to as 'straightforward assertions of unequivocal continuity: 'We've always done this.' Concentration is the technique whereby changes that cover several age-sets are concentrated into one widely recognised age of change, enhancing continuity during others. Silence is identified as 'an effective and versatile way to deemphasise and eventually erase ceremonial changes. As alternatives drop from memory, silence canõnises changes as enduring tradition. Silence is one mode of selective attention. Kratz identifies that continuity or change can also be emphasised or diminished with directed
shifts of attention in which some phrases are 'loaded with unspoken implications. Synecdochal encompassment or assimilative generalisation are the techniques by which examples that favour continuity of tradition or culture are then further extended, often in the same sentence, to imply the same consideration of history and tradition of everything in the event. By this technique the image of continuity and tradition is enlarged and extended. The totalising process thus accomplished implies common continuity for all aspects of the event by enthymemic reasoning, i.e., implying that what is the case for event or practice applies to all events or practices in the sentence [Kratz, 1993, pp 53-56]. Integral to the effectiveness of the rhetorical techniques in the presentation of the key themes is that they are interwoven so that in the minds of the readers they are interdependent, implying that where you have at least one you have all.

The meta-themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative are so inextricably interwoven that when reading the publications, it is difficult to find examples of any one theme in isolation from one or more of the others. Yet, by the rhetorical technique of selective emphasis, the reader's attention can be drawn away from this interweaving of themes.

Public narrative situated in political practice around the introduction of Ngai Tahu Whanui

The key themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative since 1996 have been inextricably situated in political practice around negotiations with the Crown over land claims issues. As addressed in Chapters Two and Five, the Ngai Tahu Trust Board since 1944 and the structures that have subsequently developed from it have dominated the management and dissemination of South Island whakapapa information and hence relations with the Crown. During this time growing access to the media has expanded the presentation of a supporting
ontological narrative about the privileged identities based in whakapapa and the meta-themes.

As addressed in Chapters Two and Five, the 1990 Runanga Iwi Act and negotiations between the Ngai Tahu 'Chief Negotiators' appointed by the Trust Board and the Crown arising out of the Waitangi Tribunal's findings from 1991 to 1996, both set the context for an emphasis on Ngai Tahu as a tribal collectivity with one all encompassing claim to a distinct geographical area – the South Island of New Zealand – Te Waipounamu. The Runanga Iwi Act carved up the South Island into runanga as representative of the tribe's 'flaxroots' traditional political organisation and set out the essential characteristics of iwi. The Runanga Iwi Act 1990 and the Waitangi Tribunal's findings in favour of the Ngai Tahu claims [1991] both facilitated the assertion of Ngai Tahu's identity as tribal and distinct from other iwi, both geographically and in terms of manawhenua identity.

The Crown's representatives from 1991 increasingly indicated to the Ngai Tahu Chief Negotiators (the 'A Team') that the Crown would be willing to reach a negotiated settlement. This would incorporate compensation, cultural redress and preemptive rights to purchase Crown assets, but that this would take the form of a single tribal settlement, to be distributed in an equitable and democratic way equally to all registered members, not on the basis of territorial claims.

Most of the references in the public narrative that I identify over the next chapters are found in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu publications in 1996, 1997 and 1998. The publications distributed over this period – Annual Reports, the 'Tribal Profile' and the 'Crown Settlement Offer' documents - were fundamental to the framing of a story, one of many possible stories, which incorporated specific versions of the meta-themes describing the history of South Island Maori identity as these affected land claims issues. This story is situated in a particular historical and political context of relations between the Crown and South Island Maori. A series
of final 'roadshows' (one of which I attended as part of my fieldwork for this research) and corresponding publications circulated by the Ngai Tahu leadership to registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members were the media for distributing the public narrative at this time leading up to acceptance by the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Team of a settlement offer from the Crown.

Ngai Tahu Whanui – belonging by membership, relating through stories – a place ‘cognitively to reside’

From 1990 to 2000 registered members of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board (until 1996) Ngai Tahu Whanui, increased from c 3000 to approximately 30,000. The majority of Ngai Tahu Whanui membership is young and newly registered.¹ In a Canterbury University lecture by Sir Tipene O'Regan, presented to the New Zealand Historical Association in December 2001, he identified that 5,000 of the more than 30,000 registered beneficiaries are second generation Australians living on the Eastern seaboard of Australia whose regular communion with the tribe is primarily by way of receipt of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu tribal publications.

Connecting with one’s kin – the relationships represented by whakapapa - was traditionally the process of whakawhanaungatanga. Now there is a process that must be followed, as established by the current leadership and reinforced by the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996. For an individual with no prior knowledge of his/her South Island Maori identity or for an individual who has experienced whakapapa relationships (whanaungatanga) but has not registered as a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui, there is a requirement to register in order to benefit from the Claims Settlement and to ‘connect’ with Ngai Tahu Whanui. For these members, the primary connection to their Ngai Tahu Whanui tribal identity is by

¹ According to figures taken at July 1, 2002: 27% of registered members are under the age of 18 years; 63% are under the age of 40 years; and only 11% are over 60 years of age [Interview: Riki Paea, Whakapapa Unit, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: July 2002].
receipt of Annual Reports and other Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu publications. For example:

My name is Magenta Wesley. I am fourteen years old and I am Ngai Tahu. For the past two and a half years I have been living in Australia but I still call New Zealand home and still call the people of Te Runanga o Otakou my family.

Through the magazines that my grandparents, Tatane and Cecillie Wesley, send me, I have slowly learnt about my whanau and ancestors, my cultural background, important dates in history and also what is happening currently....

Most of what I have learnt about my ancestors has come from my talented grandfather, Tatane Alex Tarewai Wesley or Tat as he is known around Dunedin. He knows heaps but as I can’t be around him much there is a gap in my learning that is slowly being filled by reading the Ngai Tahu magazines....

I may not have much Maori blood flowing through my veins but I still class myself as Ngai Tahu and will always remember that I have a caring whanau who will welcome me with open arms and a warm place to stay with lots of kai to fill my puku. ['Te Karaka': Autumn 2001: 41]

What all registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members hold in common is descent from one of the South Island Maori kaumatua recorded as alive in 1848, listed in the 1925 ‘Blue Book’. The ‘Blue Book’ and the recorded ancestry of contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui members to these names is the whakapapa. Neither these ancestors nor the recording of these connects individuals to one another. One reading of the process whereby ancestry is traced through the ‘Blue Book’ is that whakapapa does not unite Ngai Tahu Whanui members, it simply records ancestry of each member to the 1925 lists – something all members hold in common. It is the management of whakapapa and the presentation of a particular narrative about its history and uses that attempts to unite contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui members.

The majority of Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members, those living outside New Zealand as well as those who reside in New Zealand, do not have the benefit of an historical memory of incremental political events or alternative South Island
Maori identities that traditionally were maintained around South Island marae, such as whanau, hapu, Ngati Mamoe or Waitaha. They have not experienced these identities in the twentieth century or listened to the whakapapa and associated stories (raranga korero) passed on from tipuna. As most of these individuals have not lived on the pa within the kin relationships that are represented by their whakapapa, as previous generations have, they have a form of intellectual knowledge of their whakapapa, rather than embodied knowledge, experience, whanaungatanga. As Ngai Tahu kaumatua Jim Pohio put it to me:

*I can [meet another Ngai Tahu and trace back to a common ancestor], but the young people will have a problem working it out. They've got to go back to the Ngai Tahu whakapapa unit or Land Court records.* [Life History: 1997]

For these new members, the first entry into knowledge about the meta-themes and whakapapa and hence, South Island Maori identity, comes from Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. Consent by members to the contemporary legal-political identity Ngai Tahu Whanui, and its supporting leadership and organisational structures relies on the public narrative.

For the majority of Ngai Tahu, this public narrative takes the place of experienced relationship (whanaungatanga). In ‘the absence of presence’, as it were, at the traditional places of one’s ancestors and living within the relationships represented by one’s whakapapa, the public narrative provides ‘a place cognitively to reside’ [Rapport: 2000: 74, 78]. It is contained in the meetings, roadshows, hui, and written material circulated by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership. For Ngai Tahu Whanui members this public narrative offers what Somers [1993, 1994, 1999], Plummer [1995] and Rapport [2000] set out as the usage of narrative in the constitution of identities, a sequential and thematic order within which to situate their lives - a connection to history as contemporary South Island Maori, a narrative ‘place’ in which to constitute their newly found ethnic identities.
I argue that Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative takes the place traditionally held by *raranga korero* in offering South Island Maori who are geographically disparate but share the experience of ancestry in the 'Blue Book', a sense of place and relationship within the new collective of disparate registered members. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative becomes the key narrative within which to situate and constitute contemporary Maori identities for the majority of Ngai Tahu who have never lived as *kaumatua* like Jim Pohio. For contemporary Ngai Tahu this is an opportunity to frame their personal identities within a wider Ngai Tahu 'national' ethnic identity, where this function was traditionally facilitated by *whakapapa* and associated *raranga korero*. As Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Kaikwhakahaere, Mark Solomon puts it:

*We're going to the people face to face and what they're saying is hey, we want as much information about who we are, our culture, as possible, there's a big yearning for information. Very few people know the history of how their people got here. I doubt if there would be a dozen people in Kaikoura that actually know the history. They hunger for that information. The revival of Tahutanga, to put it honestly.* [Interview: August 1999]²

Historically, when *whakapapa* was circulated by oral recitation, it had the function of uniting individuals and *whanau* to one another and to history and place. There are strong cultural preferences among Maori people for narrative. As Bishop puts it, 'historically, Maori as an oral culture devised methods to pass on the multiplicity of knowledge that any culture gathers and constructs about itself. Story was one of the common ways of imparting knowledge.... 'There is a *wairua* (spirituality) in story that binds the listener to the teller beyond any linkage created by the words on their own' [Bishop: 1996: 25]. As Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu's Kaiwhakahaere, Mark Solomon states, 'you need the histories to find out about the culture that you come from' [Interview: August 1999].

² According to Cohen, this fits within an international trend of political engagement by aboriginal societies in self-definition vis-à-vis the Settler World in which the issue of authenticity comes under intense scrutiny. People are claiming, or reclaiming, their Aboriginality as they understand it to be, hence reclaiming, and refashioning in the process, their selves [2000: 77-78].
For those I identify as 'new Ngai Tahu', Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative forms the cognitive starting point to embed one's newly acquired ethnic identity in the whakapapa and the meta-themes of history, key ancestral place, and 'The Claim' to constitute a contemporary ethnic identity. I suggest that 'new Ngai Tahu' will increasingly rely on the public narrative to embed their individual 'national' ethnic identities as South Island Maori, with its simplified notion of history, identity and political practice.

But for the 'experienced Ngai Tahu' of this research, those members who have lived their South Island Maori identities associating with kin relationships at the marae prior to the introduction of the legal-political identity Ngai Tahu Whanui and the supporting key themes of the public narrative, it is a matter of fitting the public narrative into a history of cross-cutting narratives: identifying the introduction of this new legal-political identity as an event, one of a series of events with its historical background of events, and political context, rather than as an episode in a continuation of an uninterrupted story with a given indisputable origin, the Ngai Tahu Whanui story about Ngai Tahu origin. As Somers argues, narrative offers an opportunity to situate the study of identity formation within a relational and historical approach that challenges rigid categories of identity by emphasising that identity is positioned in overlapping networks of relations that shift over time and space [1994: 607].

While the public narrative privileges particular versions of whakapapa and the meta-themes and while these become accepted as part of a complex repertoire of identities for contemporary Ngai Tahu, other key times and identities in South Island Maori history are deemphasised. Political changes between the 'then' and 'now' represented in the public narrative, that have produced alternative identities are deemphasised, silenced or bemoaned as examples of the dilution or loss of original Ngai Tahu iwi identity [cf. Kratz: 1993: 54]. Events, acts or identities that are deemphasised or silenced in the public narrative may eventually disappear.
from memory as the generation of Ngai Tahu who have experienced these alternatives makes way for generations of 'new Ngai Tahu', if the only medium for receiving these stories is through the public narrative. As Chapters Nine and Ten address, the details of political and historical events heard in the life histories of Ngai Tahu kaumatua give way to the themes of the public narrative that gloss over incremental change, preferring to present a binary 'two time' binary notion of history. As Kratz puts it, 'How does one learn about a forsaken practice unless one already knows to ask about it?' [1993: 55].

The Waitangi Tribunal Claims brought a lot of information about whakapapa and tribal history that had been stored in family homes and in the memories of a few kaumatua into an archival collection for distribution in the courts. However, as kaumatua have died, much of the history has been lost.\textsuperscript{3} Information since 1986 has been collected and stored for a particular political purpose, not accessible to Ngai Tahu Whanui members unless disseminated by the leadership.\textsuperscript{4} Such

\textsuperscript{3} As one Ngai Tahu kaumatua stated:

Down in Southland especially, a lot of the names, the meaning is lost. A lot of it is lost now. Every time an elder dies somewhere, it doesn’t matter if he or she is not greatly interested, the elder has some knowledge and it is lost. Every time one of them dies, so much more of the history dies.... There is a lot of research needed yet. But I don’t think anyone can afford it. There’s pieces that you wouldn’t recognise, in different books, just little bits, might only be a line or a couple of lines, and it has part of some incident in it. But the old ones could tell you where it applied to.... Those old people you talked to, they could give a fairly good idea of what they were talking about and what happened. If you know enough about the history you can put their pieces of information back into the history. That’s what I’m trying to do. I’d like to get somebody to sit down and talk Maori history to, but you can’t get no one. If you contradict one of these chappies with a ticket, that’s the end of it. You’re in the dog box. That’s one of the troubles now. Nobody should live past 80, in fact 70, because everybody’s gone. [Cormack: 1997: 138-139, 155-156]

\textsuperscript{4} As a Ngai Tahu kaumatua put it: 'When I was doing court work, I could practically give the name of any Maori living between Kaikoura and Southland, and I could give them their genealogy. Because that used to be a lot of the work that I did for them – writing letters about their genealogy. I write copies of everything in exercise books. I let the Ngai Tahu Trust Board take all that away, for the claim to the Waitangi Tribunal. That’s one of the things I shouldn’t have done. They had a full carload they took away from here. It’s all my work from the Land Court, and researches I’ve done, and all letters and answers to people and that, that I’ve done over the years. I no longer have that. They sent back only four box files full' [Cormack: 1997: 145].
information is managed by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and published in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative as it supports the privileged identities and contemporary political practices adopted by the leadership.

One can already see this happening. For example, the recent Ngai Tahu Development Corporation's 'Statement of Policies and Objectives for 2001/2002' refers significantly to tribal values, culture and the outcomes for individual members as mediated through papatipu runanga. The proposed 'Statement of Policies and Objectives' and its supporting budget must be accepted by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. It was tabled for acceptance at a Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meeting on May 18, 2001, which I attended. Other identities, such as hapu or whanau, are rarely mentioned in the document, and where they are, it is in the context of a supporting role to papatipu runanga and iwi, attributed neither voting rights nor financial resources. This will be explored further in Chapter Eleven.

'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens'

As Sir Tipene O'Regan identified [December 2, 2001], the biggest challenge facing Ngai Tahu Whanui now and into the future is how to actively bind otherwise disparate members together to keep them involved in Ngai Tahu Whanui, what I refer to as 'the nation', given that for most registered members

As the same Ngai Tahu kaumatua commented: 'They gave the information freely. That's where a lot of my information came from, those old people. They had it, and there was nobody to listen to it. They wouldn't give it to the young people, because I don't think they trusted them. I think that was a lot to do with it.... That's why a lot of it was never passed down to their own families.... I was interested in listening to these old people. They were interesting to listen to because they gave you all sorts of stories. They told me that whakapapa is only a list of names unless you know the history of a lot of those people. They told me a lot of the stories that go with people and with a lot of our names' [Cormack: 1997: 138].

5 During Sir Tipene O'Regan's lecture [December 2, 2001], Dr. Te Maire Tau challenged O'Regan's reference to Ngai Tahu Whanui as a corporate body, arguing that Ngai Tahu Whanui represents a new nation. In an article in the Christchurch Press, Dr. Te Maire Tau also referred to the Ngai Tahu nation [January 26, 2002].
association is really only by receipt of the tribal publications and voting on key issues when required.

Following Dr. Te Maire Tau and others, I argue that Ngai Tahu Whanui forms a nation, made up of individual citizens, Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members. These registered members – citizens – hold in common a shared privileged position vis-à-vis the 'Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation'. Registration of whakapapa as the basis of membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui, and a corresponding public narrative bind registered members to the collective nation.

Calhoun identifies 'nationalism as discourse' - 'the production of a cultural understanding and rhetoric' which leads people to frame their identities as simultaneously local and national, individual and collective as one key dimension of nationalism [1997: 6]. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative has since 1996 presented a story of a tribal whakapapa – whakapapa as the adhesive that binds all members to one another. This has been achieved through the rhetorical association of the privileged contemporary identities with particular presentations of whakapapa and meta-themes about time, place and 'The Claim'.

As Tilly argues, ethnic groups and nationalities consist of social categories defined (and distinguished from other social categories) by beliefs concerning shared origins, culture and social relations [1996: 9]. Tilly goes on to write that states often are built on traditional structures or cultural values based on 'previously-existing ties. He identifies 'imputed ethnicity' as one such tie. He suggests that both ethnic groups and nationalities consist of social categories

---

6 In his September 22, 1998 lecture, Sir Tipene O'Regan likened the new Ngai Tahu Whanui to a church of members. The church analogy is an interesting one, as one of the key themes of the public narrative embeds the contemporary identity in metaphoric associations with symbols of spiritualism and there are definite parallels between the traditional recitation of whakapapa and the recitation of genealogies characteristic of many books in the Bible.

In an interview in August 1999 with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Kaiwhakahaere, Mark Solomon, he referred to Ngai Tahu Whanui as effectively a 'Nation of Ngai Tahu citizens'.

distinguished from other social categories by beliefs concerning shared origins, culture and social relations [1996: 9]. In the case of Ngai Tahu Whanui, a sense of collective unity is built on the traditional place of *whakapapa* in maintaining kinship ties at *whanau* and *hapu* level. This unity is overlaid on the unity that at times occurred at tribal level over war and land claims issues in the nineteenth century [Ballara: 1998].

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative privileges *papatipu runanga* as the sub-tribal collective identity represented in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu that mediates between individual members and Ngai Tahu Whanui. This is accomplished by presentation of the eighteen contemporary *papatipu runanga* as the primary sub-tribal collective identity based in *whakapapa* and history since 'then'. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is presented as a sort of 'tribal council' that has arisen out of these noble origins. In fact, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu began with the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996, and from this, which also named eighteen regions as those represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. In turn, this de-emphasises, and at times even silences, the historically privileged place of *whanau* and *hapu* as collective South Island Maori identities, as well as those individuals who can prove *whakapapa* to the *kaumatua* in the 1925 lists but who do not reside within the established Ngai Tahu *rohe*, *Te Waipounamu*. This will be addressed further in Chapters Nine and Ten.

The production of a tribal public narrative that glosses over the complexities that have characterised South Island Maori relations through history is in itself contradictory to the traditional complexities and hierarchies associated with the *raranga korero* of *whakapapa*. As Bishop writes:

...in some cases gathering five versions of a story and making a composite could have offended each of the five storytellers. The purpose of each story may have differed from family branch to family branch, because each story, if handed on from an ancestor, will carry the mana of that ancestor. [1996: 45]
Both historian Ann Parsonson and anthropologist Atholl Anderson make similar points:

Relationships among people remain the key to narratives of the years of the nineteenth century in which the lives of those who spoke in court and those of their senior relatives had been lived. They were not narratives which traversed the major key events that were part of the wider tribal memory, though various of these events were often referred to in passing.... While the histories told in court about these years tended to unfold in a roughly chronological sequence, their purpose was not to provide a broad outline of tribal history.... They were histories specific to particular communities, and they embody different memories and different interpretations.... In a society of close-knit communities the presentation of court cases was itself part of the continuing history of the people and their relationships with each other. As decisions were made about the shaping of those cases, whole histories of alliance, antagonism and obligations had to be taken into account, and those decisions themselves and their outcomes would be recorded in the oral histories. [Parsonson: 2001: 34-39]

It should be accepted at the outset that Maori traditional history, as that term is generally understood, was not constituted in antiquity. There were numerous stories about ancestors, but there is no evidence to suggest that in the prehistoric era these had been arranged and linked as coherent narrative accounts of clan or tribal history. [A. Anderson: 1998: 17]

---

7 According to historian James Stack:

I experienced considerably difficulty at first in disentangling the complicated narratives, because my Maori informants being themselves so familiar with the history did not see the necessity of explaining as they went along why things happened as they did. They would repeatedly break off from the continuous history of the tribe to follow the fortunes of a favourite hero, and again as abruptly leave him to resume the thread of the original narrative. One prolific source of confusion arose from the intermarriages which took place between the members of hostile tribes. It was bewildering to find the same person fighting for one tribe but wishing success to the other, and guilty of treachery towards both. The man who married a Ngatimamo woman would be found plotting the ruin of his wife's relations; and the Ngatimamo man who, by marriage with a Ngai Tahu woman, was admitted to that tribe, would still sympathise with his own people, and betray his connections whenever he could. Another element of confusion arose from the two tribes being spoken of as totally distinct from each other, whereas they had a common origin, and this fact afforded the only explanation of many strange things done on either side. The history throughout is one dark narrative of treachery and ferocity, brightened here and there by displays of great courage and occasional acts of generosity. [1877: 3]
However, Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative presents its privileged identities with associated shared values as original and unchanged since 'then'.

As illustrated in the above examples, Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative supports the management of these new identities that eliminate the historically hierarchical elements of whakapapa as measurement of one's cultural authenticity and sub-tribal identity in favour of a democratic egalitarianism measured by registration of whakapapa with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. For the first time in history this privileges the individual over whanau and hapu, and Ngai Tahu over other South Island iwi such as Ngati Mamoe or Waitaha. This attempts to establish equality among all registered members regardless of their whakapapa, experience, or 'time done' at the marae, shifting traditional emphasis on mana as based on criteria such as degree of whakapapa and rangatira status.

But while this has become the manifest effect of the new structure, now there exists a new range of informal hierarchies of mana as Chapters Nine, Ten and Eleven will reveal. The metanarrative of whakapapa and the meta-theme of time are central to these new hierarchies. While the new legal-political identities flatten the hierarchical power relations that have previously existed among South Island Maori in favour of a 'Ngai Tahu Nation' of individual citizens, it in turn, produces new hierarchies. A new power relationship is introduced in which the leadership of the collective nation manages the registration and uses of whakapapa information to include some in membership and exclude others. As Somers suggests, metanarratives set up conceptual gatekeepers who act to utilise the power of the metanarrative to determine membership [1999, p136]. Any South Island Maori who does not meet the legal criteria set out in the Ngai Tahu Act as a requirement for membership in the nation is excluded from citizenship status.
Ngai Tahu individuals consent to the new ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’

As Somers argues, it is by pitching political practice in indisputable metanarrative that processes of inclusion and exclusion are legitimated and a group of gatekeepers of ‘conceptual authority’ are created [1999]. Somers also argues that not any narrative is possible: in order for the story to be believed, it has to be based in some element of historical fact. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative realises that to achieve consent from Ngai Tahu Whanui citizens, any story about identity must be pitched in the irrefutable metanarrative power of whakapapa and in the meta-themes of history, place and ‘The Claim’, in which at least some elements of the story are based on historical fact. Recognition of the privileged roles of whakapapa, time, key ancestral place, and ‘The Claim’ for contemporary Maori forms the basis of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative.

As demonstrated in Chapter Four, the understanding of whakapapa as cultural core is extremely strong among all Ngai Tahu individuals I have met, pervading across all other distinctions of identity, including geographic place, degree of involvement in corporate settings, age, education, and gender. The unshakeable belief among Ngai Tahu individuals that whakapapa encapsulates lateral and historical networks of relationship and the blood and body of one’s relations, as well connecting one to place and natural environment, makes it the strongest cultural resource. Hence, all narratives about contemporary identity for Ngai Tahu, whether personal or public, incorporate the metanarrative of whakapapa. This in turn adds to the potency of whakapapa as a cultural resource. Rhetorical uses and narrative understandings of the metanarrative of whakapapa to achieve outcomes are addressed further in Chapters Seven through Ten.

Place also constitutes a key theme, a meta-theme in all Ngai Tahu narratives, personal or public. For Ngai Tahu, the places inhabited by one’s ancestors are
integral to identity. Therefore, Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership incorporates particular versions of significant place as a meta-theme in the public narrative to achieve political outcomes and to privilege particular identities. For Ngai Tahu Whanui, management and presentation of tribal boundaries and associations with place are embedded in contemporary political practice. Rhetorical uses and narrative understandings of the meta-theme of place to achieve outcomes are analysed further in Chapter Ten.

Time is another meta-theme in all Ngai Tahu narratives, personal or public. For Maori, time as bound up in understandings of whakapapa, key place and ‘The Claim’, is very significant. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative recognises the privileged place held by history to Maori, as history is what ties an individual to ancestry and place, through whakapapa. The public narrative relies on this privileged place held by the meta-theme of history to rhetorically embed contemporary political practice in particular versions of history. Rhetorical uses and narrative understandings of the meta-theme of time to achieve outcomes are analysed in Chapters Seven and Nine.

‘The Claim’ of the ancestors of contemporary South Island Maori holds a privileged place in the public narrative and is inextricably interwoven in understandings by individuals of history, place, whakapapa and identity. Sir Tipene O’Regan has identified ‘The Claim’ as the most significant cultural adhesive for contemporary Ngai Tahu over one hundred and fifty years. Rhetorical uses and narrative understandings of the meta-theme of ‘The Claim’ to achieve outcomes are analysed in Chapters Seven to Ten.

---

8 The setting up of an original point in time, 'then', as representative of authentic, original identity is a key strategy utilised by aboriginal people in asserting the viability of contemporary political claims. Paine points out that in terms of contemporary political claims by Aboriginal peoples on the basis of first-ness, the historical reference point is, in effect, the period immediately following European contact. Paine suggests that the first yardstick of aboriginality is 'first-ness'. It is likely to be subjectively embraced by 'First Peoples' at different times [2000: 81-82].
As well as providing ‘a place to cognitively reside’ [Rapport: 2000] for registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members, the public narrative facilitates the manufacture of consent for the practices of the leadership and its supporting organisational structure in negotiating claims settlement with the Crown since the passing of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act in 1996. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative supports the political processes since the beginning of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board in 1944 that have led to the introduction of this contemporary collective identity and, in turn, the particular settlement package negotiated with the Crown in 1998. It also supports the current leadership and organisational structure of the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu [see Chapter Five]. This is accomplished by the rhetorical association of contemporary political practice with the metanarrative of whakapapa and particular presentations of the meta-themes of time, key ancestral place and ‘The Claim’. Often within one sentence a recent political event undertaken by the contemporary leadership is linked with a sense of history, originality, authenticity, tradition, and whakapapa. Hence, by the technique of assimilative generalisation [Kratz: 1993: 56], such actions receive nobility and legitimacy. This will be expanded further in Chapters Seven and Eight.

Summary

This chapter has outlined how, for the first time in history, a collective Ngai Tahu Whanui identity exists – the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ - where individual membership – Ngai Tahu citizen - forms the primary identity, hence precluding the necessity of face-to-face relationship at historically significant places associated with ancestry (whanaungatanga). Through receipt of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, registered members receive ‘a place to cognitively reside’ in a new ‘national ethnic’ identity. This is managed and maintained by the Ngai-Tahu roll and the supporting public narrative that recognises the privileged place held by whakapapa, history, key places and ‘The Claim’ for South Island Maori. Because whakapapa forms an element of the basis of membership, by its metanarrative
powers, it is easily presented to entail much more. The nineteenth-century history of kin relations as recorded in \textit{whakapapa} as these formed the basis for collective organisation is fundamental here, along with the particular presentations of the meta-theme of time, key ancestral place and 'The Claim' found in the public narrative.

In turn, these themes of the public narrative serve to legitimate at least an image of a contemporary 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens' that is based in \textit{whakapapa} and tradition, an \textit{iwai} governed and represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. Alternative identities that Ngai Tahu individuals include in their personal narratives are rhetorically deemphasised and even silenced in the public narrative, which serves to exclude particular historical South Island Maori collective identities from membership in the 'Ngai Tahu Nation'. This facilitated Ngai Tahu Whanui assertion of \textit{tangata whenua} status in the South Island in order to secure \textit{manawhenua} rights to Treaty claims.

Chapters Seven to Ten will evaluate how these privileged identities are embedded in particular presentations of the metanarrative of \textit{whakapapa}, in the political practice leading to the settlement of claims issues vis-à-vis the Crown.

In one sense, Sir Tipene O'Regan was correct when he attributed \textit{whakapapa} with the power to bind contemporary Ngai Tahu. However, it is more than simply \textit{whakapapa} as DNA that binds contemporary members. In the absence of the traditional mode of dissemination of oral \textit{whakapapa}, Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative is the contemporary \textit{raranga korero} of South Island Maori \textit{whakapapa}. 
Chapter seven

Meta-themes in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative

The new middle-class intelligentsia of nationalism had to invite the masses into history; and the invitation-card had to be written in a language they understood. [Nairn: 1977: 34 in B. Anderson: 1991]

Introduction

In the management and framing of contemporary Ngai Tahu identities, *whakapapa* is interwoven with the meta-themes of time, place and 'The Claim'. These themes are integrated to the point that in both the rhetorical presentations by Ngai Tahu Whanui and in the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals no one meta-theme stands alone outside the others. Nor is it easy to discern the entrenchment of the new privileged identities addressed in Chapter Eight in narratives about *whakapapa*, time, place and 'The Claim'.

Contained in the meetings, roadshows, *hui*, and written material circulated by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership since 1996 is a public narrative, a particular story about Ngai Tahu *iwi* history, *whakapapa*, culture and identity. This chapter outlines the presentation of *whakapapa* and the meta-themes of time and 'The Claim' as these are interwoven in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. In this Chapter and in Chapter Eight I argue that Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative utilises particular rhetorical techniques to maintain complex associations of the contemporary privileged identities with *whakapapa* and the meta-themes in the minds of its readers – Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members – while presenting these themes in particular ways that both privilege the legal-political identities of
Ngai Tahu Whanui and support the leadership and its administrative and management structures – the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu – in the management and governance of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation'.

**Whakapapa** as metanarrative in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative

In order for any identity or narrative about identity to be accepted by South Island Maori individuals, it must begin from a basis in *whakapapa*. In my observations, every personal and public narrative about contemporary identity incorporates some form of *whakapapa*.

Interweaving the meta-themes and the privileged contemporary identities in the metanarrative of *whakapapa* provides Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership with the opportunity to present particular stories about contemporary South Island Maori identity that can be neither denied nor refuted. For example:

*The whakapapa of the structure is old even if the forms are new. It is rooted in our past and driven by our future.... Is there a workable alternative, consistent with the Treaty which can be authenticated by our tikanga and history? 'No'. [T. O'Regan: 1992 in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 meeting Index of Information Papers]*

*Our strength comes through our recognition and acknowledgement of our diversity... the vision document provides for the different voices within Ngai Tahu and acknowledge that the one thing that unites us is our whakapapa. [Ngai Tahu individual: notes from Ngai Tahu Hui a Tau: November 2000]*

Key to this dissertation is recognition that one of the ways *whakapapa* maintains its primacy as metanarrative for contemporary Ngai Tahu is that its meanings and understandings elude precise definition. One reason for this is that *whakapapa* is often blurred in its framings by Ngai Tahu individuals and collectivities, with the range of concepts and metaphors outlined in Chapter Four, including blood, bones, biology, spirituality and physical landscape. This gives
whakapapa some of its potency as a cultural resource in the constitution of identities. For example:

To those who work within whakapapa, it is the heart, the soul, the very being of the new structure, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 25]

One way the presentation of whakapapa adds potency to the meta-themes in the public narrative is by giving its commonly associated symbols and metaphors their own power and authority that then by assimilative generalisation, take on the power associated with the biological connections represented by whakapapa.

This document is the pou of the Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit from which our Ngai Tahu institutions are charged to exist. ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 3]

Cosmological chants about whakapapa that trace links from genealogical ancestors to divine ancestors provide potent metaphor in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative accomplishes this by entrenching its story in cosmological chants about whakapapa and relationships between people and places. For example:

Kai Tahu's eponymous ancestor is Tahu Potiki. This well-known tribal waiata traces his ancestry back to the divine parents, Raki¹ and Papatuanuku:

These are the children of Rangi and Papatuanuku
Some now inhabit the world of light
Some have descended
To live in the human realm
You have released
The heavens which stand above
The four winds which draw towards you
And the descendants of Haere mai tua
Who descended into the earth

¹'Raki is a local South Island dialect for 'Rangi' (God/sky).
To our ancestors Hounuku
Houraki, Houtea, Houmea
and Uenuku, who lived in Hawaiiki and begat
Paikea, who rode the whale
To the shores of Aotearoa
and bore Whatiu Te Ramarama
Who died at Tokatikiti
but who bore Porouraki
Of the Ngati Porou
Whose son was Tawhirih ki te Raki
Who begat Raki Papa kia Tane
Who begat Rakitane who coupled with
The great chieftainness, Hine Matiora
From who comes Hinekaitaki
The weeping daughter
From whom comes the supreme head of the Kai Tahu people
Behold the birth of life.

The following waiata was sourced from the Ngati Kahungunu anthem, Pinepine Te Kura. Often heard on marae all over the North Island, it is one of the most complex waiata composed for the purpose of informing the child of its origins and whakapapa. This version is less complex, although it is an excellent waiata for teaching our children whakapapa. This version was penned by Te Aritaua Pitama in the 1950s and was revived by Ms Aroha Reriti-Crofts during the 1980s as a waiata to be used by Ngai Tahu:

My darling child, my jewel, precious and beautiful
A jewel whose lines stem from afar as Murihiku
We, this party of travellers in time and space,
Have journeyed to you
We are descendants of the lines of Hounuku,
Houraki and Houatea who eventually begot Uenuku,
father of Paikea. Paikea, it was who bore Tahu Potiki,
ancestor of Ngai Tahu.
My mountain that stands supreme is Aorangi
And these are the canoes from which our descent lines allows you and I to claim:
Uruao, of Rakaihaut,
Taiera, of Tama Ahua,
Mahaanui, for the descendants of Maui
and Takitimu, canoe of the descendants of Kahungunu. [Te Kakaia': Spring 1997: 58]
Whakapapa is given its metanarrative potency as epistemology and ontology by rhetorical and metaphorical conjoining with social naturalism. This in turn attributes to whakapapa the ontological powers associated with spirituality [Somers: 1999]. Just as whakapapa (in whatever form it is presented) is insulated from the standards of empirical proof that apply to other cultural claims, due to its association with the laws of nature, so too particular metaphors associated with this primary cultural concept become insulated from rigorous investigation or critical analysis. These metaphors thus become free to create boundaries of exclusion and inclusion, thus facilitating significant extension of the uses of whakapapa for political purposes.

Because of its already metaphoric associations with a range of other organic and spiritual metaphors and with history, as well as its indisputable potency as cultural resource in understandings of identity by Maori, the interweaving of the meta-themes and the privileged identities of the public narrative in the potency of whakapapa is omnipresent, not necessarily explicitly stated. The connection is tacitly understood by the readers, again contributing to the metanarrative power of whakapapa as well as the potency of the public narrative. In the following example, the association of whakapapa with ihi, atua, whenua, tipuna, and tapu is interpreted as the link and protection, not of Maori, but of iwi with these essences and with the mana of the Maori world:

The knowledge of whakapapa was protected as the essence of each iwi. It gave iwi their link with atua, whenua and tipuna – it is the very source of our mana. [‘Te Karaka’: Summer 2000: 12]

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative spreads the metanarrative potency of whakapapa further by rhetorically associating its meta-themes and privileged identities, as well as recent political practices, with natural and spiritual symbols. Following are several examples:
The story of Maui fishing up the North Island is not only a good story but also code for the discovery trails used by Maui to discover Aotearoa. The story of the deeds of his brothers in breaking up Te Ika a Maui, is a pretty good description of the deeds of modern Maori fighting, in the lawyer-infested waters of Te Ohu Kai Moana [contemporary body involved in Maori fisheries issues]. ['Te Karaka': Summer 2000: 12]

We sometimes joke: "Ngai Tahu are a humble people with high mountains! We're the sandstone which grinds the pounamu." Over the past year our mountains have come a little closer and - at last - the pounamu is within reach. ['Joint Chairs' Review': Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 13]

The term nohoanga (literally 'a place to sit'), traditionally referred to the seasonal occupation sites which were an integral part of the mobile lifestyle of our tipuna, as they moved around Te Wai Pounamu in pursuit of various food and other natural resources. This traditional concept has been given contemporary effect in the Crown's Settlement Offer through the provision to Ngai Tahu of 72 temporary campsites adjacent to lakes and rivers, to facilitate customary fishing and the gathering of other natural resources.... Nohoanga will provide all Ngai Tahu with an opportunity to experience the landscape as their tipuna did, and to rekindle the traditional practices of gathering food and other natural resources, so long an essential part of Ngai Tahu culture. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: November 1998: 38-39]

[Ngai Tahu have evolved their contemporary tribal structure] by evolving their traditional tribal Runanga as their putahi, or heart. [T. O'Regan: 1992 in 'Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 Meeting Index of Information Papers']

The role of Time: 'Then' and 'Now'

Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future. ['Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future': 2000]

The presentation of a particular story about time is a key component of all the interwoven themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. It is what I refer to as a meta-theme. Its presentation underpins the potency of each of the key themes
and the metanarrative of *whakapapa*. As Cohen argues, 'It is common practice for nationalists to use the passage of time to give legitimacy to their construct of 'nation'. Nations must have history, just as kinship must have genealogy; and if they don't have it in fact, they must invent it' [2000: 153]. Each meta-theme and privileged identity of the public narrative is embedded in a particular presentation of time that strategically overlooks the incremental aspect of historical process, preferring to set up and compare just two points in time: 1840/1848 as 'then' and 1996/1998 (and all time after) as 'now'. 'Then' is presented as the origin of collective 'now' identities. Moreover, all time before 'now' is imaged simply as 'then', a long period of time rolled into one undifferentiated moment of history:

Ngai Tahu is the Maori tribe of the southern islands of New Zealand, where it settled around 1,000 years ago. In 1840, the tribe became a signatory to the Treaty of Waitangi and began highlighting violations of the Treaty by the Crown in 1848.

In 1998, Ngai Tahu and the New Zealand Government agreed upon an Apology and Settlement for these violations. The Apology was delivered on behalf of the Crown by the then Prime Minister in November 1998. [‘Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future’: 2000]

It’s a bit too easy, though, in the flush of current enthusiasm, to forget the long drudging years lived out by the relatively small band of our tupuna who kept the Ngai Tahu Claim alive through seven generations. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1998: 12]

As an examples of undifferentiated time:

From time immemorial, the whakapapa of our people... [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 20]

As Kratz notes, 'Golden Age versions gloss over remembered difficulties and also deftly erase disagreements or resentments about the changes in their lives... masking the historical process, making flat and uniform change that took place over time, often incrementally and differentially.' [1993: 41]. This binary presentation is what Kratz identifies as a Western notion of time, used
strategically to construct contemporary notions of tradition [1993], and in the case of Ngai Tahu, I argue, identity, as continuous with an original point in history, which attributes the contemporary construction with originality and authenticity. These framings of history are embedded in contemporary practices around land claims issues addressed in Chapters Two and Five.

In her discussion of such binary notions of history, Kratz indicates that the final point may indicate fairly extensive changes from the first in terms of cultural practice and issues surrounding identity. In the current Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, however, the shifting social and material circumstances between 'then' and 'now' are glossed over. This facilitates an image of continuity of history, identity and cultural practice that can, in turn, be used, as Kratz suggests, 'both as explanation and justification for doing things and for the way things are' [1993: 58]. Particular points in the past (identified as 'then') become canonised and incorporated into accepted, unquestioned tradition [Kratz, 1993: 41]. Other key dates in the past can be deemphasised or silenced. This image of continuity of history, identity and cultural practice and corresponding glossing over of remembered difficulties is interwoven into the key themes of the public narrative, which will become clear as this chapter unfolds.

The period between 'then' and 'now' covers a long time span, and both the recording of contemporary history and the personal narratives of individuals show that this time has been marked by significant changes in how Ngai Tahu individuals and structures organise their lives and constitute their identities. It is in the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals that political changes, disagreements and resentments are expressed [see Chapter Eight].

The setting up of an original point in time, 'then', as representative of authentic, original identity is a key strategy utilised by aboriginal people in asserting the viability of contemporary political claims. Paine points out that in terms of contemporary political claims by Aboriginal peoples on the basis of first-ness, the
historical reference point is, in effect, the period immediately following European contact. Paine suggests that the first yardstick of aboriginality is 'first-ness'. It is likely to be subjectively embraced by 'First Peoples' at different times [2000: 81-82].

In Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, 'then' is set as 1840/1848. The reason I present two dates, 1840 and 1848, as representative of 'then' is because, while the Waitangi Tribunal introduced the '1840 rule' in the 1987 New Zealand Maori Council proceedings to the High Court, which has in turn led to a great deal of emphasis in both the public narrative and in other forms of whakapapa management by Ngai Tahu Whanui. The choice of these as the key dates is actually embedded in Crown requirements for the management of whakapapa information in the determination of South Island land claims issues. 1840 was set by the Crown as the date to which all contemporary Maori land claims must prove unchanged and unchallenged origin - the '1840 rule'. This is because the 1985 Waitangi Tribunal Act allows claims back to 1840 as the year the Treaty of Waitangi was signed. So 1840 became the benchmark vis a vis claims negotiations with the Crown.

However, while The Claim holds such significance, 1840 seems to be de-emphasised by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership. Instead, significant emphasis is placed on 1848, which in the narrative is rhetorically blurred with the signing of the Treaty:

The Whakapapa Unit is the entity charged with the kaitiakitanga or guardianship of the Ngai Tahu tribal whakapapa record. It is responsible for the care, protection and restoration of the tribal whakapapa dating back to 1848. The management of this database has evolved in conjunction with the prosecution of our tribal claim.

---

2 In fact, it is out of this context that the term 'Aborigine' emerged (from the Latin ab origine), who, the Oxford English Dictionary informs us, are 'the natives found in possession of a country by Europeans who have gone thither as colonists.' [Oxford English Dictionary].
This work began in the 1840’s and resulted from the early dealings between Ngai Tahu and the Crown. As a result of various land purchase agreements the Census of the “middle island natives” was compiled in 1848. This Census was the first Census of an indigenous people conducted within the British Empire. Today these records form the basis of our work. [Manager, Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 20]

At times 1844 and 1849 are mentioned as well, signifying the Otakou Purchase and the ‘beginning of the Ngai Tahu Claim – Te Kereme’, when the South Island Chief, Matiaha Tiramorehu first petitioned the Crown to have adequate reserves of land put aside [‘Crown Settlement Offer’ document: 1998: 59, ‘Te Karaka’: Summer 1998: 24]. This then deemphasises 1840 as well as events that occurred in South Island Maori history between prior to 1844 and 1849. 3 1848 is presented as the authentic origin of contemporary Ngai Tahu identity as an iwi. 1848 is the date of Shortland’s census of ‘the Middle Island Natives’, a list of South Island Maori kaumatua which later formed the basis of the 1925 'Blue Book', to which contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui must establish whakapapa in order to qualify as registered members.

However, while 1848 is presented as key in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, the recent political context of its significance is not emphasised. Rather, ‘then’ is

3 Angela Ballara records a series of shifts in Crown recognition of South Island Maori identities between 1840 and 1848, in which she identifies a trend toward preference by the Crown to negotiate land claims issues with ‘tribal formations’ and a tendency to accept the assertions of the most outspoken Maori spokespersons, without further investigation. Her historical analysis critically engages the story presented by contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership that Ngai Tahu tribal kaumatua signed the Treaty on behalf of a Ngai Tahu iwi. Ballara makes the point that although there was a tendency from ‘the 1840s to view Ngai Tahu as the dominant tribe in the South Island, Ngai Tahu was not actually mentioned as a tribal group ‘in the southern Maori signatures to the Treaty. Also, in 1844 Shortland recognised Ngati Mamoe as the ‘admitted proprietors of the southern half of the South Island, but by 1851 Shortland had ‘changed his stance’, presenting a ‘new version of Ngai Tahu traditional history ... based on information from contemporary Ngai Tahu chiefs [who] naturally...assigned much more mana to their own people’ [Ballara: 1998: 71-72].

As discussed in Chapter Five, Ballara [1998: 69-74] also argues that the 1848 list was by no means an official census.
presented as the time when the Maori *iwi* collective identity for the South Island thrived in natural harmony with the physical environment, prior to the arrival of European settlers. The arrival of these outside forces represents the disruption of the natural basis of Maori society - the *iwi*.

While 1840 is deemphasised as the date of 'then' in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, the signing of the Treaty is still acknowledged as key to the origin of contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui privileged identities. Compare the historical facts outlined in Chapter Two with the Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative version of 'then' quoted above. Events between 1840 and 1848 are 'glossed over' to refer generally to 'the 1840s'. This is followed by a jump through time from 'then' (1840s) to 'today', overlooking the incremental political and social changes over this period as outlined in Chapter Two.

'Now' is set as 1996/1998, 1996 because Ngai Tahu Whanui was created as a legal-political identity by the passing of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, and 1998 because of the passing of the Ngai Tahu Claims Settlement Act and the Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu. For example:

These past two years have been momentous enough in themselves. Now we confront the biggest decision in our history.

In 1996 we finally achieved our autonomy as a people: complete control over our own affairs. With the passing of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, we again became free as a people - free of the State bureaucracy, free of governmental paternalism - answerable only to ourselves.... Our generation now confronts an enormous and historic challenge. We have a choice that our earlier generations never had. [T. O'Regan: Crown Settlement Offer Document: November 1998: 5]

We are becoming accustomed to referring to this present phase as "the hinge of our history"; as an "historic turning point"; as the "beginning of a new beginning". It has been reasonable to talk like that because most of us are conscious of the

---

4 What is represented as autonomy from the state is in fact a legal-political identity created in legislation, the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996, as the result of Crown requirements to settle the Ngai Tahu land claims [see Chapter One].
enormous scale of what we are doing in our generation. [T. O'Regan: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1998: 12]

This Annual Review comes at an historic transition. [Joint Chair's Review', Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 6]

That was a historic reversal of more than one and a half centuries of Crown policy towards Iwi Maori. ['Joint Chair's Review': Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 6]

We have, however, come to the end of an important era - the end of the first phase of post-Tribunal settlement negotiation with the concluding of a Heads of Agreement with the Crown on the Ngai Tahu claims. ['Joint Chair's Review': Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: 1996: 6]

In these examples phrases such as 'have been momentous', 'historic turning point', 'historic transition', 'historic reversal' and 'end of an important era' present 'now' as the end of an era, the end of a particular history and the beginning of a new one:

Very few dates that are representative of shifts in political structure of collective identity are acknowledged in the public narrative. Those that are occasionally acknowledged are cast as representative of natural steps from 'then' to 'now', reinforcing the homogeneous nature of iwi identity in 1848:

When the Treaty of Waitangi was signed in 1840 by seven, high-ranking southern chiefs, it was seen as a convenient arrangement between equals. By 1849 when the Crown began defaulting on the terms of a series of ten major land purchases dating from 1844, earlier suspicions of the Crown's good faith by some of the Ngai Tahu chiefs seemed confirmed, and the Ngai Tahu Claim – 'Te Kereme' – was born....

Ngai Tahu first took its case to the Maori Land Court before Chief Judge Fenton in 1868, receiving only paltry additional rights. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 59]
Interestingly, in order to focus emphasis on the new political identity and acceptance of the 1998 negotiated settlement, the history of South Island Maori land claims is exorted in the public narrative as something to be forgotten, left in the past, a great 'taniwha':

The opportunity to lay our past to rest is both a thing of joy and a thing of fear – joy in our belief that what our tipuna could only dream, we might achieve; and fear that we might fail to achieve it....

As I look into the eyes of my mokopuna, I reflect that the Ngai Tahu Claim is now seven generations old, in many ways it has become our culture, a culture of grievance. In that sense the Claim, Te Kereme, is a taniwha, a monster that has consumed our tribal lives down through the years as generation after generation has struggled for 'justice'.

At the same time, though, that struggle has bonded us together in a special way. It has shaped our tribal organisation over the years and given us a focus that other tribes have not had. [T. O'Regan: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 25]

This poses a dilemma between leaving behind what has been identified as integral to Ngai Tahu culture since 'time immemorial' and the shift to find an alternative cultural adhesive, as addressed in lectures by Sir Tipene O'Regan [December 2, 2001; September 22, 1998].

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative presents a story about the most original South Island Maori whakapapa, situating the tangata whenua status of a Ngai Tahu iwi in the South Island of New Zealand beyond 1840, to an even more authentic eponymous ancestor, Tahu Potiki, and then, as addressed later in this chapter, rhetorically linking contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui as the equivalent of Ngai Tahu iwi, unchanged since 'then'. Here, 'then' is stretched back further in history from 1840 to the time of Tahu Potiki:

To me a Ngai Tahu person is [from] Tahu Potiki. [T. Ryan, Manager Whakapapa Unit: Crown Apology Hui, Onuku marae: November 28, 1998]
Ngai Tahu, our tribe - originating with ancestors Paikea and his descendant Tahu Potiki from the North Island East Coast, and linking with the long-time South Island resident Waitaha people.... Through intermarriage, warfare and political alliances, Ngai Tahu interests amalgamated with Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha iwi. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: November 1998: 59]

Tukua mai ki ahau ko tuku tipuna ko Tahu Potiki... Te Arikitapu o Ngai Tahu

Draw closer within the essence of Tahu Potiki, the Supreme Head of Ngai Tahu. ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 1]

This extends 'then' to cover all time before 1840, indeed all time before 'now'. Interestingly, once again a glossed over version of all time from 1840 to Tahu Potiki is presented, deftly erasing shifts and challenges in collective identities. This silences any contemporary competition for manawhenua South Island Maori identity and associated rights to land, based on Ngati Mamoe or Waitaha identity, both of which existed in the South Island prior to 1840 and, indeed, since. This illustrates the way that definitions and presentations of reality are political,

---

5 According to Ngai Tahu kaumatua, Syd Cormack:

That’s how Kai Tahu could push their way down the South Island. They got beaten, even a Kai Tahu kaumatua says, ‘We were beaten many times. If we hadn’t been able to draw on the North Island people, we’d have been beaten, we’d have been chased out of the South Island’. But Kai Tahu now says they won every time. You read all the books. ‘Kai Tahu were never beaten’. [1997: 145-147].

6 According to Atholl Anderson:

Much has been written about the early South Island people referred to as ‘Waitaha’. The name has been used in various ways, some of them legitimate and some not. The recent claim that Waitaha were a multiracial people who inhabited New Zealand for a thousand years before the arrival of the Maori is a modern fable. Although evidently not known to its authors, it actually originates in similar but less spectacular conjecture during the early twentieth century. [1998: 20-21] 

It should be noted here that there was another person called Waitaha who occurs at about the same point in the whakapapa of the people in the central North Island descended from the Arawa canoe.... By about the late sixteenth century, some groups of Ngati Mamoe had begun to settle in the South Island. [1998: 22-23]
connected to issues of power [Foucault: 1980, Giddens: 1985]. Tahu Potiki represents the uniting of three tribal peoples into 'one' iwi, Ngai Tahu.\footnote{Atholl Anderson writes:}

Ngai Tahu means “people of Tahu” after the tribe’s founder, Tahu Potiki. About ten generations ago, his descendants migrated from the North Island of New Zealand to the South Island. Through inter-marriage and conquest, these original migrants merged with the resident Waitaha and Kati Mamoe tribes to form Ngai Tahu as it is today. [‘Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future’: 2000]

The ancient land Te Waipounamu and its surrounding islands have for forty-four generations sustained iwi Waitaha, Kati Mamoe and more recently Ngai Tahu. Descendants of these iwi today number 30,000 and make up the fourth largest tribe of Maori in Aotearoa.... Tahu Potiki a Paika is the ancestor we take our Ngai Tahu name from. His descendants arrived in Te Waipounamu ten generations ago and by intermarriage and conquest, merged with resident Mamoe and Waitaha. [‘Tribal Profile’: 1997: 3]

This image is a vital one for current Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership in order to exclude other South Island Maori tribal identities and maintain support from its membership for achieving current and future political aims. Arguably it constitutes the only identifiable basis for unity that has continued to exist for the various Ngai Tahu hapu.\footnote{According to Atholl Anderson:}

\footnotetext{Ngai Tahu are descendants of Tahu Potiki, of Hawkes Bay.... There has been some disagreement about whether the particular ‘Tahu’ in Ngai Tahu was Tahu Potiki himself, or one of his descendants. Tuhawaiki implied to Shortland in 1843 that the tribal name came from Tahumutu and others have also been suggested, including Tahumurihape. To some extent, the difference of opinion reflects the process of tribal formation – that as a clan rises to tribal status it places a different emphasis upon the ancestral connections it holds in common with the tribe from which it originated. [1998: 24]}

\footnotetext{It will also facilitate understanding of the Ngai Tahu migration if it is first accepted that, speaking literally, there never was such a thing. Ngai Tahu, it has been suggested, is very much a retrospective tribal appellation, certainly for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and, as Shortland’s impeccable authorities imply, came into general use only after the Ngai Tahu occupation was complete and the various southern peoples were fairly}
The Ngai Tahu negotiating team's submission to the Waitangi Tribunal in opposing a cross-claim prior to Ngai Tahu Whanui's negotiated settlement in 1998 argued that Waitaha was seen as a group of great antiquity, but they were not a distinct people in 1840. At that time they did not have a separate hapu or whanau identity and had not done so since, and Waitaha claimants cannot be Waitaha unless they are also of Ngai Tahu and/or Ngati Mamoe descent. [Christchurch Press: 4 June 1998: 3]

There is a political purpose underlying the incorporation of Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha within the wider legal-political identity, Ngai Tahu Whanui. The Crown had set 1840 as the date to which original tangata whenua iwi status had to be established in order to negotiate a settlement – the '1840 rule' [Maori Council proceedings to the High Court re position of Treaty of Waitangi vis-à-vis State Owned Enterprises Act 1987]. Even after the Waitangi Tribunal's findings in 1991, a series of challenges to the Ngai Tahu claim, both from within Ngai Tahu iwi and from Waitaha were presented in both parliament and in the media. As Sir Tipene O'Regan explains:

I wish to commence...with a political statement. It is a particular kind of political statement and it has been drafted with care.

Ngai Tahu are the people that claim traditional manawhenua over the vast majority of Te Waipounamu, the South Island of New Zealand. We are Ngai Tahu (Kai Tahu). The origins of our tribe lie in the North Island, and before that, in the islands of Eastern Polynesia. The story of those origins is the story of migration and of motives: conflict, marriage, the need for resources, even the simple zest for discovery. There are three main streams of descent which flow together in those histories to make us the tribe known as Ngai Tahu. In historical order, these streams are: Waitaha, Mamoe and Tahu.... It is important for me that the statement should withstand...examination. If it cannot be sustained in certain important respects, Ngai Tahu lack a basis for regarding themselves as the manawhenua tribe of the traditional area described. They would have no rights under Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi. They would have no rights in fisheries, land and other properties.... Ngai Tahu would not have the standing to bring the Ngai Tahu claim

[Well united.... In historical narrative, Ngai Tahu can be used to refer generally to any individual or group who are likely to have argued a primary claim to descent from Tahu Potiki, and where no more precise ascription is available. [1998: 26-27]
before the Waitangi Tribunal and, perhaps, almost as important, the Crown would not have a basis for setting that claim in terms of the findings of that Tribunal....

On the whole, there is not too much objection when someone undertakes the enormous financial and human task of bringing a case before the Tribunal. There is considerable unity. But after the hearings, as part of the remedy process, the Crown begins to ask another set of questions.... 'But who is the iwi? Who is Ngai Tahu? What are their traditional boundaries? What is the basis for that statement? How many of them were there anyhow?'

The evidence now required is of a different order. Generally it is to do with ancient history. It is not about what happened between Maori and the Crown, it is about who and what are the iwi, which tribe is the Treaty partner and what territory and resources are traditionally associated with that iwi...

...the process of assertion of a right to control resources almost certainly means competition with others. There is competition within the tangata whenua, and there is competition between the tangata whenua and Maori groups that have come from outside... there is claim and counter-claim about who and what is the iwi and whose boundaries are where.

Why must we persist with these questions? The answer is simple. The mass assimilation of Maori has clearly become impossible, and it is therefore plain that there must be some administrative structure that enables Maori to manage their own affairs within our own world. All analysis shows that there is only one rational base for that to take place on, and that is the iwi.... I ask you to remember that the identity of Waitaha is a fundamental element of the origins of Ngai Tahu, that it is recognised and identified as one of the original elements of our people...

Apart from the aspect of exclusive guardianship, and the implied denial of Ngai Tahu connection to our Waitaha heritage, Ngai Tahu can have no real objection, you might say, if these people wish to walk the hills, having their conversations with the trees and the stones. The difficulty is that their assertions are increasingly being read as assertions of manawhenua - and that is an assertion that conflicts with Ngai Tahu's Treaty-based manawhenua.... All I ask is that... the power culture... should not be tempted to depart from the Treaty base and the 1840 rule by toying with the mysticism on the sidelines. [T. O'Regan: 1993, 1991]

Then, the 1998 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report states:

There have been two sets of High Court proceedings brought against the settlement; the first by the Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga which has been struck out; the second by a group calling itself Waitaha is still at large. It cannot succeed but that does not mean that this group will not keep asserting their allegations in other ways....
Returning to Waitaha, Ngai Tahu people should always remember that they are Waitaha as much as they are Mamoe and Tahu and that the claims by some small groups that they alone represent the "authentic" Waitaha or Mamoe whakapapa are a demonstrable nonsense. Most of those who have opposed the settlement are members of Ngai Tahu Whanui and have all the same rights of inclusion as any other member of our tribe. What we have resisted is the notion that, if they want to separate themselves in some unique new identity, they can't take the tribe's rights and assets with them. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1998: 13]

Waitaha is cast here on the one hand as having started prior to 1840 and later subsumed into Ngai Tahu Whanui, and on the other as a 'unique new identity', implying that 'new' is somehow less authentic, less noble than 'old'. Yet, whakapapa to Tahu Potiki is not a requirement for membership to Ngai Tahu Whanui under the Act. In fact, while Tahu Potiki is heralded in the public narrative as the eponymous ancestor of Ngai Tahu for political purpose, whakapapa to Tahu Potiki would not constitute membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui. Only proof of whakapapa to one of the 1848 kaumatua constitutes the right to register as a member. The 1848 lists do not include all possible lines of descent from Tahu Potiki, but those descendants not acknowledged in the 1848 lists would be excluded from membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui.

In my observations for both my 1991 MA and this PhD research, Tahu Potiki was not mentioned in Ngai Tahu public narrative until 1997.9 The 1996 Te Runanga

---

9 Evison's comprehensive history of Southern Maori during the period of European colonization, endorsed and published in 1993 by the Ngai Tahu leadership, makes reference to the North Island origins of Ngai Tahu but does not mention Tahu Potiki [1993].


Ngai Tahu are descendants of Tahu Potiki, of Hawkes Bay. He was married to Hemo ki Te Raki who was previously married to his older brother, Whatuia Te Ramarama, whose son was Porourangi, the ancestor of Ngati Porou. Ngai Tahu are also closely connected with the Ngati Kahungunu peoples, especially Ngati Ira, with whom many North Island ancestors are held in common, and with Thai Tara and Rangitane. The ascription of these latter tribes to Ngati Kahungunu-ki-Wairarapa seems to have occurred only in the nineteenth century. Prior to then, the main tribal name was Ngati Ira, and earlier still, Ngai Tara. These peoples, and also Rangitane - Kurahaupo canoe descendants - share
o Ngai Tahu Annual Report makes no reference to Tahu Potiki. It does acknowledge, however, that, 'peace has not yet broken out. In fact there are a number of new wars, mainly of an inter-tribal kind, the aim of which is, as it was in history, the expropriation of southern assets.' ['Joint Chairs Review': 1996: 6]. In 1997, the public narrative began to present a theme about Tahu Potiki as the most original, eponymous ancestor of the contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui, which includes all Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha who register their whakapapa in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu's Whakapapa Unit.

So while a story about common descent from Tahu Potiki is used to subsume Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha īwi into Ngai Tahu Whanui, the descendants of many South Island Maori who descended from Tahu Potiki but whose descendants were not included in the 1848 lists were also excluded.

‘The Claim’/’Te Kereme’ as meta-theme

As Sir Tipene O'Regan pointed out in his September 1998 lecture at Canterbury University, the Ngai Tahu Claim – 'Te Kereme' - has held a privileged position as cultural adhesive for South Island Maori since 'then'.

Presentation of a particular image of 'Te Kereme' as one singular tribal claim initiated in the 1840s by a united tribe, unchanged in perspective and sharing a united historical culture since 'then' is a meta-theme underlying the identities that are privileged in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative.

Land claims issues between South Island Maori and the Crown since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, 'then', to 'now' provides a clear example of how

---


10 Sir Tipene O'Regan’s daughter, Hana writes that since the 1840s: ‘No group has more consistently maintained its grievance as a marker of its identity and its cohesion, other than, perhaps, Waikato’ [2001: 147]. It is for this reason that it is impossible to consider any analysis of Ngai Tahu history, identity, whakapapa or culture without consideration of the role of ‘The Claim’.
a history of political events is utilised in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative and interwoven with whakapapa and the meta-themes of time and place to present the contemporary privileged identities as authentic, original and unaltered since 'then'. I argue that these collective claims and series of events are interwoven into a particular story to present them as episodes in one continuous, longstanding, united, tribal claim which is viewed by contemporary South Island Maori as an iconic symbol of Ngai Tahu history and culture, in turn associating the contemporary legal-political identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui with such continuous development. The Claim and its history are cast in such a way as to legitimate political actions by the Ngai Tahu leadership since the mid-1980s that have resulted in the introduction of the privileged identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui.

As outlined in Chapter Five, there is a particular political context within which the key themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative began to be circulated from 1996. By outlining a series of censuses and pieces of legislation leading up to the contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui roll, Chapter Two demonstrated the positioning of whakapapa management in negotiations over land claims issues between South Island Maori and the Crown from 1840 to 2000. In the period from 1996 to 1998, the 'A Team' and their supporting legal consultation, in presenting their position to the Crown as representatives of the tangata whenua of the South Island, were required to gauge Ngai Tahu public opinion on the preferred option of a negotiated settlement (see Chapter Five). Both the Crown and the Chief Negotiators indicated preference for a united tribal settlement, hence the establishment of a new legal-political identity as interchangeable with 'iwi' in the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act.

The legal recognition of Ngai Tahu Whanui was required as a step in the process of establishing an iwi and the corresponding representative body to receive the negotiated settlement. The Crown had been indicating to the Chief Negotiators that it would be willing to reach such agreement by offering a package incorporating compensation, cultural redress and preemptive rights to purchase
Crown assets. The Crown indicated that this would take the form of a collective tribal settlement, not one based on the nine territorial claims that had formed the shape of The Claims package when it originated in 1986 and which, as this dissertation argues, characterised South Island Maori land claims since the signing of the Treaty in 1840.

As the previous section showed, the key dates of 1840/1848 and 1996/1998 that underlie the privileged legal-political identities are based on the origin and subsequent settlement of South Island Maori land claims. Presentation of 'The Claim' is rhetorically intertwined with particular presentations of whakapapa and time to further entrench images of history, authenticity, originality, shared tradition and culture. This is achieved by the rhetorical attachment of these images to the political practice that Ngai Tahu leadership has engaged in around 'The Claim' throughout the twentieth century.

The following 'History of the Claim' published in the Ngai Tahu Whanui magazine, 'Te Karaka', indicates a glossing over of incremental political developments and multiple perspectives from the period between 1840 and 1991:

Ngai Tahu made its first claim against the Crown for breach of contract 149 years ago. In 1849, Matiaha Tiramorehu petitioned the Crown to have put aside adequate reserves of land for the iwi, as it had agreed to do under the terms of its land purchases from Ngai Tahu. In the 20 years from 1844, Ngai Tahu signed formal land sale contracts with the Crown for some 34.5 million acres, approximately 80% of the South Island, Te Wai Pounamu.... When Ngai Tahu first took its case to the courts, in 1868, the government passed laws to prevent the Courts from hearing or ruling on the case. A Commission of Inquiry a decade later had its funding halted by the Crown to prevent completing its work. In 1887, Royal Commissioner Judge MacKay said only a "substantial endowment" of land secured to Ngai Tahu ownership would go some of the way to "right so many years of neglect". By the time of the findings on the land claim by the Waitangi Tribunal in 1991, at least a dozen different commissions, inquiries, courts and tribunals had repeatedly established the veracity and justice of Ngai Tahu's claims. ['Te Karaka': Summer 1998: 4]
In this excerpt, particular dates from the 1840s are canonised and other key dates are excluded. While it is 1840 that marks the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the 1987 Court of Appeal '1840 rule', 1840 is not mentioned in this history of 'The Claim' and receives very little acknowledgement elsewhere in the collection of public narrative. There is a significant jump through time from 1887 to 1991, glossing over political events of the twentieth century that have contributed to the context of the 1991 Waitangi Tribunal findings. This brief timeline does not include the key date of dates of 1944, 1946 and 1955, marking the introduction of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board. The Trust Board began after considerable attempts by a section of South Island Maori keen to effect a pan-iwi settlement. 1990, which I identify as a key date in the development of contemporary South Island Maori identities as it marks the passing of the Runanga Iwi Act, is silenced. These political developments of the twentieth century required South Island Maori to organise in the form of one 'iwi' structure, with a representative body, deemed to be capable of receiving and administering a negotiated settlement from 'The Claim'. This brief timeline does not continue past 1991 to 1996/1998, other key dates in this history of events and political practices leading to the settlement of 'The Claim' [as outlined in Chapters Two and Five].

In the following example, a Ngai Tahu 'iwi' is reinforced as the collective organisation of South Island Maori identity that the Crown has negotiated with since 'then', as the generations of South Island Maori individuals and hapu are referred to as 'generations of Ngai Tahu':

Each successive generation has become kaitiaki of Te Kereme. As we stand on the threshold of this decision it is important to remember our tipuna who named every mountain, lake and stream in Te Wai Pounamu. Generations of Ngai Tahu have devoted their lives to the pursuit of justice to Te Kereme. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 4]
By the technique of assimilative generalisation, over time various political events that Ngai Tahu individuals articulate with clarity in their personal narratives are linked into an image of one consistent approach, the approach to a tribal settlement that has been adopted by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership 'now'. Contemporary political practice around claims issues is embedded in the metathemes and the metanarrative and these are presented within a wider image of history, originality, homogeneous tribal identity. Shared culture and tradition 'then' are rhetorically linked to political practice 'now', legitimating these practices in the minds of Ngai Tahu Whanui members:

The Crown's Settlement Offer gives us the opportunity to achieve the aspirations of our tipuna who met at Te Umukaha (Temuka) in 1907 to discuss Te Kereme. Their hui manifesto stated: "Me whai huri te iwi he whakamana i nga mahi o Te Kereme - The people must have determination, in order to give effect to the Claim. Ninety years later you, as a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui have, for the first time in our history, the chance to have your say regarding the settlement of our Claim. As Kaiwhakahaere, I urge you to inform yourselves about the Crown's Settlement Offer. To assist you, the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Group will be holding consultation hui throughout New Zealand. This consultation is an important part of the decision-making process of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. As we look to the future, influenced by the events of our past, let us ensure that the decision which is made is the best one for ourselves and our mokopuna. Should Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu decide to accept the Crown's Settlement Offer we will liberate future generations from carrying the heavy burden that has for so long been borne by ourselves and our tipuna. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 4]

It is important, as we stand at this historic juncture, that we should remember those who have helped to bring us here. The generations of our old people who travelled from hui to hui, year in year out, debating and petitioning, raising their meagre funds and going without: it was they who kept the Ngai Tahu Claim breathing. It was they who handed it on to our generation. But they did not hand it on to us so we could, in our time, just keep it breathing. They kept the Claim alive so that it could one day be resolved, so that it would end.... The point is that, for this settlement proposal to realise its full potential, we will have to grow the value ourselves. The cash compensation, plus the 'bolt-ons', give us the opportunity, if we use them wisely, to re-establish an economic base for the tribe. Your negotiators believe that a substantial growth in value can be achieved. Ngai Tahu now has considerable experience in this area.... By contrast, the risks and costs of continuing the struggle in the hope of winning 'justice' are just too high, given that there is an opportunity to achieve the result another way. What we have to give up, however, if we are to take the settlement route, is the old notion of utu - 'an eye for
an eye, a tooth for a tooth'. As I have said before, 'justice' in that sense is simply not available to us.... The Ngai Tahu Negotiating Group unanimously recommends that you vote 'in favour' of the Crown's Settlement Offer. It is now the time for Ngai Tahu to take full control of its own destiny. As a people we can only do this if we are prepared to lay to rest the great taniwha - Te Keremé - ... and if we are prepared to take this bold step into the future. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 5-7]

The Crown's Settlement Offer was negotiated on behalf of Ngai Tahu by the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Group. These people follow in the footsteps of many Ngai Tahu who have, over the years, worked tirelessly to have Te Keremé resolved.... This team is mandated by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to manage the negotiations process and to carry out the tasks necessary to advance the resolution of Te Keremé. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 55]

These images of history and a united original tribe are then linked by the rhetorical technique of assimilative generalisation and by their metaphorical associations with whakapapa and the meta-themes to contemporary approaches to the claims settlement and the supporting structures that were set up through the 1990s to ensure a particular pan-Ngai Tahu iwi settlement approach. The Crown's offer over this time fell well short of the value of the lands and mana lost by South Island Maori after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, yet the advice from the leadership is not to hold out for a better offer. This advice is presented with the assistance of rhetorical techniques, framing particular versions of the meta-themes of time, place and 'The Claim'. For example:

It was they who kept the Ngai Tahu Claim breathing. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 5-7]

It was they who handed it on to our generation. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 5-7]

They kept the Claim alive. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 5-7]

...the Claim of our ancestors... ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 7]
...our tipuna... named every mountain, lake and stream.... Generations of Ngai Tahu have devoted their lives to the pursuit of justice.... ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 4]

The following references are to 'The Claim' as 'the Tall Trees' of one united tribal approach, linking the claim to metaphoric associations with the natural landscape, further entrenching it in the metanarrative potency of whakapapa:

Five generations of Ngai Tahu men and women have grown old in the shadow of our tall trees. [Title page: 'Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 5-7]

Aoraki is the jewel in Ngai Tahu's landscape. It is the taonga that will represent the restoration of Ngai Tahu's mana, and reassert the commitment of Ngai Tahu and the Crown to the Treaty partnership. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 3]

Ngai Tahu's ability to express its traditional relationship with the natural environment and to exercise its kaitiaki responsibilities has been drastically eroded over the last 150 years. The Cultural Redress elements of the Crown's Settlement Offer provide us with unique opportunities to see the iwi's mana over taonga resources and areas of land recognised and given practical effect in day to day management. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 3]

This section has shown how the public narrative presents a simplified 'glossed over' version of 'The Claim' that presents it as a united, tribal claim for a shared tribal territory since 'then'. Chapters Nine and Ten will address how 'experienced Ngai Tahu' consider these presentations within networks of personal and political experiences and narratives.

Summary

This chapter has analysed the presentation of particular versions of whakapapa and the meta-themes of time and 'The Claim' in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative between 1996 and 2000. What is presented in the public narrative is a binary 'then/now' approach to time and a simplified version of the history of
events around South Island land claims issues that have set the context to the recent claims settlement and introduction of the privileged identities.

Chapter Eight will address the interweaving of themes about the privileged contemporary legal-political identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui in whakapapa and the meta-themes of time and 'The Claim' in the public narrative. Chapters Nine and Ten consider the understandings of whakapapa, time, 'The Claim', key ancestral place and the privileged Ngai Tahu Whanui identities in the stories and understandings of Ngai Tahu individuals. Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten provide further detail of events and political practice around the history of South Island land claims issues and territorial identities which will serve to critically engage the simplified version of the development of the Claims process since 1840 presented in the public narrative.
Chapter eight

Privileged identities in
Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative

The nation was conceived in language, not in blood. [B. Anderson: 1991: 145]

'We had a DNA fragment of a tribe. We built it into a tribe in this generation. The claim became a part of us and we used it to rebuild our culture and our identity...we built this into a story about property rights." [T. O'Regan: Waitangi Day Hui: Onuku: 2000]

Introduction

This chapter analyses the rhetorical techniques used in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative to associate the metanarrative of whakapapa and the particular meta-themes about time and 'The Claim' outlined in Chapter Seven with the privileged contemporary legal-political identities. These are Ngai Tahu Whanui, eighteen papatipu runanga as represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and individual registered members. The approach adopted by the current leadership to claims settlement and subsequent administration of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' becomes accepted by rhetorically associating these with the meta-themes of time, place, 'The Claim' and the metanarrative of whakapapa. This chapter addresses the role of the public narrative in the presentation of Ngai Tahu Whanui as iwi, with its whakapapa and geographical boundary, distinct from other iwi, constituted of individual registered members and mediated by eighteen papatipu runanga and their representative body, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

In turn, these key themes serve to bind Ngai Tahu Whanui members together in the same way that the raranga korero aspects of whakapapa did historically for South Island Maori. They also facilitate consent to at least an image of a
contemporary 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens' based in whakapapa, history, united culture and shared place. Alternative identities that Ngai Tahu individuals consider in their personal narratives are rhetorically deemphasised or silenced in the public narrative. This serves to exclude other historic Maori collective identities from membership in the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' to allow Ngai Tahu Whanui to assert tangata whenua status in the South Island in order to assert manawhenua rights to Treaty claims.¹ Chapters Nine and Ten address the understandings of these privileged identities in the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals.

Privileged identity: Ngai Tahu Whanui as Ngai Tahu Iwi

A key theme of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative is the place of iwi, specifically a Ngai Tahu iwi, as the primary collective Maori identity in the South Island since 'then' (1840/1848) and before, to the time of an eponymous ancestor, Tahu Potiki. The presentation in the public narrative of Ngai Tahu Whanui as equivalent to Ngai Tahu iwi is interwoven in the particular meta-themes about whakapapa, time, place, and 'The Claim' addressed in Chapter Seven.

In the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Reports from 1996 to 2000, most references to a collective identity are to iwi or 'Ngai Tahu iwi' or simply, 'Ngai Tahu'. Ngai Tahu Whanui is rhetorically and metaphorically associated with whakapapa, naturalism, and spiritualism as well as a particular binary construction of time as 'then/now', and a particular story about the history of 'Te Kereme', to present Ngai Tahu Whanui as the original South Island iwi and tangata whenua since 'then'. Calhoun identifies that often the content of

¹ Atholl Anderson identifies that whakapapa and narrative were used historically by South Island Maori for the political purposes of appropriation of territory:

We might wonder...whether the historical elements of...events have been massaged to encode a political message. Since the story occurs at the beginning of the history of Ngai Tahu in the South Island, it is perhaps concerned with defining the political legitimacy of territorial appropriation in terms of one group rather than another. [1998: 60]
discourses about nationalism draw on ethnicity and invocations of history, when in fact nationalism is distinct to the modern era [1997: 8]. He adds that, ‘nationalists commonly present nations as large families sharing bonds of culture and descent’ [1997: 29]. Ideas about Ngai Tahu as one large family or whanau, connected by shared whakapapa are also found in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative.

As outlined in Chapter Five, the Crown has recognised iwi since 1990 as the Maori collective identity that represents tangata whenua. Following this policy, Ngai Tahu Whanui is a new legal-political identity introduced by the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996. It is defined in the Act as the collective of all descendants of the persons listed in the ‘Blue Book’. Registered members are those who prove this whakapapa and register it in the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. This is particularly interesting given that Williams’ Dictionary of Modern Maori [1985] defines ‘whanui’ as ‘broad, wide’.2 Administration of benefits and circulation of information is to those who register this descent. This is the purpose of the Act. Ngai Tahu Whanui is presented, however, as an identity that is tribal and has been through time, beginning in original history:


This indicates that while Ngai Tahu Whanui is setting itself up to be bureaucratically independent, it is still legislatively dependent – operating and legally defined through and in relation to the Crown.

Legislation in 1996 of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, brought about the demise of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board responsible to the Minister of Maori Affairs. In

---

2 Ryan’s dictionary [1989] does not contain the word ‘whanui’. According to Ryan [1995], ‘whanui’ means ‘wide, star name, vega, broad-minded, liberal’.
effect, it returned Tino Rangatiratanga to Ngai Tahu Whanui and Ngai Tahu became answerable to its own people. ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 11]

Assertion of Ngai Tahu Whanui as Ngai Tahu iwi is reinforced by a range of rhetorical techniques in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative to interchange Ngai Tahu Whanui with Ngai Tahu iwi, blurring the difference between the whakapapa basis of Ngai Tahu iwi and the recent legal-political determinants of Ngai Tahu Whanui but iwi is also a legal-political identity. In the public narrative, Ngai Tahu Whanui thus is presented as interchangeable with a complete and 'original' Ngai Tahu iwi, as this extract from an official booklet demonstrates:

NGAI TAHU WHANUI

Ngai Tahu means "people of Tahu" after the tribe's founder, Tahu Potiki....

A census undertaken in 1848 means that every Ngai Tahu tribal member can today trace their whakapapa back to a relative living at that time. They also affiliate to smaller local groups, or runanga.

Ngai Tahu tribal members can be found throughout the world, but over 50 percent continue to live in the South Island. Other places with large numbers of Ngai Tahu are Auckland, Wellington and Australia. Ngai Tahu is part of the South Island and New Zealand landscapes. ['Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future': 2000]

Ngai Tahu Whanui is framed as a group sharing whakapapa to relatives, kin, so that the contemporary version is framed as a large family. Calhoun's arguments [1997: 29] about nation as family are reflected in the framing of Ngai Tahu Whanui as a group sharing whakapapa to relatives, kin – so that the contemporary version is framed as a large family. Even the word 'whanui' sounds synonymous with whanau (family). In the public narrative, Ngai Tahu Whanui is sometimes framed as 'whanau'. For example:

At the celebrations I was very mindful of our people, of our history and of the numbers of our whanau who have worked tirelessly to achieve better services for Maori....

As we continue our task of whanau and tribal development. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 22]
In the following example Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu [TRONT, as most often referred to by Ngai Tahu individuals] is established as the representative body of all Ngai Tahu iwi, when in fact, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is accountable only to Ngai Tahu Whanui, i.e. those Ngai Tahu who have registered their whakapapa in the Whakapapa Unit.

TRONT is the legally authorised voice of Ngai Tahu, able to enter binding agreements, and is accountable only to Ngai Tahu Whanui. [Tribal Profile: 1997: 4]

The following examples incorporate both the metanarrative of whakapapa, a 'then/now' approach to history and a particular presentation of the role of 'The Claim' to present the contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui identity as Ngai Tahu iwi, entrenched in a history of united identity, unchanged since 'then'. In turn, whanau and hapu whakapapa are incorporated into iwi whakapapa and then, by the blurred association between Ngai Tahu Whanui and Ngai Tahu that has been created in the minds of the reader, this is extended to imply equivalence to Ngai Tahu Whanui whakapapa:

Identifying with your Iwi is central to understanding your history and ancestry as a Maori. Iwi is both roots and family. [Crofts, Kairakauera, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: 'Te Karaka': Spring 1997: 5]

Ngai Tahu Whanui is the iwi to whom Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and its organisational bodies are responsible.... Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 in turn created a legal entity, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu whose task is to represent the collective tino rangatiratanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui, to create structures through which appropriate management of its development could occur and for the distribution of benefits to its people. [Tribal Profile: 1997: 4]

---

3 According to 2001 Census data, there are 39,180 Maori who identify as Ngai Tahu/Kai Tahu [Statistics New Zealand media release 2001 Census Snapshot 4 'Maori' 20 March 2002. Yet in an interview with me [June 2002], Terry Ryan, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit Manager, identified the number of registered Ngai Tahu to be around 30,000.
Ngai Tahu Development Corporation is positioning the tribe as a major provider of health, social and education facilitator to iwi whanui and those living within the rohe of Te Waipounamu. [‘Tribal Profile’: 1997: 12]

This last example begins by acknowledging that Ngai Tahu Whanui is the body to which Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and its organisational bodies are responsible. It then goes on to interchange Ngai Tahu Whanui with Ngai Tahu, implying the entire iwi, not just those who have registered their whakapapa in the Whakapapa Unit, as the collective to which Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is accountable. Its differences from ‘Ngai Tahu iwi’ or simply ‘Ngai Tahu’ are often rhetorically deemphasised or even silenced.

In the following examples iwi is rhetorically linked to symbols of nature and organicism, which in turn tend to take on by their rhetorical association, the metanarrative properties of whakapapa, and the passing of uniform, undifferentiated time, as well as to whakapapa and Te ‘Kereme’:

It is suggested that the term 'tribe' used in the English language version of the Treaty has stood the test of time. [T. O'Regan: 1992 in ‘Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 Meeting Index of Information Papers’]

As we continue our task of whanau and tribal development, I am always aware of the importance and comfort of remembering our past journeys. It is in this recollection that the wisdom, the courage and the tenacity of our kaumatua set the framework and the pattern of the activity that will serve us in our journey into the future. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 22]

As we stand on the threshold of this decision it is important to remember our tipuna who named every mountain, lake and stream in Te Wai Pounamu. Generations of Ngai Tahu have devoted their lives to the pursuit of justice, to Te Kereme. [‘Crown Settlement Offer’ document: 1998: 4]

Ngai Tahu has a strong cultural and spiritual relationship with the natural environment. Tikanga (customs) relating to the use and management of natural
resources are an essential part of the unique culture and identity which define us as an iwi. [‘Crown Settlement Offer’ document: 1998: 2]

Ngai Tahu's enduring relationship with its taonga and the environment is an integral part of our identity as an iwi. ['Crown Settlement Offer’ document: 1997: 43]

I often fly over Te Waipounamu, and always seek our Mauka tapu: Aoraki, Maungatere and Tapuae o Uenuku. They stand steady, connect me with Ngai Tahu whanui and with our tipuna; they remind me of the traditions and aspirations which have moulded us, and which we are kai tiaki of. They remind me too that long after our time, Ngai Tahu whanui will be here, and will face tasks similar to ours as well as tasks unique to the new time. [T. O'Regan: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1998: 20]

In this last example, Ngai Tahu Whanui, rather than simply 'Ngai Tahu' is interwoven in the meta-themes of time, key ancestral place and the metanarrative properties of whakapapa.

Any changes that have occurred between 'then' and 'now' are cast as the result of attempts by outside forces, such as the Crown, to chip away at what is original, authentic, continuous, even spiritual. In Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative these attempts are described as the Crown's attack on natural Maori collective identity – iwi - further reinforcing the intricate interweaving of the meta-theme of time with the privileged identities addressed in the public narrative's key themes. For example:

---

4 Interestingly, as addressed later in this chapter, Angela Ballara argues that from the turn of the twentieth century it was the Crown that vied continuously for 'tribal formation', forcing Maori to define themselves as 'tribes' particularly in the South Island, leading to the eventual development of the Ngai Tahu Trust Board [1998: 315]. Ballara states that in the South Island, the government, in addressing the Ngai Tahu claims between 1910 and 1938, wanted one body of negotiators to deal with rather than several. She writes:

This program was adhered to in spite of protest. For example, the chief judges of the Native Land Court received clear evidence that the people of the Puketeraki settlement were not happy to allow those of Kaiapoi to make decisions on their behalf. Ngati Mamoe,
That [the new legal identity for Ngai Tahu, introduced by the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act] was an historic reversal of more than one and a half centuries of Crown policy towards Iwi Maori. ['Joint Chairs' Review': Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 6]

If Ngai Tahu were to look back over the twentieth century, the dominant themes would be adaptation and adjustment to a new order that was no longer in tribal control. [M. Solomon, Kaikwhakahaere, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: 'Te Karaka': Winter 1999: 6]

There is a traditional process, amoeba-like, of division and reassembly. Over time, the overall iwi collective remains reasonably unitary. This process of division and reassembly is, in respects, a direct outcome of the policies of iwi development that have been advanced by the Government in recent years. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 159, 1991: 15]

Presenting the privileged contemporary identities is also closely linked with imaging a strong sense of shared culture where imaging one implies that you have both. Kratz argues that, 'imaging tradition incidentally images a sense of cultural identity as well: Continuity of tradition and a distinctive sense of collectivity by those who follow the tradition are closely related' [1993: 53]. Kratz suggests that if an image of continuity of tradition and cultural practice is closely linked in the minds of the audience to a distinctive sense of collectivity then particular ends can be achieved in the present because they become legitimated by history and tradition.

Throughout Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative since 1996, are seen the pronouns 'us', 'we', 'our', words representing unity of whakapapa identity, history, values, culture, tradition, and then by the technique of assimilative generalisation. This is especially evident in the two significant Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu publications of 1997, the 'Tribal Profile' and the Annual Report of that year. These were distributed in the period leading up to the postal vote of Ngai Tahu

Poutini Ngai Tahu and some northern descent groups struggled to make their presence felt. [1998: 315]
Whanui members to gauge support for the negotiated pan-Ngai Tahu Whanui tribal settlement (my emphasis):

_We are very mindful of holding a task that our tipuna have worked hard over many generations to give us._ [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 24]

... the pou of Ngai Tahutanga from which we draw and strengthen our identity. ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 3]

_We are on the verge of great change._ [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 6-7]


... papatipu runanga of our people. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 3]

Despite language loss and cultural deprivation, we have been able to hold together a cultural core of whakapapa and identity... we have, on the whole, stayed close to our ancestral lands and coasts. Those that have moved away, stay in touch with that core. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 25-26]

Key to the public narrative is presentation of a distinct, homogeneous 'Ngai Tahu way of doing things', as if Ngai Tahu were one organic actor in possession of singular characteristics. For example:

Despite the fact that the Statute will say that Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu 'is Ngai Tahu' the question remains, 'Is this the entity which holds the Treaty guarantee under Article 2? Is this collective of Papatipu Runanga the repository of the collective tino rangatiratanga of Ngai Tahu? Is this the body which will be heard as the voice of Ngai Tahu for all purposes? The answer to the question goes like this: 'If the carefully and constitutionally rendered will of Ngai Tahu says so, then, Yes! [T. O'Regan, 1992 in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 Meeting Index of Information Papers]
...our path into the future is one that reflects Ngai Tahu aspirations, strengths and values. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 22]

Ngai Tahutanga ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 3]

The following examples are taken from the 1998 'Crown Settlement Offer' document:

Ngai Tahu mana
Ngai Tahu land
Ngai Tahu tikanga
Ngai Tahu values
Ngai Tahu mana and rangatiratanga
Ngai Tahu culture

The Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Vision Statement provides an excellent example of how, once Ngai Tahu Whanui is attributed with possessing a history and whakapapa as well as values, culture, spirituality and even economic and political aspirations, there is an implication that these shared and homogeneous 'tribal characteristics' associated with the past will unquestioningly continue into the future:

Vision: A future where Ngai Tahu whanui will have the opportunity to protect and enhance their spiritual, cultural, educational and economic aspirations in a setting of excellence.

Mission: To prudently manage the collective taonga of Ngai Tahu for the maximum benefit of this and future generations.

Values: Our organisation reflects the values of Ngai Tahu in everything we do. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Vision Statement, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999]
Privileged mediatory collective identities: eighteen *papatipu runanga* represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu

The mediatory identities that have been privileged by Ngai Tahu Whanui are the eighteen particular *papatipu runanga*, each with a representative on the governing body, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. In Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, *papatipu runanga* are presented as the traditional, original sub-tribal bodies since 'then'. However, *papatipu runanga* is a contemporary construction, situated in recent historical events around South Island claims negotiations with the Crown.

An image of *papatipu runanga* corresponding to eighteen geographical territories of *Te Waipounamu* (the South Island of New Zealand) is rhetorically linked in the public narrative to the fight of 'Te Kereme', which is presented as a singular tribal fight traditionally always carried by *papatipu runanga*:

1991: Ngai Tahu adopted the position that any assets returned from the Ngai Tahu Claim should return to Ngai Tahu rather than to the individual. This followed the tradition of 1879 where Ngai Tahu had wanted to promote the Runanga as the basis of a tribal structure. ['Crown Settlement Offer’ document: 1998: 60-61]

In the following examples *papatipu runanga* are interwoven with the metanarrative potency of *whakapapa*, by the metaphoric associations of *whakapapa* with ancestry and kin:

All major investment and other decisions are approved by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu 18-member tribal council. The 18 members are elected from each *runanga* (local council). Together, the 18 members of the tribal council bring both history and forward thinking to the table. ['Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future': 2000]

Culture and identity have been identified among the top priorities for the tribe. During the year nearly a hundred hui wananga and events were held at a tribal, runaka [runanga], and taurahere level. These hui focused on a broad range of
kaupapa including: te reo, tikaka [tikanga], history and traditions, heritage, performing, visual, and language arts. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 24]

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is sometimes referred to as the tribal 'parliament' of Ngai Tahu. It represents the tribal collective, but does not trespass on the rangatiratanga of its individual members, the Papatipu Runanga. These Papatipu Runanga are regional collective bodies that were established by Ngai Tahu in the 19th century around traditional marae-based communities. The members of Ngai Tahu Whanui who whakapapa to particular Papatipu Runanga elect committees which are responsible for appointing a Runanga Representative and an alternate Representative to the tribal parliament. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 51]

Papatipu runanga are linked to iwi, history, tribal authority, tradition and the history of 'Te Kereme':

While Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is enshrined in New Zealand law, the structure is based on traditional regions of Ngai Tahu authority. As far back as 1874, Ngai Tahu ancestors established runanga (tribal authorities) to unite the collective interests of the tribe. The 1996 Act recognises 18 runanga which are centred around Ngai Tahu settlements throughout the South Island. While each runanga has its own Treaty of Waitangi mandate at a local level, a Council made up of 18 elected representatives manages the collective assets of the tribe. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 22]

In the following examples papatipu runanga are associated with one hundred and fifty years of unchanging tribal history since 'then' and even before the Treaty of Waitangi (1840) by rhetorically linking these structures to cultural concepts such as 'tikanga' and 'tipuna'. These concepts are attributed traditional status that is somehow timeless. Papatipu runanga is given additional credence by its presentation as constitutive of the tino rangatiratanga of the iwi, a term loaded with cultural associations because in the latter half of the twentieth century, it was at the forefront of public debate around the interpretation and meanings of

---

5 According to Ngai Tahu kaumatua, Jim Pohio, tino rangatiratanga was a term he never heard while he was growing up at Tuahiwi [a Maori 'reserve' and marae], where he was born in the 1920s. Jim spoke of a new 'cultural arsenal' of contemporary assertion of Maori rights and cultural identity [Life history: 1997].
the Treaty of Waitangi, in its uses referring to issues of sovereignty arising from the Treaty claims process:

[Ngai Tahu] argue that they have exercised their 'development right' to evolve their contemporary tribal structure over the past 150 years and that they have done so by evolving their traditional tribal runanga as their putahi, or heart. These 18 Papatipu Runanga contain their marae and are the focus of their tribal and social order. They are multi-hapu groupings for historical reasons derived from the pre-Treaty tikanga of our tupuna and referred to earlier. If the tino rangatiratanga of Ngai Tahu lives anywhere, it rests in our Papatipu Runanga. [T. O'Regan: 1992 in 'Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 Meeting, Index of Information Papers']

Runanga began in the nineteenth century as small reserves that were created by the Crown to represent hapu, sometimes several hapu, and the runanga represented their concerns and negotiated with the Crown as the other partner to the Treaty. Ballara identifies several forms of runanga that began mid-nineteenth century. Some of these she identifies as Crown-created, and some as 'runanga-Maori'; their form and purpose varying across collectivity and place. She identifies that in some cases, the original 'komiti and meetings termed runanga but called for short-lived specific issues' developed into 'tribal runanga...ongoing institutions, reconvened whenever an issue involving the whole tribe arose. She considers these tribal runanga to be the first governing institutions of 'the modern tribes' of the nineteenth century [1998: 288].

According to Angela Ballara, Ngai Tahu has never known an indigenous body interested in administering the entire tribe due to the segmentary character of Ngai Tahu society. Prior to the arrival of the Trust Board in 1944, any community governance or negotiation of claims issues was carried out by the independent leaders of runanga, hapu and whanau [1998: 231, 315].

One past member of the Trust Board, Rakihia Tau, offers an explanation of the history of Ngai Tahu's runanga structure. He claims that runanga developed in the South Island in the mid-nineteenth century because of the Crown's refusal to
adhere to the Treaty of Waitangi and its obligations to Ngai Tahu regarding land purchases, so that 'our people' were limited to small areas called reserves. Thus, in order to compete with the Crown for acknowledgement as a partner to the Treaty, South Island Maori had to develop another social structure. He claims, 'we needed people who could speak... for and on behalf of us' [Interview: 1990].

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative presents a simplified chronology of the historic origins of papatipu runanga, citing just four dates: 1874, 1944, 1991 and 1996. These contemporary bodies are associated with the runanga (committee) structures introduced by the Crown in 1874. This casts an uninterrupted link from the contemporary construction to an original runanga structure back in time, to attribute it with originality and authenticity. Ironically, 1944 and 1991 are the key dates that are missing from the binary presentation of history that characterises Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative. But these dates become necessary to build a perception of the papatipu runanga as based in history, 1874 being the only historic date associated with the origin of runanga committees. The distinction is then blurred between these committees, scattered around the South Island, and the eighteen contemporary papatipu runanga. 'Then' which is 1848 elsewhere in the public narrative, becomes blurred with 1874:

While Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is enshrined in New Zealand law, the structure is based on traditional regions of Ngai Tahu authority.

As far back as 1874, Ngai Tahu ancestors established runanga (tribal authorities) to unite the collective interests of the tribe. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 22]

To give papatipu runanga historical authenticity, it is necessary to attribute to them a vote in the twentieth-century political negotiations surrounding 'The Claim', because, as the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals reveal in
Chapters Nine and Ten, *papatipu runanga* have not been attributed political powers in claims negotiations historically.

The 1989 *Revised Dictionary of Modern Maori* does not include the phrase *‘papatipu runanga’*. The 1995 version of Ryan’s dictionary defines *‘papatipu’* as ‘land with Maori title, ancestral home’. It defines *runanga*(tia) as ‘assembly, institute, debate, discuss, seminar, council’. Williams’ *Dictionary of the Maori Language* does not contain the phrase *papatipu runanga*. *Papatipu* is defined as ‘Maori land not having a European title’, and *Runanga* as ‘assembly, council’; ‘discuss in an assembly’ [Ryan: 1995].

Evison’s 1993 book, *Te Waipounamu: The Greenstone Island*, endorsed by the Trust Board and Te Runanganui as an authoritative and comprehensive account of South Island Maori history, does not contain the word *‘papatipu’* or the phrase *‘papatipu runanga’*. There are only two brief uses of *‘runanga’*: One is a reference to the ‘Kaiapoi runanga (Maori Council)’ as the body with which Walter Mantell negotiated in 1860 over issues of individualisation of land titles in the area [1993: 398]; The other is a reference to the organisation of Ngai Tahu individuals who met at ‘Te Hapa o Niu Tirenī on 16th July 1907 to discuss what could be done about the South Island Landless Natives Act fiasco’ [1993: 480]; ‘a standing committee was elected to collate documents, appoint legal advice, call meetings, and levy the various runanga for a fighting fund’ [1993: 481]. Evison defines *‘runanga’* in the glossary as ‘Maori council, assembly’.

Atholl Anderson’s 1998 book *Welcome of Strangers*, another history of South Island Maori migration that has been endorsed by key members of the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership, does not mention *‘papatipu’* at all. *‘Runanga’* is referred to [1998: 103, 113].

---

6 According to Butterworth:

In the mid-nineteenth century Runanga were Crown-created meetings by which to devolve at least minimal power, i.e., to handle minor criminal matters and civil disputes between
Governance of Ngai Tahu communities had moved [1850s to 1860s] from chiefly authority to the bureaucratic institution of runanga, a village council of elected leaders. It was to the literate, mission-educated, pragmatic men, such as Tiramorehu, Pohio, Waruwarutu and Te Maire, that the government agencies looked for opinion and leadership by the 1860s. [A. Anderson: 1998: 103]

The 1981 Ngai Tahu Annual Report states that the Trust Board planned to assume a much wider range of functions than it was originally established to undertake [1981: 106]. The Trust Board was of course aware of the supervisory powers that historically lay with the runanga, so after work on the land claims ended in 1988, work began on the development of a structure which would acknowledge the direct supervisory power of the runanga as well as the Trust Board itself. As indicated by my M.A. research, this represents a separation between governance by the runanga based on their marae and 'traditional' legitimacy, and that which the Trust Board can perform due to its centralised, bureaucratic nature and collection of 'files' about the population of the iwi.

Associated with a theme about the historically privileged position of papatipu runanga is a theme about the place of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, the representative body of the eighteen papatipu runanga, as set out in the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. By its rhetorical association with 'traditional papatipu runanga' and its interweaving with metanarrative and meta-themes, Te Runanga

---

Maori in the nineteenth century, as well as management of native schools, hospitals, jails and local roads throughout their districts and to adjudicate land disputes.

They were proposed by Governor Grey as the basis for an elaborate system of local and regional government. They were created and elected in acknowledgement by Grey that Maori had to be properly incorporated within the framework of government. His approach was an alternative to his predecessor's (Gore Browne's) promise of having regular conferences of Maori chiefs to discuss government legislation and policies. Maori interest in the structure waned, however, when it became apparent that the government wished to impose its own agenda on Runanga. The Runanga policy was formally abandoned by the government in 1866. [1989: 10]
O Ngai Tahu is perceived in the minds of the readers as the only possible contemporary governing structure:

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is sometimes referred to as the tribal ‘parliament’ of Ngai Tahu. It represents the tribal collective, but does not trespass on the rangatiratanga of its individual members, the Papatipu Runanga. These Papatipu Runanga are regional collective bodies that were established by Ngai Tahu in the 19th century around traditional marae-based communities. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 51]

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative privileges the individual as ‘Ngai Tahu Citizen’

As pointed out in Chapter Five, for the first time in the history of South Island Maori identity, the individual is privileged above the traditional identities of whanau and hapu:

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu will distribute benefits to Papatipu Runanga and to individuals on the same basis. No person with the appropriate whakapapa qualifications will be deprived of benefit. Allocation of resource control and benefit will be subject to the 'tribal over-right' described in the Muriwhenua Report. The Charter or 'Kawenata o Ngai Tahu' defines roles, functions and rights within the tribe with great care. [T. O'Regan: 1992 in 'Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 Meeting, Index of Information Papers]

...members of Ngai Tahu Whanui...have all the same rights of inclusion as any other members of our tribe. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report 1998: 13]

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative is published and circulated to registered individual members of Ngai Tahu Whanui. In the following examples, individual member identity is embedded in the metanarrative properties of whakapapa and in the particular meta-themes of time and ‘The Claim’ in order to assert the newly privileged identity of individual, registered member, or ‘Ngai Tahu client’:
Through the tribal council structure Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is accountable to its tribal members. All accountability procedures are rigorous and have been strongly endorsed by independent auditors. ['Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future': 2000]

Ninety years later you, as a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui have, for the first time in our history, the chance to have your say regarding the settlement of our Claim.

As Kaiwhakahaere, I urge you to inform yourselves about the Crown's Settlement Offer. To assist you, the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Group will be holding consultation hui throughout New Zealand. ['Crown Settlement Offer’ document: 1998: 4]

Ngai Tahu Development Corporation Limited distributes benefits and grants directly to all members of Ngai Tahu Whanui regardless of where they live. Individuals who are not active or even associated with a particular Papatipu Runanga can still benefit from the settlement. The settlement would result in a rapidly increasing number of educational grants, health initiatives and wananga being available in the future. ['Crown Settlement Offer’ document: 1998: 53]

Ngai Tahu Holding Corporation – The company’s task is to manage Ngai Tahu assets to provide the financial resources to fund the Group and fund the benefits distributed to Ngai Tahu beneficiaries and Papatipu Runanga, on behalf of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

Ngai Tahu Development Corporation – This company’s task is to effectively manage the distribution function to Ngai Tahu beneficiaries and Papatipu Runanga, on behalf of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 17]

Contemporary political practice rhetorically interwoven with the meta-themes and whakapapa to facilitate consent

Association of the privileged contemporary identities with particular constructions of whakapapa and all its metaphoric associations, time, key ancestral place, and ‘The Claim’ is linked by the rhetorical technique of assimilative generalisation to statements about contemporary political practice, hence serving to justify these practices and the mandate of the appointed leadership in the minds of the
reader. Ngai Tahu Whanui members hence accept contemporary political practices because it is linked with history, tradition and original tribal identity.

*Tino rangatiratanga* of Ngai Tahu Whanui/iwi above other South Island Maori *whakapapa* identities, is used in the following example to legitimate the political practices that are outlined in Chapter Five of this dissertation:

TRONT whose task is to represent the collective *tino rangatiratanga* of Ngai Tahu Whanui. [*Tribal Profile*:1997: 4]

This association legitimates all of the following political practices and entities: single tribal settlement of the Treaty claims rather than *hapu* or *whanau* territorial claims; settlement with Ngai Tahu Whanui rather than with other South Island Maori collective identities; endorsement of the contemporary leadership which has arisen out of the 1944 Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board; endorsement of the new representative body, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and its supporting organisational structures; endorsement of the particular forms of *whakapapa* management adopted by these structures; endorsement of Ngai Tahu Whanui and its supporting organisational and leadership structures:

Here are some other examples of the association of specific political practices with the metanarrative and meta-themes:

Ultimately the tribe must participate in the decision-making process to identify and determine priorities for social and cultural development. [M. Solomon, Kaikwhakahaere, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 8]

Full participation of the people leading to a united tribe will ensure a bright and enduring future for Ngai Tahu. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1998: 11]
The decision that the tribe is about to make will have a profound influence on the shape of our future as a people. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 4]

These corporations allow the tribe to move forward into the next century. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 22]

The imaging of a united, culturally homogeneous iwi is then linked to statements about political practices in the present and future, and so, by assimilative generalisation, these political actions become legitimate in the minds of the reader, thereby also giving legitimacy to the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership. For example:

We are moving into the first post-settlement year. It is now the time to put in place the building blocks of strong growth and development so that our path into the future is one that reflects Ngai Tahu aspirations, strengths and values. That will be best based on our past and our traditional ways, because that is what makes us who we are, and absolutely unique. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999: 22]

The concept of Topuni derives from the traditional Ngai Tahu tikanga (custom) of persons of rangatira (chiefly) status extending their mana and protection over a person or area by placing their cloak over them or it. In its new application, a Topuni confirms and places an 'overlay' of Ngai Tahu values on specific pieces of land managed by DoC. A Topuni does not override or alter the existing status of the land..., but ensures that Ngai Tahu values are also recognised, acknowledged and provided for. ['Crown Settlement Offer' document: 1998: 35]

Most of these references are found in the 1997 and 1998 'Crown Settlement Offer' documents. These publications presented a particular story about the history of South Island Maori identity as these affected land claims issues. I also noted that these references to iwi and the future also formed part of presentation in the final 'roadshows' leading up to acceptance by the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Team of the Crown's 1998 settlement offer. Some examples from my research in the field are given in Chapter Ten.
The handling of 'The Claim' and its presentation by the leadership has been absolutely critical to the development of the privileged identities. The public narrative emphasises a Ngai Tahu Whanui, united in its struggle with the Crown over 'Te Kereme', presented as one comprehensive tribal claim taken by a united homogeneous iwi, with both unaltered since 'then'. 'The Claim' is imaged as an icon of Ngai Tahu history, original identity, shared whakapapa and cultural practice through time - the essence of Ngai Tahu culture and tribal homogeneity since 'then':

It is plain from both the historical and traditional evidence, that the signatories were persons of rangatira status derived from their whakapapa but that they signed in respect of the Ngai Tahu tribal interest.... the historical and whakapapa evidence adduced in WA127 leads clearly to the conclusion that the signatories signed on behalf of the Ngai Tahu tribe as a whole and on behalf of themselves as rangatira of standing within it at the time. [T. O'Regan: 1992 in 'Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 Meeting Index of Information Papers']

I reflect that the Ngai Tahu claim is now seven generations old. In many ways it has become our culture, a culture of grievance. At the same time, though, that struggle has bonded us together in a special way. It has shaped our tribal organisation over the years and given us a focus that other tribes have not had. Despite language loss and cultural deprivation, we have been able to hold together a cultural core of whakapapa and identity. [T. O'Regan: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 25-26]

Discussion took place on [the issue of sovereignty] and it was generally agreed that Ngai Tahu recognised the partnership with Pakeha under the Treaty of Waitangi, and that sovereignty for the tribe would be achieved if and when the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Bill was passed by Parliament, giving Ngai Tahu a legal identity. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 30]

Having established their legitimacy, papatipu runanga and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu are also associated with contemporary political actions in an attempt to provide, by assimilative generalisation, a traditional basis to those actions. Political actions primarily involved the negotiation and administration of a pan-
settlement, and to legitimate Ngai Tahu Whanui as the preeminent collective South Island Maori identity – *tangata whenua* with *manawhenua* rights:

TRONT whose task......, to create structures through which appropriate management of its development could occur and for the distribution of benefits to its people. [‘Tribal Profile’: 1997: 4]

The company's [Ngai Tahu Holding Corporation] task is to manage Ngai Tahu assets to provide the financial resources to fund the Group and fund the benefits to be distributed to Ngai Tahu beneficiaries and Papatipu Runanga, on behalf of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 17]

This company's [Ngai Tahu Development Corporation] task is to effectively manage the distribution function to Ngai Tahu beneficiaries and Papatipu Runanga, on behalf of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 17]

By act of Parliament, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu became the official tribal council governing the affairs of Ngai Tahu Whanui. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu replaced the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 3]

Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 gives the tribe the statutory authority to control its own destiny. This legal identity replaces the paternalistic Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board which operated under the control of successive governments for 50 years. While Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is enshrined in New Zealand law, the structure is based on traditional regions of Ngai Tahu authority. As far back as 1874, Ngai Tahu ancestors established runanga (tribal authorities) to unite the collective interests of the tribe. The 1996 Act recognises 18 runanga which are centred around Ngai Tahu settlements throughout the South Island. While each runanga has its own Treaty of Waitangi mandate at a local level, a Council made up of 18 elected representatives manages the collective assets of the tribe.

Mo tatau, a, mo ka uri a muri ake nei - For us and our children after us

The guiding principles for Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu are embodied in the concept known as the House of Tahu....Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu is a unique structure which gives the 18 traditional runanga and its 20,000 descendants ultimate control of the tribe's assets. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 22]

The roadshows and the postal vote were ostensibly to gain a mandate from the members – Ngai Tahu Whanui – to negotiate a pan- Ngai Tahu settlement, but
these also gave the consent to manage assets. It is through these rhetorical associations of contemporary political practice with the 'then' of original Ngai Tahu tribal identity, significant ancestral place and shared whakapapa, that consent by Ngai Tahu Whanui members to the privileged identities and the new leadership is given.

Identities excluded in the public narrative

If one chooses to view whakapapa as an adhesive that binds contemporary South Island Maori to one another because each Ngai Tahu Whanui registered member can claim ancestry to one of the kaumatua alive in 1848, as listed in the 1925 ‘Blue Book’, then the possible web of whakapapa for New Zealand Maori is lateral and wide. This could ultimately connect all New Zealand Maori to one another by using particular interpretations of whakapapa. Each contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui member can trace whakapapa to a range of collective identities – whanau, hapu and iwi. Any one of these collective identities, as long as it is cast within the metanarrative powers of whakapapa and particular themes about history, key ancestral place, and land claims, could hold unquestioned authenticity in predominant stories about identity.

But while Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative presents three privileged identities as legitimate by their interweaving in the meta-themes and whakapapa, it also in turn deemphasises and silences alternatives through their emphasis in a range of rhetorical techniques. By emphasising the whakapapa associations of the privileged identities and situating these in particular versions of the meta-themes, conceptual authority is strategically wielded in the public narrative, to create boundaries of inclusion and exclusion of membership in the collective identity of Ngai Tahu Whanui. Other tribal whakapapa is acknowledged but subsumed through the framing of Ngai Tahu Whanui in a meta-theme about history back in time to Tahu Potiki, the eponymous ancestor [see Chapter Seven].
Just as Kratz [1993] describes the historical ceremonial changes that are
deeplished by contemporary Okiek, so South Island Maori collective identities
that existed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, such as hapu, whanau,
Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha, are neither denied nor ignored in Ngai Tahu Whanui
public narrative. But through the techniques of selective attention, canonisation
and silencing [Kratz: 1993: 55], these come to be the identities that are not noted
nor emphasised in the public narrative. Where whanau or hapu are
acknowledged, it is in a way that subsumes these within the collective iwi:

The whakapapa is the thread that weaves the hapu together to form the 'iwi'. It is
the complex interweaving of hapu, one with the other, to form historically distinct
iwi or tribes that provides the problem. In the Ngai Tahu case the hapu are
insufficiently distinct both in whakapapa or in a geographical sense to be a suitable
holder of communal asset - even on a temporary basis. [T. O'Regan: 1992 in 'Te
Runanga o Ngai Tahu January 2001 Meeting Index of Information Papers']

Identifying with your Iwi is central to understanding your history and ancestry as a
Maori. Iwi is both roots and family. ['Te Karaka': Spring 1997: 5]

Whakapapa: This is the sacred link between whanau, hapu and iwi Maori. It links
us to descendants of Tipuna listed in the 'Official Census of Ngai Tahu Living in
the South Island in 1848'. ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 3]

[Whakapapa is] a solid rock of information which gives full meaning to any Ngai
Tahu connections to whanau (family), hapu (sub-tribe) and iwi (tribe). ['Te Karaka':
Spring 1997: 7]

The following programmes and services are in place and will continue in 1997: ...
Runanga wananga - to strengthen the cultural base of the whanau, hapu and iwi.

As pointed out above, the presentation of the privileged whakapapa identities in
Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative corresponds to political negotiations between
Maori and the Crown over the settlement of claims under the Treaty of Waitangi.
So too, deemphasis or exclusion of alternatives in the management of *whakapapa* and the public narrative is situated in this history of political practice around land claims issues. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative subsumes and deemphasises alternative *whakapapa* identities, in order to assert the *manawhenua* status of the new legal-political identity. This was done because of the indications by the Crown from 1990 to 1996 (beginning with the Runanga Iwi Act 1990 and the Waitangi Tribunal Reports on the Ngai Tahu Claims) that it required a particular South Island Maori collective identity - *iwi* - to negotiate with. It was continued due to subsequent challenges from other collective *whakapapa* identities.

Where other South Island *whakapapa* identities are acknowledged, it is in a way that subsumes these within the collective Ngai Tahu Whanui.\(^7\) The publication, 'Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future' [2000], states, 'The purpose of this document is to introduce Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to those who are unfamiliar with our people and our tribal organisation'. It does not cite *hapu, whanau, pa* or any other historic collective South Island Maori identity, apart from the privileged identities and Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe as subsumed within these.

By emphasising the *whakapapa* associations of the privileged identities, conceptual authority is strategically wielded in the public narrative to create boundaries of membership in the collective identity, Ngai Tahu Whanui. *Hapu*

---

\(^7\) Also able to coalesce within 'Ngai Tahu whanui', are 'whanau' groups, i.e., 'Ngai Tahu networks outside the rohe:

The Runanga Development Manager also maintains contact with Ngai Tahu networks outside the rohe, usually known as whanau groups. The whanau groups are a good way for Ngai Tahu living away from their papakainga to keep closer links with tribal issues and events. One Papatipu Runanga has taken the step to establish satellite groups for their members who are looking for regular input into Te Runanga o ngai Tahu discussions. This is a very good way of ensuring wider participation in runanga decision making. If you are interested in being part of a Ngai Tahu network in the area that you live in, please contact the Runanga Development Manager at Ngai Tahu Development Corporation. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 29]
and whanau collective identities are neither denied nor ignored in the public narrative, but subsumed within a story about the privileged identity of Ngai Tahu Whanui as iwi, papatipu runanga and Ngai Tahu Whanui members.

As outlined in Chapter Seven, Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha are acknowledged only insofar as these are subsumed within the privileged contemporary iwi identity of Ngai Tahu Whanui. Rhetorically embedding the privileged identities in a meta-theme about time before 1840, i.e., to the time of the eponymous ancestor Tahu Potiki, is utilised to accomplish this:

The ancient land Te Waipounamu and its surrounding islands have for forty-four generations sustained iwi Waitaha, Katie Mamoe and more recently Ngai Tahu. Descendants of these iwi today number 30,000 and make up the fourth largest tribe of Maori in Aotearoa.... Tahu Potiki a Paikea is the ancestor we take our Ngai Tahu name from. [Tribal Profile: 1997: 3]\(^8\)

The subsuming of these multiple identities, however, has not been unproblematic in the history of South Island Maori identities [Ballara: 1998, A. Anderson: 1998, Evison: 1993, Stack: 1877]. Neither is it unproblematic in my observation of the understandings Ngai Tahu individuals bring to their whakapapa and identity. Chapters Nine and Ten address the place of whanau, hapu, Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha in the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals as they critically engage the privileged identities of contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui.

---

\(^8\) According to the 2001 Census, Ngai Tahu/Kai Tahu is now the third largest iwi in New Zealand. Tribal membership has risen from 20,304 in 1991 to 39,180 [Statistics New Zealand media release 2001 Census Snapshot 4 ‘Maori’ 20 March 2002].
The abridged Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Charter and the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Vision Statement

The kaupapa of the 1993 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Charter, inserted in a prominent place in each Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report since 1996 as well as in the 1997 'Tribal Profile' published by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and distributed to Ngai Tahu Whanui members, exemplifies all the key themes found in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative and a particular version of the metanarrative of whakapapa as the basis of the new privileged identities:

The Kaupapa hakatuwhera of this Charter is that the House of Tahu is set up amongst us to nurture our people, to shelter our people, and to serve our people. It is both the symbol of our identity as Ngai Tahu Whanui and the Whare Whataraki of that which we together own....

The Kaupapa Whakakotahi is that the poupou of the House of Tahu are the Papatipu Runanga of our people each with their own mana, woven together with the tukutuku of our whakapapa. In them resides the tino rangatiratanga of Ngai Tahu. Its collective voice is Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1997: 3]

This Charter presents Ngai Tahu Whanui collective identity and the sub-tribal identities that it privileges as the contemporary embodiment of a historic, original, authentic tribal identity, legitimated by their metaphoric associations with whakapapa, history and traditional culture. However, Ngai Tahu Whanui, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, papatipu runanga and the House of Tahu are all recent constructions. Ngai Tahu Whanui and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu were created by the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. Papatipu runanga is a recent term developed to refer to committees set up in the 1870s to organise community issues, and occasionally territorial land claims, some around traditional marae, some not. The House of Tahu is also new.\(^9\) It is not referred to, at all in the 1996 Act.

\(^9\) In an interview with a long time employee of the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, he identified that the House of Tahu was a recent creation of his [Interview: May 1996].
*Tino rangatiratanga* for South Island Maori has historically resided with neither Ngai Tahu Whanui nor with a Ngai Tahu *iwi* in an unproblematic way. What we find, when we look more closely at historical developments (see Chapters Two and Five) and consider the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals (see Chapters Nine and Ten), is that the particular forms and meanings associated with Maori identity are changeable and at times contested. Yet this brief version of the 1993 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Charter constitutes possibly the only bit of the Charter that is regularly circulated to registered members. It is presented at the front of the 1996 and 1997 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Reports and in the 1997 ‘Tribal Profile’ glossy publication.

This abridged version of the Charter overlooks a great deal of constitutional provisions set out in the full Charter. These provisions refer little to tradition and cultural identity but lay out requirements for membership to Ngai Tahu Whanui, voting rights, ownership and management of assets issues, and accountability within Ngai Tahu Whanui – issues, it could be argued, commonly associated with citizenship status. The body of the Charter also refers to the place of *hapu*, Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha as alternative identities, none of which are mentioned in the much-quoted brief version. This version provides a simplified context of history, tradition, *whakapapa* and united homogeneous identity for contemporary registered members to embed their individual ethnic identity, while in turn, legitimating claims settlements approaches adopted by the contemporary leadership.

The Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Vision Statement, inserted at the beginning of the 1999 Annual Report also rhetorically links the metanarrative of *whakapapa* and the meta-themes of time and ‘The Claim’ with contemporary political practices:

**VISION**

A future where Ngai Tahu whanui will have the opportunity to protect and enhance their spiritual, cultural, educational and economic aspirations in a setting of excellence.
MISSION

To prudently manage the collective taonga of Ngai Tahu for the maximum benefit of this and future generations.

VALUES

Our organisation reflects the values of Ngai Tahu in everything we do.

WHANAUNKATAKA (FAMILY)

He ora wakapiri, he mate te whakatakari
There is strength in unity, defeat in anger.

Whakapapa provides the foundation for Te Whare o Tau.
In this whare we house our whanau and taoka in an environment which promotes:

- mutual respect
- kotahitanga; and
- the building of lasting relationships.

Kratz identifies the strategic uses of rhetorically situating contemporary practices within images associated with history, tradition and original practice, where often within one sentence a recent political event is linked with a sense of history, originality, authenticity, tradition, and in the case of Ngai Tahu, whakapapa [1993: 54]. Hence, by the technique of assimilative generalisation, such actions are attributed nobility and legitimacy. The particular images of history, whakapapa and identity that are presented in the abridged version of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Charter and the Vision Statement are also rhetorically linked to statements about contemporary political structures and practice, presenting by the techniques of assimilative generalisation and enthymemetic reasoning, an image that such practices are also based in uncontested history and tradition. For example, the House of Tahu is imaged as existing in some timeless fashion through history to look after a united, homogeneous iwi. This image is then extended to present that the way, the only way, to accomplish this
is to look after and administer a collective putea that has arisen out of the recent claims settlement. Then it is presented that the collective voice, the only collective voice, of this homogeneous united iwi is Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, as if it always has been so. This establishes the settlement package negotiated by the Claims Negotiators as the measure of looking after the collective identity, while in turn legitimating both the leadership that has taken on this process and the particular approach to claims settlement that is adopted in negotiations with the Crown – a united tribal settlement.

Political structures and practices that are actually recent are attributed further irrefutability by their rhetorical embeddedness in the metanarrative properties of whakapapa: ‘mana, woven together with the tukutuku of our whakapapa’. By embedding contemporary political structures and practices in a rhetoric of historic, collective identity and whakapapa (‘we’, ‘our’, ‘us’, ‘our people’, ‘we together’), contemporary uses of whakapapa for political ends are validated, whatever form these may take. Also, given that most adult Ngai Tahu cannot understand or speak te reo Maori, casting the key themes in a blend of Maori and English terms, lends a sense of ethnic culture and tradition, use of te reo Maori by Ngai Tahu is associated with the nineteenth century, until its resurgence in the mid-1980s.

Summary

This chapter has addressed how Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative utilises particular rhetorical techniques to maintain complex associations with the metanarrative of whakapapa and particular meta-themes about time and ‘The Claim’ to embed a theme about the privileged contemporary legal-political identities: Ngai Tahu Whanui, eighteen papatipu runanga as represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and individual registered member.
The public narrative emphasises a Ngai Tahu Whanui, united by *whakapapa*, shared history, shared ancestral place, and culture in its struggle with the Crown over *'Te Kereme'*, the Ngai Tahu Claim. *'The Claim'* is imaged as an icon of Ngai Tahu united tribal *whakapapa*, history, identity and cultural practice. The approach adopted by the current leadership to claims settlement and subsequent administration becomes accepted by the rhetorical association in the public narrative of these practices with these key themes. This is accomplished by presentation of a particular image about *'Te Kereme'* as one singular tribal claim initiated in the 1840s by a united tribe, unchanged in perspective and sharing a united historic culture since 'then', as a key theme, I argue, a 'meta-theme' underlying the identities that are privileged in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative.

This serves to legitimate at least an image of a contemporary 'Ngai Tahu Nation of Citizens' based in *whakapapa* and tradition - Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members united by common *whakapapa* – an *iwi* - governed and represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu - which the public narrative creates in the minds of Ngai Tahu Whanui members. Alternative identities that Ngai Tahu individuals consider in their personal narratives are rhetorically de-emphasised and even silenced in the public narrative. This in turn, serves to exclude particular historic Maori collective identities from membership into the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' at a time when Ngai Tahu Whanui has asserted *tangata whenua* status in the South Island in order to assert *manawhenua* rights to Treaty claims.

Chapters Nine and Ten go on to address the understandings of these privileged identities in the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals. Chapter Ten will examine how a particular *rohe* – bounded place - is presented in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, as the *rohe* of Ngai Tahu Whanui, to assert *iwi* identity, *tangata whenua* identity for the South Island, and hence associated *manawhenua* rights in negotiations vis-à-vis the Crown, Pakeha and other *iwi*.
Chapter nine

Identity in the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals

Experience is constituted through narrative. [Somers: 1994: 614]

_I never heard of Ngai Tahu [when I was a kid]. I remember we were Maoris._ ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' individual on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: April 1997]

Introduction

This chapter draws upon the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals to critically engage Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative and to examine how the privileged identities of the new 'Ngai Tahu Nation' are considered in the personal narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals. As Somers [1994], Plummer [1995], Rapport [2000] and Bishop [1996] argue, it is through narrative - and for Somers, metanarrative - that identities are constituted. Somers argues that narrativity provides an opportunity to infuse the study of identity formation with a relational and historical approach that challenges rigid categories by emphasising the place of identity in overlapping networks of relations that shift over time and space [1994: 607]. Through collecting and recording of narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals, I have been able to critically engage the themes and meta-themes of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative in the management of contemporary South Island Maori identities.¹

¹ As Calhoun puts it, 'The issue is not only whether participants use a specific term (cf. Greenfeld: 1992). It is, rather, whether participants use a rhetoric, a way of speaking, a kind of language that carries with it connections to other events and actions, that enables or disables certain other ways of speaking or acting, or that is recognised by others as entailing certain consequences.' [1997: 3-4].
I argue that the key themes of the public narrative are also fundamental to narratives about identity for Ngai Tahu individuals. Even 'experienced Ngai Tahu' acknowledge their status as members of Ngai Tahu Whanui and one or more of the eighteen privileged _papatipu runanga_ as well as their places as individual members of a wider collective identity. This is not uncommon in national identity formation. According to Calhoun, 'recognition as a nation clearly requires social solidarity – some level of integration among the members of the ostensible nation, and collective identity – the recognition of the whole by its members, and a sense of individual self that includes membership in the whole' [1997: 4].

As with the public narrative, framings of identities by individuals are always situated in particular considerations about _whakapapa_, time and 'The Claim'. However, versions of the metanarrative of _whakapapa_ and the meta-themes vary for individuals so that the framings of identity are possibly as multiple and varied as the number of Ngai Tahu. In the public narrative, other identities that are also based in _whakapapa_ – other South Island _iwi_, North Island _iwi_, Pakeha and even sub-tribal identities such as _hapu_ and _whanau_ - are either excluded or subsumed within Ngai Tahu Whanui. As shown in Chapter Eight, the _whakapapa_ basis of alternative collective identities is not denied in the

---

2 According to Anne Kane:

> Because of their metaphoric nature, symbolic systems are fluid structures. Although coherent and strong enough to structure understanding and thus action, they are transformable but they are transformable within the bounds of collective interpretation. The interpretive process, upon which meaning construction and action is predicated, is the fundamental step of agency. All... participants engage in interpretation to construct meaning and to plan action. How they interpret, i.e., the metaphoric associations and extensions they make, is highly contingent, based on the store of concepts from experience and the specific events being interpreted. And in collective interpretation, meaning construction is highly contested, as participants enter the process armed with diverse systems of meaning upon which they base their interpretation. The outcome of such a process is conditional: it is not a case of "anything could happen", but numerous scenarios are possible. [1997: 272]

In my observations, the key 'institutional and cultural' practices that distinguish personal considerations of the privileged identities are: age, degree of experience/ 'time done' at places of ancestral significance, employment or other involvement in the infrastructural support structure of Ngai Tahu Whanui – the Offices of Ngai Tahu, level of education, and degree of association with North Island _iwi_ whose _whakapapa_ connects to Ngai Tahu _whakapapa_ when traced back to Tahu Potiki.
public narrative. Rather, when they are acknowledged, it is in a way that subsumes these within the privileged identities, which are given pre-eminence by their embeddedness in whakapapa and particular stories about time, key ancestral place and 'The Claim'.

As well as the privileged identities, 'experienced Ngai Tahu' incorporate tribal, whanau, hapu, other iwi and even Pakeha identity. In my observations, individuals sometimes concur with the particular presentations of these themes found in the public narrative, but often they differ. However, what I have discovered is that, where understandings differ, they are not mutually exclusive. Ngai Tahu Whanui members incorporate the stories of the public narrative into a repertoire of framings about identity where national Ngai Tahu Whanui as a large conceptual category encompasses and at times silences other traditional categories based in whakapapa.

_identity embedded in whakapapa for 'Experienced Ngai Tahu'_

In Chapters Seven and Eight I addressed the presentation of the privileged identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative in particular versions of the meta-themes of time and 'The Claim'. While these chapters point out the complex interweaving of these meta-themes, both into one another and with the metanarrative of whakapapa, the simplistic and binary versions of whakapapa and the meta-themes presented in the public narrative makes separate analysis of the meta-themes possible. The narratives of 'Experienced Ngai Tahu'; however, highlight the complex, multiple, and ever-shifting nature of these meta-themes and their inseparability. 'Experienced Ngai Tahu' identify that the privileged contemporary identities are situated in a history of events around land claims issues, considering particular uses of significant ancestral place. Whakapapa, however, maintains its metanarrative properties, beyond critical investigation.

Chapter Four analysed the metanarrative properties of whakapapa for Ngai Tahu. This section extends this analysis to look at how whakapapa is
considered in understandings of identity for individuals – their ‘felt reality’. All Ngai Tahu I have listened to and spoken with acknowledge both their Ngai Tahu iwi identity and their identity as members of Ngai Tahu Whanui. Many acknowledge other collective Maori identities as part of their repertoire. All acknowledge that the basis of their Maori identities is whakapapa. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Kaiwhakahaere, Mark Solomon, sums up the potency of whakapapa for considerations of Ngai Tahu identity:³

_It is whakapapa that binds us all together... Without whakapapa you’re not Ngai Tahu. It’s the simplest way of putting it._ [Interview: August 1999]

Koa Mantell, past Executive Officer of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, and Terry Ryan of the Whakapapa Unit have both developed hierarchical models of degrees of ‘Ngai Tahu-ness’ among those who have a right to register as members in the current Ngai Tahu Whanui structure [in H. O’Regan: 2001: 97-99].⁴ For all of their categories, there is a taken-for-grantedness that the most basic criterion for claims to Ngai Tahu identity is possession of whakapapa, or ‘bloodline’.

Laid over this basic criterion is a range of factors that contribute to the complexity of ‘national ethnic identity’ for contemporary Ngai Tahu. These factors include variations in the range of human experience, age, educational attainment, length of time spent at the traditional places of one’s ancestors [see Chapter Ten] and the situation of these experiences and understandings in wider contexts of political practice.

---

³ Hana O’Regan records her father’s words to her on the centrality of whakapapa to one’s tribal identity: ‘Darling you don’t have to worry about being ‘Maori’, whatever you think that means. You are Ngai Tahu, you have that whakapapa, and that is something that no one can take away from you’ [H. O’Regan: 2001: 21].

⁴ See Chapter Ten.
The privileged identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui are considered by all Ngai Tahu Whanui as based in *whakapapa*.\textsuperscript{5} 'Experienced Ngai Tahu' at times concur with the presentation of *whakapapa* and the meta-themes and associated identities found in the public narrative, while at other times and in some places, question and challenge these. These questions occur in situations where one's local identity and access to territorial rights are challenged. Integral to these challenges are various metaphoric associations with *whakapapa* and varying considerations of the meta-themes. This in turn, extends and blurs understandings of *whakapapa*, contributing to its potency as metanarrative. As one 'experienced Ngai Tahu' man who has been very involved in the management and governance infrastructure puts it:

*It's more than DNA. I have DNA but no cultural legitimacy – no *whakapapa*.  [‘Experienced Ngai Tahu’ Individual involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: December 2001]*

While it is *whakapapa* that is understood by all – 'experienced' and 'new' Ngai Tahu – as the basis of membership in the contemporary identity, on top of this are layers of consideration that at once unite and distinguish members from one another, according to particular understandings of the metanarrative properties of *whakapapa* and the meta-themes.

**Time as meta-theme**

*It's not 18bloody40.  [‘Experienced Ngai Tahu’ woman involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: 1999]*

I have shown in Chapter Seven how Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative offers its individual members a history, incorporating two key times: 'then' (1840/1848) to 'now' (1996/1998). These are set up to suggest that the

\textsuperscript{5} As Inihapeti Ramsden, a Ngai Tahu woman, puts it, 'Ngai Tahu identity has always been a complex issue. Descent from Ngai Tahu people recorded in the 1848 census establishes the right of the individual to belong to Ngai Tahu, after that every option in the range of human experience applies' [in H. O'Regan: 2001: 10].
contemporary legal-political identity of Ngai Tahu Whanui and contemporary political practice around claims issues are continuous from an original point in history. The two key times are presented to frame contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui whakapapa as a united tribal adhesive, unchanged from its point of origin – 1840 and before, to Tahu Potiki. The origin of Ngai Tahu Whanui is presented as one of many events of an ordered history since ‘then’ in which ‘new’ individual members, or citizens, can contextualise their own whakapapa as members of the collective.

Where Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative presents a ‘then/now’ version of time, Ngai Tahu individuals who have had experience of their Ngai Tahu identities prior to 1991 (marking the introduction of the Runanga Iwi Act 1990 and the Waitangi Tribunal’s findings on the Ngai Tahu claims) incorporate more complex understandings of the role of history and time in the development of both South Island Maori politics and contemporary identities. Such considerations occur along with understandings about ongoing claims settlement issues, with more detailed consideration of shifting events, particularly in the twentieth century, either from first-hand experience or from communication with parents and grandparents. The following excerpt from the life history of kaumatua Bill Solomon illustrates this:

*Mum would always talk about our history. We constantly were told about the history and whakapapa. And Dad was always involved in the politics of Maori. He was one of the first involved in the Trust Board.... They couldn't do what they wanted. Until the government made the decision about the Waitangi Tribunal there was never ever going to be a settlement. Dad was from Canterbury, so a lot of his politics concerned Canterbury. Mom wasn't really involved in seeking solutions. She was only interested in instilling in us our history. She always instilled in our minds our history. I'm only talking about her history. It wasn't something we needed to research. She taught us our whakapapa and we knew where the injustices had happened. She got it from her mother and some she knew first-hand.* [Life history: 2000]

As Kratz notes, 'golden Age versions gloss over remembered difficulties ...masking the historical process, making flat and uniform change that took place over time, often incrementally and differentially' [1993: 41]. It is in the
personal narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals that the political changes, disagreements and resentments that have characterised South Island Maori social life both prior to and since European settlement are revealed, as an example from kaumatua Jim Pohio points out:

*Tribal history. The punch-ups between different whanau and hapu and close families. Of course that's Ngai Tahu. South Island history, pushing and shoving and it continues today. Well, we picked it up more than it was taught to us, we heard people talking...* [Life History: 1997]

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative emphasises a straight uninterrupted connection back in time from 1840/1848 to Tahu Potiki as Ngai Tahu's eponymous ancestor. In the narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu', Tahu Potiki is acknowledged, but the relevance of this ancestor receives different emphasis than in the public narrative. The 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals I have spoken with know their whakapapa connections to Tahu Potiki. As the personal narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' indicate however, connections to Tahu Potiki are not acknowledged to assert prior authority over other South Island Maori for the purposes of asserting South Island tangata whenua status, for claims-making. ‘Experienced Ngai Tahu’ acknowledge their whakapapa to Tahu Potiki as a way to connect their identity in history to North Island Maori and also to South Island hapu as representative of both significant identity and significant local ‘place’. For example.⁶

---

⁶ Ngai Tahu kaumatua, Syd Cormack's life history states:

That sister that's living up in Masterton, she told me some of those North Island people are very cruel. She says they look down on South Island people. So I says, 'I'll send you up a whakapapa.' So I wrote it all out, and it goes back to Porourangi and then to Paikea, and sent it up to her. Now Paikea had about six wives, but from Paikea and the wife Tamaoruatea (Te Mahoruatea), two children are concerned with the South Island. North Island won't have this. One is Tahu Potiki, and one is Whaitua Te Ramarama or Te Marama. Now, the first one is Kai Tahu, this second one here is the father of Porourangi, Ngati Porou. He is known as Nanaia in the North Island. Well, the children of this one married the children of that one, both ways, not just one marriage, two of them. And there's your two lines coming down. There's no difference between Ngati Porou and Kai Tahu, they both go back to Porourangi. So I wrote it out and sent it up to her: I've never heard from her since! [1997: 40]
St Paul's [school] were all Maori kids. There were only about five or six of us from around here, three from Tuahiwi. I learned how much the northern tribes disliked us. I got along really well with the ones from Ngati Porou, Kahungunu. We were part of their whanau. These three tribes have always had a relationship with each other. We’re all basically one tribe, from Paikea (Ngati Porou), Tahu Potiki’s brother. Through Tahu Potiki we’re from the same families in the north. So we have this, their friends are our friends. And Kahungunu are deadly enemies of Tuhoi. Yes, yes, we had a common sort of bond with them. Basically Rapaki, Port Levy, Tuahiwi, they’re the same people. All came from my great grandfather, Solomons, on Dad’s side. We knew them all our lives - saw them at tangi and things like that, at Christchurch. We would make contacts, learn about each other. We’re very closely related, I’m closely related to Charlie [Crofts], the Te Aikas, Pitamas, Tau. [B. Solomon: Life History: 1999]

For Jim Pohio:

Well, Ngai Tahu really is a general term, but when you come back to particulars it comes back to which part of the South Island do you have a right to stand and which is the ancestor that put you on that land? Not Tahu Potiki....But when we call ourselves Ngai Tahu, we know if we go back far enough, we’ll find a common family tie, or hapu tie, or whatever. We go back to Tahu Potiki himself who is the Ngai Tahu ancestor who links us all together even though he never stood on the land himself. Tahu Potiki ties us as an iwi or tribe. His descendants who led us onto lands on the South Island identify our hapu and hapu lands. [Life History: 1997]

---

Eruera Stirling, Ngai Tahu kaumatua with whakapapa to Whanau-a-Apanui in the North Island acknowledges Tahu Potiki:

The history of our family on the East Coast side goes right back to that far-off land, Hawaiki. The great East Coast ancestor Paikea [Tahu Potiki a Paikea] was a high chief in Hawaiki.... Paikea was the great ancestor of the East Coast tribes and most of our genealogies go back to him. [Salmond: 1980: 26-27]

---

7 Jim Pohio further considered his relationship to North Island tribes in the following excerpt:

...there was no harm, pushing and shoving like there is now. I never had any problems relating to the marae there. This thing of creating a cultural arsenal has become the fashion in recent times to push something at the Crown but that wasn't the thing then. All right, if people wanted to do their cultural thing, good, it didn't worry anyone, there was no conflicting agenda involved. Marae and culture had their own environment and did not impinge on non-Maori. Now its heavy artillery.... all this involvement with cultural revival, that sort of thing, well I don't need it. And of course, I didn't experience anything like it then. [Life History: 1997]
In this example, Pohio acknowledges the unity of *whakapapa* through history to the eponymous ancestor, that all contemporary Ngai Tahu share. But he considers this connection in terms of *hapu* not *iwi*.

An ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ man involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu pointed out in an interview that, while much reference has been made in what I refer to as Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative to Tahu Potiki as the eponymous ancestor who unites all contemporary Ngai Tahu, in fact, Ngai Tahu Whanui members are not bound to each other by this *whakapapa* connection [Interview: December 2001].

He points out that membership to Ngai Tahu Whanui is by proof of *whakapapa* to one of the *kaumatua* listed in the 1925 ‘Blue Book’. He makes it clear that if the unifier of all contemporary South Island Maori were indeed Tahu Potiki; this would have to include a wider South Island Maori collective, because the 1848 *kaumatua* listed in the ‘Blue Book’ came from only one of several direct lines to Tahu Potiki. As he put it, ‘someone can *whakapapa* from Tahu Potiki (or those lower in the tree) but still not *whakapapa* from an 1848 *kaumatua*’ [Interview: November 2001].

‘The Claim’ as meta-theme

As in Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative, understandings of time for the ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ I spoke with are also inextricably linked with the history of South Island Maori land claims since 1840. The public narrative presents the claims settlement process advocated by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership 'now' as a direct, irrefutable outcome of one united tribal claim by South Island Maori *tipuna* 'then' and that all political developments around the claims process between 'then' and 'now' are episodes in one long continuous event, rolled up into one indistinguishable 'then'. Incremental developments or changes are glossed over in this binary presentation of the history of ‘The Claim’. As the following excerpt from the life history of Jim Pohio reveals,
however, those with lived experience of their South Island Maori identities acknowledge Ngai Tahu Whānui as a recent political event that has occurred as one of many possible outcomes of the historical pursuit of South Island Maori land claims since 1840. As Becker would argue, each event has a history, a story, 'a first this happened, then that happened' [1998: 60-61]. Jim points out the incremental political, social and material events since 1840 that have led to this particular outcome:

As the politics of each generation change, so does the perspective of the viewpoints.... We had a group that was Land Court recognised, who negotiated and got a result from government as a result of petitions. Any benefit that might have been there to start with in 1920 certainly disappeared by the time the Labour government played socialism... with the Labour Party/Ratana Church settlement which produced the Trust Board....

The Labour government put together a settlement package in 1946 or 44, during the War and we've been stuck with that nonsense ever since.... We had a group of people who looked after the Ngai Tahu Trust Board, that's the one that was replaced by the Ngai Tahu Whānui. The old Trust Board...these bodies have since become TRONT.... the Ngai Tahu Runanga Bill... has been one of those things that has gradually developed and become entrenched by an Act of Parliament.... [before the Trust Board]....

The Claim has more or less been acknowledged since around 1920, had been quantified and left on the table of the government...., because they backed off and dived for cover, and that was the end of it.

The lands that were allocated were already held in ownership. The Claim had never been allocated, although... the 1848 kaumatua were named and listed in the Blue Book and given shares in the Claim if it ever eventuated. So shares were given against their names against the day when there would be a settlement. It was worked out through the Land Court system.

Those shares and whatever were handed in to the Ngai Tahu Trust Board when it was formed in 1946 for them to look after. Now, about ten or so years after, in the 1950s, someone in their wisdom saw fit to cancel all those shares, thereby creating the basis for pan-Ngai Tahu rights in common by all members.

Well, I guess roughly I'd know the movement of different groups that came to the South Island anyway. That's practically common knowledge for people who identify as Ngai Tahu in the South Island. It would be
safe to say that The Claim and whakapapa were subjects that were ongoing matters of discussion.

The claim is a big part of every South Island Maori's life. It was something that was handed down, generation to generation. But as the politics of each generation change, so does the perspective of the viewpoints. Today the claim is viewed less as a way to recover territorial natural and physical assets than as a source of dollars....

I never had any disillusions about this sort of thing. The old people as I remember, had a territorial-based sense of rights, territorial-based constitutional rights, territorial-based politics, territorial-based economics, territorial-based resources, all these things. It all started from territory. I'm talking about the elders that I was close to, right through the South Island. There's no misunderstanding on how they view 'the claim'. Of course, in the mid-1940s, during World War 2, we had something called a Labour government and something called a Ratana Movement and its four Maori MPs who introduced a whole new concept of claim relationships. The end result to that of course, was a pan-Tahu thing, and this is where it is today. [Life History: 1997]

Jim Pohio here presents a somewhat different view of the role of 'The Claim' than is presented in the public narrative, one which provides a more detailed account of time and political event. It is clear in his personal narrative that, although South Island Maori always knew about 'The Claim', 'as the politics of each generation change, so does the perspective of the viewpoints' [Pohio: Life History: 1997]. Pohio considers the history of 'territorial' local claims rather than the united tribal claim that is now asserted in the public narrative. He situates this united 'pan-Ngai Tahu' approach in its historical and political context – the introduction of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board. Jim Pohio's personal narrative makes connections between the development of 'The Ngai Tahu Claim' and changing socioeconomic and political circumstances of life within Ngai Tahu (and in wider New Zealand society), while placing the life of the individual within this context of change:

The Labour government put together a settlement package in 1946 or 44, during the War and we've been stuck with that nonsense ever since. Nobody has seen fit to put it back to the way it should be.

The lands that were allocated were already held in ownership. The claim had never been allocated although... the 1848 kaumatua were named and listed in the Blue Book and given shares in the claim if it ever
eventuated. So shares were given against their names against the day when there would be a settlement. It was worked out through the Land Court system.... but not equal, according to whatever for each family. A basic share would have been ten shares and then for each family maybe four or five or whatever, but the ten shares was a sort of benchmark.... Some of them have up to twenty or thirty ancestors or kaumatau in that Blue Book so they can all go back and make a claim on any of those. It becomes very complex..... Those shares and whatever were handed in to the Ngai Tahu Trust Board when it was formed in 1946 for them to look after. Now, about ten or so years after, in the 1950s, someone in their wisdom saw fit to cancel all those shares, thereby creating the basis for pan-Ngai Tahu rights held in common by all members.... I'm not quite sure how that was done. They had the right to speak for the Ngai Tahu Trust Board beneficiaries. So what was created was a general right instead of a particular shareholding..... There has been no link back to the Land Court system since, in respect of claimants' rights. All rights are held within the Ngai Tahu structures - the House of Tahu, or TRONT and the eighteen runanga. So they won't appear in the Land Court anymore, not unless sufficient beneficiaries get together and challenge the Ngai Tahu Runanga Bill. It has been one of those things that has gradually developed and become entrenched by an Act of parliament.

They [parents' generation] had resources and they became divided up as the generations came. And these are the people who had a very clear concept of what 'the claim' was all about. And I'm sorry to say that their perspective is something that's been lost in the present generation of 'the claim.' [Life History: 1997]

Kaumatau Bill Solomon also acknowledges the role of 'The Claim' in the formation of the twentieth century political body, the Trust Board, the precursor to Ngai Tahu's contemporary privileged identities:

The Trust Board just gave us another official body because it was still subject to Crown definitions. It was broken up into areas, Kaikoura and Mangumaru. We had no negotiating power because the tribe had no legal identity. Little groups would stand up and say, these people didn't represent us, and this weakened our position. We tried to break off relations with the Crown and it was really about creating a legal identity. The Trust Board only represented beneficiaries to the claim but they had a whole lot of rules that prevented them from doing the things they needed to do. They realised it was better to negotiate with a legal identity so we started again with our own structure back to negotiations with the Crown. But of course, they refused to allow us to do that....to negotiate...at that time we'd become the members of TRONT. [Life History: 2000]
One 'experienced Ngai Tahu' woman involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu reveals an awareness of the management of whakapapa in the pursuit of the claim through history, but to her this does not necessarily mean 'tribal' whakapapa, or 'tribal' settlement:

*It was whakapapa that actually drove it [the claim], but there are different parts of it, in a different shape.* [Interview: July 1999]

I have found that 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals, in talking about their lives, cannot escape offering a chronology of South Island Maori land claims. This takes the form of an analysis of the history of 'The Claim' in terms of the role of one's own whanau and hapu in the political developments.\(^8\)

In the personal narrative of an 'experienced Ngai Tahu' like Jim Pohio, 'The Claim' has been presented in terms of its practical use as a tool for securing territorial property rights. He saw that interpretations of perspectives involved in claims issues have altered through time according to the particular actors involved and the social, political and economic contexts within which they have moved.

As well as awareness of nineteenth century South Island Maori history, 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals I have spoken with indicate an understanding of more recent events, identifying key dates in the twentieth century, particularly 1944 (beginning of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board),

---

\(^8\) For example, according to Ngai Tahu kaumatua, Syd Cormack:

Trusts, in a way, they just evolve. That's what happened with the Tautuku Waikawa Trust down here - that's the Catlins. The Ngai Tahu Trust Board wanted the Court to order that every piece of Maori land in Otago and Southland be put in a trust to be run by the Board and a few others. Well, we didn't think that was right so we called a meeting down here. We had about ninety people at that meeting - all against it! They voted against it. They didn't want land here to be run from Christchurch. The Ngai Tahu Trust Board appealed the decision when the court refused it, but the decision held. [1997: 173-174]
1986 (filing of the Ngai Tahu claims with the Waitangi Tribunal), and 1991 (publication of the Waitangi Tribunal's report on the Ngai Tahu claims). These individuals understand the impact of these key political events on the introduction of Ngai Tahu Whanui. For example:

It's probably only been highlighted or obvious in the last ten to twelve years since the land claim. Most people before that, before 1985, probably, a lot of people couldn't even have told you who the tribe was, that's what I believe [and even moreso in the past year]. So, It's becoming more and more, the profile has come up of Ngai Tahu, and then people now start to identify, they can say, 'ahh, you guys own all this' and so on... ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' man involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: April 1997]

When you're sitting at a table of eighteen and you ask a question about something over the last nine years, there'd be a number of people sitting there going, 'What's she on about?...and they even put their hands up and say, 'I don't even know what you're on about', and that's right, they don't.... The Act doesn't make any reference to [the validity of past Runanganui policy] and I would have thought with all the legal advice we had...and the thing is with some of our policies, we've actually put documents out...[to] regional councils and district councils throughout Te Waipounamu. So you've got to go back and acknowledge those. And if you don't go back and acknowledge those pre-1996 policies, we're actually saying to everybody, history actually means nothing. But we can't say that because we've just come through a settlement. For us to get to now, you have to go back.... And to say something like our policies haven't really got a place or are irrelevant now, until you actually can go through them and have a look, that's when you can make an informed decision. I had the same question posed last night: 'But they're old, they mean nothing'. But how can you say that? ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' woman involved with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: July 1999]

'The Claim' is utilised in current Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative as a symbol of shared tribal culture, yet it is subject to multiple readings by Ngai Tahu individuals. 'The Claim' is imaged as an icon of Ngai Tahu united tribal history, identity and cultural practice, while the approach adopted by the current leadership to its settlement and the administration of that settlement becomes accepted by the rhetorical association in the public narrative of such political practices with whakapapa and the meta-themes.
The personal narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ I have spoken with indicate more detailed understanding of time and history, making connections between the development of ‘The Claim’ and changing socio-economic and political circumstances of life within Ngai Tahu and in the wider New Zealand society – ‘The Claim’ as event, rather than as icon. For ‘new Ngai Tahu’, understandings of history will most likely continue to form an integral part of consideration of their Ngai Tahu identity but these may vary from such understandings by ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’. The leadership and the public narrative identify ‘The Claim’ as the culture that has bound Ngai Tahu individuals to one another through time from ‘then’ to ‘now’. Key to variations in these understandings will be the degree of embodied experience of the relationships recorded in their whanau, hapu, runanga and iwi whakapapa, time living among these relationships at places of ancestral significance, and involvement in political practices around land claims issues prior to the introduction of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996.

The privileged identities in the narratives of ‘Experienced Ngai Tahu’

Ngai Tahu Whanui

*The tribe means different things to different people at different times.* [R. Tau: Waitangi Tribunal hearings video collection: Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu archives]

In Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative whakapapa is presented as the link, the connective tissue that unites contemporary registered members of an iwi – Ngai Tahu – that has existed as whole, homogeneous and unified, with its own tribal rohe – Te Waipounamu - mediated by another identity based in whakapapa – papatipu runanga – since ‘then’ and before, to Tahu Potiki. The public narrative also attributes national identity to its individual members who are framed as ‘Ngai Tahu people’ or simply ‘Ngai Tahu’.
While ‘new Ngai Tahu’ are invited by the public narrative to equate Ngai Tahu as *iwi* with Ngai Tahu Whanui, for the ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ the relationship between Ngai Tahu Whanui and *iwi* is somewhat more complex.\(^9\) All Ngai Tahu in this research acknowledged *iwi* as part of their individual repertoire of identities. Consideration of the place of *iwi* for contemporary Ngai Tahu is complex and shifting, sited in personal experience and understandings of the metanarrative of *whakapapa* and the meta-themes. Some Ngai Tahu individuals who are involved in working within the supporting infrastructure of Ngai Tahu Whanui (The Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu) consider their Ngai Tahu identity as synonymous with Ngai Tahu Whanui.

‘New Ngai Tahu’ have not experienced alternatives to the new legal-political identity. But for the ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, there has been some form of either intellectual or embodied experience of a Ngai Tahu tribal identity that existed prior to 1996. Yet, the distinction between the old and the new is at times articulated and at times silenced. Calhoun identifies such a phenomenon:

> We can also see that nationalism derives much of its force from the phenomenological experience of ordinary people that, in general, their nations are always already there. Many of the distinguishing characteristics of national cultures, like language, are not created by individuals. Rather, individuals only become persons in social relationships that are already shaped by culture. Moreover, some of these relationships, like family and ethnic bonds, may seem so basic that people – at least in some settings – cannot imagine themselves without their attachments to these relationships.... Clearly people experience their social worlds as always in some part given to them prior to their own actions. Equally clearly, many aspects of these social worlds – including the demarcation of nations – are products of human action and subject to potential manipulation. [1997: 30-31]

This shifting between ‘old’ identities and ‘new’ is accomplished through the cultural potency of *whakapapa*. Jim Pohio, Bill Solomon and Mark Solomon

---

\(^9\) According to Calhoun, ‘the questions we need to ask are: (1) how does it come to be that people’s experience of being at home in the world is often bound up not only with their immediate personal relations but with the larger category of the nation?’ [1997: 33].
pointed out that whakapapa to nineteenth-century tipuna, as listed in the 1925 'Blue Book' is the link shared in common by all South Island Maori. The recent introduction of Ngai Tahu Whanui is then at times blurred with this historical link to Ngai Tahu iwi, with a legitimate basis in whakapapa, as the South Island iwi that existed at 1840 and before. At other times, the political and historical context of the recently introduced Ngai Tahu Whanui is acknowledged.

In all my participant observation at hui and meetings at the runanga level, centralised level and tribal Hui a Tau, I have observed that Ngai Tahu Whanui is framed by the presenters – representatives of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, as one and the same as 'Ngai Tahu' as the iwi that continued since its first written mention in the Treaty. For Mark Solomon, who grew up listening to his parents discussing 'The Claim' but was somewhat disinterested, knowledge of the history of the political events that have led to the introduction of Ngai Tahu Whanui has been gained more from firsthand experience than has been the case for most contemporary registered members, but less than that of kaumatua such as Jim Pohio, Rick Tau, Bill Solomon, or Syd Cormack. His life experiences were very much localised around the Maori community at Kaikoura where he grew up. Mark acknowledges his whakapapa connections throughout Ngai Tahu as a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui, viewed as equivalent to the Ngai Tahu iwi of previous generations.

However, Jim Pohio considered Ngai Tahu Whanui for its recent legal-political origins:

I've been to a couple of these meetings where they've had a negotiator representative of the group that's been negotiating. Charlie Crofts who is chairman of TRONT is also the chairman of the runanga he's representing, Port Levy, and representatives from other local runanga, and they're all confused. They are confused about their roles, their rights and responsibilities and how they're being represented, all that sort of thing.

Well, they might be able to clarify some basics and then from there let the beneficiaries and the runanga know what the ground rules are. What is a puzzle at the present moment is what the formalities are for
becoming a member of a papatipu marae in which our mana has been vested by an Act of Parliament. [Life History: 1997]

For both Mark Solomon, Kaiwhakahaire of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, and an ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ woman involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, understandings of iwi are presented within a framework of whanau.¹⁰

It is whakapapa that binds us all together, but like any family, we are a lot of individuals. What Ngai Tahu is, is a very big family, and there are times when individually we have something we need to do and say, and then we can come in collectively as a little whanau. [Interview: July 1999]

Whakapapa is extremely important. Ngai Tahu really is a tribe of cousins. We are quite closely related.... I find that special, the fact that I can go down to Awarua and I know that I am actually standing amongst my relations. It’s broadened a lot since I’ve actually actively got involved with Ngai Tahu. I think its reviving again. It’s extended a lot. As I say, I can go down to Awarua and they mention to me, oh you’re related this way.... Whakapapa links. [Interview: August: 1999]

Mark Solomon pointed out in this interview that whanau, runanga and Kaikoura as significant place are the primary consideration to how he considers his personal Maori identity. He places particular relevance on Kaikoura as the place where his whanau comes from and where his runanga is.¹¹

¹⁰ As Calhoun writes, ‘nationalists commonly present nations as large families sharing bonds of culture and descent’ [1997: 29]. In turn, ‘people speak of their nation as being like a large family, or claim blood ties, or talk of how their ancestors fought their ancient enemies in some long-ago battle’ [1997: 37].

¹¹ Roger Maaka states that ‘The concentration of tribal power in a centralised form, such as a trust board or runanga, may be effective for some, notably Ngai Tahu, Tainui an Ngati Tuwharetoa. For others, local interest by far outstrips any notion of centralized control, as is illustrated in difficulties with the settlement processes in Taranaki, Muriwhenua, and Te Whakatōhea. For the majority of tribes tino rangatiratanga as self-determination means a major emphasis on local control of local resources’ [1998: 203].

As Calhoun writes, ‘what is being asserted by nationalist leaders who say ‘we are one family’ is something very different from how family works for peoples for whom it is more basic’ [1997: 38].
I always acknowledge that the Kaikoura people are my family, they're my close relations. I don't just mean first cousins, some of the families are [fourth?] but we all come from a common ancestor. I find that special. In my youth I could walk into most Ngai Tahu people's homes and be welcomed. I knew all the elders then, uncles and aunties...but it's not as close now as it was when I was a teenager.... It depends on which role I'm fulfilling. If I go out on behalf of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu then I'm the Kaiwhakahaere. If I go onto a marae representing Kaikoura I will go on as Kati Kuri, but I'm acknowledging my whakapapa links there.

I've only just chosen to stand at Takahanga. I had as much right to stand at any of those and they all acknowledge this not because of me personally, they know exactly who I am, that I have whakapapa. [Interview: August 1999]

His Ngai Tahu Whanui identity is more salient when he is fulfilling his role as Kaiwhakahaere of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu

James Daniels' experiences of his Ngai Tahu identity coincide in several ways with Mark Solomon's. Both are males in their mid-40s whose parents were heavily involved in tribal politics and land claims issues in their childhood. Their knowledge of the history of 'The Claim' comes more from experience than for most newly registered members, but neither of them became directly involved until adults in their 30s or 40s. Both consider Ngai Tahu Whanui as part of their repertoire of whakapapa identities; that Ngai Tahu Whanui is equivalent to the Ngai Tahu iwi of previous generations, and both feel very strongly about the relevance of their local runanga and hapu identities when acting outside their roles within the governing structure.

For such 'experienced Ngai Tahu', their understandings of claims issues and ethnic identity were localised, with an acknowledgement of a wider ethnic identity that was often 'Maori' rather than tribal. As the introductory extract to this chapter from an 'experienced Ngai Tahu' man involved in Te Runanga o

Benedict Anderson writes of traditional communities: 'The fundamental conceptions about 'social groups' were centripetal and hierarchical, rather than boundary-oriented and horizontal' [B. Anderson: 1991: 15].
Ngai Tahu acknowledges. Ngai Tahu *iwi* was not even known in his childhood.\(^{12}\)

*Kaumatua* Jim Pohio also claimed that during his childhood on the Tuahiwi reserve, he never heard of Ngai Tahu; he only knew that as Maori children he and his siblings and mates were different from the transient Pakeha individuals who often came through the neighbourhood [Life History: 1997].

*Papatipu Runanga* represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu

While Ngai Tahu Whanui is accepted by most contemporary Ngai Tahu, at times as equivalent to their traditional *iwi* identity and at times with acknowledgement of their differences, often the localised identities of *runanga*, *hapu*, and *whanau* are asserted as primary. This challenges the binary, homogeneous, glossed-over version of traditional identity found in the public narrative.

As the above portion of narrative from Mark Solomon indicates, *runanga* identity is most important to him in any capacity where he is not acting in the specific role of Kaikwhakahaere. This is the same for all the representatives on Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: they are present to assert the identities and needs of their local *runanga*. However, from my observation at *marae*

---

\(^{12}\) Reina Whaitiri, a Ngai Tahu woman makes a similar statement:

I was never really conscious of being Maori when very young. Not until I was taken south, to meet my paternal grandmother was I made aware that I was Maori and somehow different. She called me her little Maori girl... [1998: 171-190]

According to Angela Ballara, many Maori growing up in the twentieth century had no knowledge of a tribal identity, but often *hapu* identity was considered:

The variations in...Maori-designed lists are another indication that by the mid-20th century the same trend was happening amongst Maori as amongst Europeans - lists were getting shorter and groups deemed to be units were getting bigger, subsuming other descent groups formerly regarded as separate. Anecdotal evidence from Maori brought up in the 1940s and 1950s is strikingly similar: 'When I was young, we never heard about Te Karawa; if you lived in Northland, you were Nga Puhi'. [1998: 281]
settings, many ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, while they might not draw attention to the recent legal-political context of Ngai Tahu Whanui, do draw attention to the legal-political uses and nature of the contemporary papatipu runanga structure. Some draw attention to its recent origins. While ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ consider their local identities as primary in situations where they are not speaking or acting on behalf of Ngai Tahu, some assert hapu or whanau and others, runanga. For others, all these collective identities are considered but runanga identity is taken on only in a limited capacity, as necessity to achieve ends for local people within the new management structure. In the personal narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, there is often challenge to the legitimacy of the supporting infrastructure of Ngai Tahu Whanui. Interestingly, where hapu or whanau identity are asserted, it is at times vis-à-vis runanga, and at times vis-à-vis Ngai Tahu Whanui. Invariably, assertions of local identity are embedded in understandings and experiences around ‘The Claim’, or more precisely, territorial claims. For example, as one ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ woman puts it:

In terms of going over to Onuku that day, I was disappointed for a number of reasons: One, because back in 1992 a stance was taken by Onuku and Wairewa that the Akaroa Purchase was not being fully addressed in the Deed of Settlement....

What happened originally [mid 1980s]... I believe, and I certainly know its true of my dad, is that we should have done the claim either by hapu or by the 'Tall Trees'. It was presented out here as if we're doing this, we're doing the 'Tall Trees', and then when it got too hard, we're dealing with one claim. Because if it was done truly by the Tall Trees, then the Peninsula and the Akaroa purchase would have been a full and final settlement.

13 At the Arowhenua Hui which I attended in September, 1990, many Ngai Tahu indicated that there were indeed groups within Ngai Tahu that would have liked to be included in the Runanganui o Tahu [the intermediary ‘tribal council’ of Ngai Tahu that worked alongside the Trust Board from 1993 to 1996] but felt impeded from doing so because the feared they would be excluded from the distribution of land claims settlement.

14 Calhoun writes that ‘large families are always composed of smaller families’ and which level of family would matter would depend on the situation’ [1997: 38-39].

15 As Calhoun writes, ‘what is being asserted by nationalist leaders who say ‘we are one family’ is something very different from how family works for peoples for whom it is more basic’ [1997: 38].
The 'Nine Tall Trees' theory was only used as a means to get people to agree because they thought they were going to do it in nine lots. I truly believe there were a lot of Ngai Tahu members who really believed we were going for the 'Nine Tall Trees' and we were going to do it individually. [Interview: July 1999]

Jim Pohio acknowledged the unity of whakapapa to the eponymous ancestor, that all contemporary Ngai Tahu share. But he thought of this connection in terms of hapu:

*His [Tahu Potiki] descendants who led us onto lands on the South Island identify our hapu and define our hapu lands.... Well, Ngai Tahu really is a general term but when you come back to particulars it comes back to which part of the South Island do you have a right to stand and which is the ancestor that put you on that land? Tahu Potiki does not appear as the ancestor who links me with our different lands.* [Life History: 1997]

Just two months before the 1997 tribal ballot, the Upoko for Wairewa challenged the Chief Claims Negotiator at the 1997 Tribal Hui a Tau in Kaikoura on pursuing the negotiations on a pan-Ngai Tahu settlement, imploring him to continue to negotiate multiple South Island territorial claims, as had been the approach historically since the signing of the Treaty. He pointed out that the Treaty of Waitangi was signed by the chiefs of five primary hapu, not by one tribe or eighteen tribal representatives. To this the Chief Negotiator replied that to undo the proposed settlement and the corresponding tribal structure now would be 'like unscrambling an egg'.

Jim Pohio and Bill Solomon considered Ngai Tahu tribal identity only as salient at times and in contexts in which Ngai Tahu come together vis a vis an outside body, such as the Crown or in interaction with non-Maori. For the rest of the time, local identities such as runanga, hapu or whanau are more salient. The following excerpts from other 'experienced Ngai Tahu' illustrate this point:
We all sometimes utilise the mahinga kai of other runanga and kei te pai, we’re all whanau anyway, but when it comes to representation, we need our own. [M. Daniels: Onuku Runanga meeting: August 1996]

There’s no such thing as Ngai Tahu tikanga. Each individual and each marae has their own tikanga and then they can all come together into a mutual arrangement under one umbrella at times....

It was decided at one meeting to put ‘Ngai Tahu tikanga’ into the Ngai Tahu Act (or the Charter), but this was thrown out because there is no way the top council was going to have a say in what goes on on the marae. Those who did support it were those who seemed very insecure about their tikanga and probably they relate to a mix of Maori and Pakeha. [Young Ngai Tahu man employed in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: April1997]

When I asked the young man quoted above what he considers his identity to be, he said ‘Ngai Tahu; but at Te Taumutu I think of myself as rangatahi, a young man; in a larger tribal hui I think of myself as Ngati Mako, which is one level higher than Te Taumutu [hapu]. It’s connecting yourself to bloodlines rather than to a building or a runanga, and that’s why marae are named after ancestors.’ ‘Looking at hapu relations is the next step down from looking at people in terms of where they’re from and the families they’re from’ [Interview: May 1997].

An ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ woman on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, when asked what identity she asserts vis-à-vis North Island tribes, responded that she used to assert Ngai Tahu but now asserts Ngati Irahehu, her hapu [Interview: July 1999].

Wally Stone, a young ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ and C.E.O. of Whale Watch Kaikoura, cited his hapu and runanga identity, rather than South Island tribal identity in the following interview:

---

16 This same individual when asked by me in an interview in 1991 what he considered his identity to be when he spends time at the university as a student, responded, ‘Ngai Tahu’.
My Dad came from the Wairoa area – he’s of Ngati Porou and Ngati Kahungunu descent. My mother is from the South Island, she’s Ngai Rapaki. ['North and South': June 2002: 80]

'Experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals incorporate runanga into their repertoire of collective Maori identities but acknowledge the historical and political context of the introduction of runanga and its purpose as a type of community committee rather than as meaningful kin identity:

...being a runanga member qualifies one for benefit from claim settlements. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

The problem with the structure that we’ve created, Te Runanga, is that it’s brought all these people to the marae who have never had anything to do with the history of the marae. They’ve lived as Pakeha and they’ve sniffed the dollar and the structure creates its own problems. [B. Solomon: Life History: 2000]

Also acknowledged is the fluidity of runanga associations, due to the complexity of whakapapa and the interweaving of whakapapa with significant ancestral place through history for Ngai Tahu. One person can now belong to many runanga and marae, depending on ancestry and rights to land.\(^\text{17}\)

Whakapapa is understood by many Ngai Tahu to connect South Island Maori individuals to one another as well as to nineteenth-century ancestors and the places occupied by these tipuna, in a lateral as well as a linear fashion. This understanding of multi-runanga membership as determined by whakapapa is refuted by many ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, but for those who accept such an interpretation of whakapapa, it serves to strengthen the public narrative about whakapapa as the bond that unites all Ngai Tahu Whanui members to one another, as the following example indicates:

\(^{17}\)‘Each member of Ngai Tahu Whanui is entitled to be a member of each Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui to which he or she can establish entitlement by descent’ [s 13(1) Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996].
Our strength comes through our recognition and acknowledgement of our diversity. Hoped that the vision document provides for the different voices within Ngai Tahu and acknowledge that the one thing that unites us is our whakapapa. [Ngai Tahu individual: notes from Kaikoura Hui a Tau: November, 2000]

The following excerpts from the narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals illustrate the varied considerations of how runanga identity 'fits' in the multiple strands of Maori identity for 'experienced Ngai Tahu':

*I've heard Charles, I've heard Stephen say, I whakapapa to all eighteen runanga and I say kia ora, I whakapapa back to Wairewa. Well one or two really, because Onuku, as far as I'm concerned personally, Onuku is part and parcel of Wairewa, whilst they may have status as a papatipu runanga, that was done at a time when even the use of the word papatipu was very new to everyone. In their own right, they have their Upoko. They've got their marae. They've got the people. When we talk about hapu and particularly for hapu of Ngati Irakehu, my whakaaro, my thoughts on that are Wairewa is the centre of that hapu and the reason I think its the centre is because Rapaki also whakapapas back to Ngati Puki; Koukourarata whakapapa back to Tuahuriri; Onuku whakapapa to Irakehu and some of Ngai Tarewa; Taumutu whakapapas back to Tuahikihiki; whilst they all whakapapa into Irakehu, Wairewa only whakapapas back to Irakehu. So we're the purist and we're the future of the universe for Irakehu as far as I'm concerned. [*' Experienced Ngai Tahu' woman on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: July 1999]*

In this narrative excerpt it is interesting to note the use of both the vertical and the horizontal as spatial metaphors to describe uses of whakapapa whereby vertical connection is the privileged identity at hapu level and at Ngai Tahu Whanui level horizontal connection is privileged, as the following excerpt from kaumatua Jim Pohio shows:

*Well, they had a runanga group and all the business of the community was conducted through that group. The chairman was elected. That worked quite well. There has been no link back to the Land Court system since, in respect of claimants' rights. All rights are held within the Ngai Tahu structures - the House of Tahu, or TRONT and the eighteen runanga. So they won't appear in the Land Court anymore, not unless sufficient beneficiaries get together and challenge the Ngai Tahu Runanga Bill. In respect of those interests that had already been
determined and issued with a title. Each had their own individual part of the reserves, and that's all they were entitled to. I suppose my spiritual ties are here in the South Island, not Tuahiwi, all the way through, I've got links with virtually every runanga, every area in the South Island, Stewart Island. That's where my people left me rights and that’s where I can claim a right to stand. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

There was a group that met (a runanga) in one another's houses. They would get about 30 or 40 at the meetings, mostly men. Previous to the Trust Board there was a sort of council of important people. They knew about the injustices firsthand, the old people. The politics involved these meetings and dealing with the Land Court, making submissions to government, petitioning government to stop Council from building roads through their pa sites..... There wasn’t a marae here [Kaikoura] then, the marae came in 1987. We used to use halls, etc. [B. Solomon: Life History: 2000]

When I asked Jim Pohio if his four grown children maintain their connections to runanga, he responded:

Not really. They know of it, but not, they don't worry about it, they don't need it, they're independent. It's what you put together yourself that counts most. Still, being a runanga member qualifies one for benefit from claim settlements. [Life History: 1997]

It is interesting that hapu is asserted not solely as a sub-tribal alternative to runanga, but as well as runanga, and prior to iwi:18

---

18 This is in keeping with Benedict Anderson's treatment of nation as 'an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign' [1991: 5-6]. The sovereignty of iwi is a conceptual category, shifting into the background where local needs and identities take precedence.

According to Roger Maaka, 'There are certainly a number of shortcomings with tribes as representative bodies for all Maori in all circumstances, and clearly there exists an identifiable Maori ethnicity, nevertheless to consider one as an alternative to the other misunderstands the nature of the interrelationships between an over-arching ethnic identity and its constituent, contributing identities.' In making this argument, Roger refers to Stephen Cornell's The Return of the Native, Oxford University Press, New York, 1988, who discusses the situation of Native Americans and argues that while there is a tension between pan-Indian and the individual First Nation identities, they are interactive and interdependent [1998: 204].

Roger Maaka also indicates that government prefers to deal with Maori 'in terms of tribe as in 'iwi'', but that this strategy is proving problematic [1998: 203].
We are becoming a mob until we start comparing notes and work out who we are, relationships, our links with each other, whatever. But when we call ourselves Ngai Tahu, we know if we go back far enough, we'll find a common family tie, or hapu tie, or whatever. We go back to Tahu Potiki himself who is the Ngai Tahu ancestor who links us all together even though he did not himself walk the land unopposed. Tahu Potiki ties us as an iwi or tribe. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

Having whakapapa at many runanga allows one to vote at many runanga, but it doesn't mean [stronger whakapapa]. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

In the following example, the Upoko for Wairewa runanga sets out the possible approaches for the members of the runanga to considerations of the Ngai Tahu Deed of Settlement proposed by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, prior to the postal vote:

We have three options this morning:

1. We do it as a runanga
2. We do it as a hapu
3. We do it as individuals

The hapu option wanes. The runanga is probably the best, done by a limited number of people but with the backing of the runanga. [M. Daniels: October 1997]

For 'experienced Ngai Tahu' such as Jim Pohio and Rick Tau, whanau was the primary collective identity of their childhood and therefore continues to be today. Other collective identities become added to a repertoire, but again, those that are introduced by legal-political means – the Ngai Tahu Whanui privileged identities – are recognised for their political origins and political uses:

Families were responsible for all things - the emphasis was on family units looking after their own things/problems.... We were brought up to protect the good name of our family. [R. Tau: Interview: April 1997]
Jim Pohio recognised the historical and political context within which the identities of 'Ngai Tahu iwi' and individual member/beneficiary became more salient than whanau and hapu. He identified the Trust Board, in negotiation with the Crown over claims issues, as responsible for the introduction of a 'pan-Ngai Tahu' identity, whose rights would supersede the traditional territorial rights of families with whakapapa to the 1848 kaumatua. This emphasis on South Island Maori individual identities as 'beneficiaries' continued from the middle of the twentieth century as evidenced in Trust Board, Te Runanganui o Tahu and Te Runanga documentation and in the narratives of individuals:

Some have up to 20 or 30 ancestors or kaumatua in that Blue Book so they can all go back and make a claim on any of those. It becomes very complex. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

Then, in 1996, the identity of 'beneficiary' shifted to 'Ngai Tahu Whanui member' or 'client' [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999], both defined by the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act and in the public narrative. In the public narrative since 1996, 'beneficiary' is still a term used often and interchangeably with 'Ngai Tahu Whanui member' or simply, 'Ngai Tahu'.

**Ngai Tahu Whanui registered member**

Finally, it is imagined as a community, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. [B. Anderson: 1991: 7]

As addressed in Chapters Five and Six, Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership, by its management of whakapapa and a supporting public narrative, asserts a 'Ngai Tahu Nation' in which the individual registered member – citizen – has become a privileged identity. According to Calhoun, 'Nationalist rhetoric
posits whole categories of people without reference to their internal differentiation, or claims priority over all such internal differences; ideally, typically, one is a member of a nation directly as an individual.' [1997: 39]. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative invites ‘new Ngai Tahu’ to embrace the privileged identities.

Thomas Hylland Eriksen suggests that the nation is the metaphorical space in which people locate their personal histories, and thereby their identities. Thus, as he puts it, 'The tree beneath which one first kissed becomes, in this way, a Norwegian tree; the parental house becomes a Norwegian house, and so on....' The biography of individuals is thus appropriated by the nation and connected to the national narrative. Personal identity becomes synonymous with national identity. He also observes that the meaning and relevance of 'the nation' varies enormously over time and its meaning for individuals varies according to personal circumstances [Eriksen: 1997: 109 in Cohen 2000: 152].

The ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ of this research acknowledge their individual identity as Ngai Tahu members, for example:

*It's the responsibility of TRONT c/o Deloittes [a multi-national accounting and auditing firm] to see that this gets to all beneficiaries or tribal members as we're all called. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu representative for Wairewa: runanga wananga: October 1997]*

Their acknowledgement, however, is limited to recognition of the recent legal-political context and practical uses associated with membership, as in the following example:

*They've got me down as a member but not up to date the way they do it now. They want more information from us. They've got to administer a claim on behalf of their kaumatua lists. This is the application form. They ask you to fill in the details if you want to become registered. I've prepared it. I have not yet sent it in and I may not. Once there's a renewal, anyone following from me, they only need to go back to my record and they pick it up from there....*
being a runanga member qualifies one for benefit from claim settlements. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

This narrative illustrates an 'experienced Ngai Tahu' resisting registration because his culture and identity are from lived experience, not from registration enscribed on paper. For 'new Ngai Tahu' culture and ethnic identity are attributed by legislation. Jim Pohio indicated that he did not wish to register because that is what those without embodied connection – 'new Ngai Tahu' – must do.

Chapter Five examined how the strategic management of whakapapa in the time period building up to the Claims Settlement in 1998 attempted to accomplish a 'Ngai Tahu Nation' of individual members, Ngai Tahu citizens. At Onuku, Wairewa and Taumutu runanga meetings and at Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meetings I attended over that period, extensive discussion took place on the issue of voting rights as determined by whakapapa. At a runanga meeting I attended at Te Taumutu [September 1996], a message was discussed that Rick Tau, kaumatua and then Tuahuriri runanga representative on Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, had been circulating. His message was a belief that within Ngai Tahu families, some people have more rights than others. The Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu representative for Te Taumutu, Cath Brown, commented that this sounded like some Ngai Tahu people are more Ngai Tahu than others. This led to a discussion about which rights take precedence: democratic rights as equal members of the collective or rights defined by whakapapa, which were historically hierarchical, tribal assets or individual or family land rights. It was agreed by those present that Te Taumutu runanga would take the position that individual and family ownership remains, but that one person/one vote applied to wider tribal issues.

As indicated by the various ideas of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' (addressed above) on the role of papatipu runanga and the rights of individuals to belong to up to eighteen privileged papatipu runanga, the issue of egalitarian
citizenship rights introduced by Ngai Tahu Whanui is ongoing and subject to multiple perspectives, Ngai Tahu Whanui and *papatipu runanga* identities are acknowledged by ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ as a sort of conceptual community, salient at times but as part of a repertoire of *whakapapa* identities where often local *whakapapa* ties are more relevant. The same applies to consideration of individual member identity. As Ngai Tahu Whanui develops and talks about traditional identities associated with significant ancestral place declines, ‘new Ngai Tahu’ may increasingly accept their egalitarian identities as registered members – citizens – over traditional hierarchal *whakapapa* identities. This is already evidenced in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu documentation.

‘Unprivileged’ Identities in the narratives of ‘Experienced Ngai Tahu’

As indicated in Chapters Five and Eight, the privileging of Ngai Tahu Whanui identities excludes other identities from membership in the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’. In this chapter I have already addressed how the excluded identities of *hapu*, *whanau* and North Island *iwi* are considered in the narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’. According to Calhoun, ‘nationality...becomes one large categorical identity that encompasses many smaller categories...each of which may be organised internally on the basis of further categories and complex networks of interpersonal relationships.’ [1997: 39]. In this section I consider how other identities excluded by Ngai Tahu Whanui’s management of *whakapapa* and narrative, are talked about and understood by the ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ of this research.

**Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe**

As addressed in Chapters Five and Eight, by the management of *whakapapa* and a supporting public narrative, the tribal identities of Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe are subsumed within Ngai Tahu Whanui. The public narrative acknowledges Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe for their separateness prior to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. I have not personally witnessed any
challenges to the encompassing of these two historical tribal identities. I am aware, however, that there are some individuals, both registered and unregistered members of Ngai Tahu Whanui,¹⁹ who continue to assert their whakapapa to either Waitaha or Ngati Mamoe as separate from their Ngai Tahu whakapapa. Statistics that are compiled by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu indicate that in 1998, some Ngai Tahu were continuing to assert ‘Waitaha’ identity [T. O'Regan: Canterbury University lecture: September 22, 1998]. As an ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ woman on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu explained to me:

Te Runanga acknowledges Waitaha but in name only. And that’s why within the whole whanau concept of Ngai Tahu whanui, that’s why you have those debates that you have within family because those that are very staunch Waitaha, Ngati Mamoe. I guess for me it’s not just about using those words in legislation, it’s about living those things and acknowledging that yes, they are part of our whakapapa. [Interview: July 1999]

In his life history, kaumatua Syd Cormack stated:

I’ve collected quite a bit from Polynesian Society journals and that sort of thing. There’s about three or four genealogies of Waitaha that back up Te Maihaoa’s, and I know where the people came from. There’s one in the Journal of the Polynesian Society, and all it’s got is Tauira, well that’s Tauira from Colac Bay. Some of those genealogies were quoted to me, but I don’t know where they came from, and I don’t think anybody else knows. But they come down, and you can put any of the tribes onto them, you can put Kai Tahu, you can put Kati Mamoe. They all come down. When you get those ones a long way back, come down so far, and then you can go into Waitaha, come down Waitaha into Kati Mamoe or Kai Tahu.

Kai Tahu claim Tuahuriri as their tupuna. Well, Tuahuriri was a beaten man. He was chased out of Miramar Peninsula by his own people. And that was the

¹⁹There are Waitaha individuals who still meet regularly as an iwi group and assert Waitaha whakapapa. Some assert this as well as their Ngai Tahu whakapapa, and some assert this instead of Ngai Tahu whakapapa. According to Terry Ryan, Whakapapa Unit Manager, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, the assertion by a small group as Waitaha as a separate iwi identity in the South Island, has tapered off since the settlement in 1998. Terry Ryan has himself been actively involved in the Waitaha Cultural group for nearly thirty years and on prior occasions has asserted his Waitaha identity but in response to my question about whether some registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members still prefer to assert their Waitaha identity as foremost, he responded, ‘we are all New Zealanders’ [Interview: June 2002].
raruraru that caused the movement from the North Island to the South island, by
the last of the Kai Tahu..... When the Kai Tahu defeated the Kati Mamoe at
Pariwhakatau, north of the Conway, the Kai Tahu chief Tu Rakautahi was
wounded in the thigh and they carried him to Kaiapoi. There was no Kati
Mamoe living at that time between Pariwhakatau and Banks Peninsula. Kai
Tahu carried him down there, and he is the man that gives Kai Tahu the right to
Canterbury, because he settled there. But he was half Kati Mamoe. The people
north, up Kaiapoi way, they'd be half Kati Mamoe and half Kai Tahu.

Down here in Murihiku, in Southland, Kai Tahu influence is very small. The
people might have been only a thirty-second Kai Tahu through intermarriage.

A while back somebody asked me, 'What are you?' I says, 'I'm Waitaha, Kati
Mamoe, and Kai Tahu.' As well, I can give whakapapa back to Porourangi,
which is Ngati Porou. And to Kahungunu. The daughter of Porourangi and the
grandson of Tahu Potiki married Kahungunu, and you have the three - Ngati
Porou, Kahungunu, Kai Tahu.

There's quite a bit of early Waitaha history down here in Southland....

The Ngai Tahu Trust Board is annoying a lot of people down here by making
them just Kai Tahu when, really, they're not Kai Tahu. They might have a little
bit of Kai Tahu, but they're mainly Kati Mamoe - or Waitaha. That's the way it
is down in this part here, Southland. That's why you've got all these different
customs, different language, and the whole lot of it here in the South.
[Cormack: 1997: 149-153]

In my observations, contemporary Ngai Tahu do not assert their Waitaha and
Ngati Mamoe whakapapa in meetings/hui at Ngai Tahu settings, nor in their
personal narratives. However, ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ acknowledge that
their whakapapa extends further in history than 1840/1848 and that this
includes Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe tribal whakapapa.

'Non-South Island Maori' identities

An interesting trend I began to observe from 1998, following the passing of
the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 and the 1998 Ngai Tahu Settlement, is
the acknowledgement by both 'experienced' and 'new' Ngai Tahu of the
strands of their whakapapa that are not South Island Maori. Ngai Tahu
individuals comfortable in the security of their registered Ngai Tahu Whanui
membership, and with the emphasis on Claims settlement passed, are acknowledging the multiple and complex whakapapa they hold beyond South Island Maori. This incorporates whakapapa to North Island tribes,\(^{20}\) to Pakeha\(^{21}\) and even to First Nations People in North America ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' woman: Onuku: Waitangi Day 1999].\(^{22}\) Over the weekend of the Crown Apology Hui at Onuku, November 1998, I was fascinated by the open forum discussion in which several ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ were asserting their whakapapa and identities as multiple and extending beyond the South Island.\(^{23}\) These assertions were made with an air of confidence about the

\(^{20}\) According to a Ngai Tahu kaumatua, Syd Cormack:

Genealogy - Maori relationship is a long way wider than European relationship. You can take a line back to practically any of the principal people who are mentioned in the South Island - Kai Tahu, or any of them before it, though no one has gathered much of the Kati Mamoe genealogy. [1997: 145]

\(^{21}\) According to Benedict Anderson:

Even in the case of colonised peoples who have every reason to feel hatred for their imperialist rulers, it is astonishing how insignificant the element of hatred is in these expressions of national feeling.... Something of the nature of this political love can be deciphered from the ways in which languages describe its object: either in the vocabulary of kinship (motherland, Vaterland, patria) or that of home (heimat or tanah air [earth and water, the phrase for the Indonesians’ native archipelag]). Both idioms denote something to which one is naturally tied. As we have seen earlier, in everything ‘natural’ there is always something unchosen. In this way, nation-ness is assimilated to skin-colour, gender, parentage and birth-era - all those things one can not help. And in these ‘natural ties’ one senses what one might call ‘the beauty of gemeinschaft’. To put it another way, precisely because such ties are not chosen, they have about them a halo of disinterestedness. [1991: 140-145]

\(^{22}\) It is interesting that Ngai Tahu individuals in the post-settlement era, are now voicing that they are part of a web of whakapapa associations wider and wider to include North Island iwi, Pakeha and North American First Nation’s peoples, yet do not consider the web of whakapapa to be as Anderson coins, ‘coterminous with mankind’. As Benedict Anderson puts it, ‘The nation is imagined as limited because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind’ [1991: 7]

\(^{23}\) Angela Ballara also stresses the complex and multiple identities of Maori in the twentieth century. Following is one example of the life of a Ngai Tahu kaumatua, Erura Stirling:

In the mid 1940s, to be a Maori was to share in a complex and sometimes unconscious, shifting or balancing act of identity, or so it might seem to outsiders. At Poho-o-Rawiri meeting-house in Gisborne, Erura Stirling was Te Whanau-a-Apau. In the South Island he was Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare of Ngati Porou. When his mother, Mihi was Te Whanau-a-Raukokore he was Te Whanau-a-Maru. Sometimes he was Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare of Ngati Porou. When his mother, Mihi Kotukutuk was she wanted her house, Hine Mahuru at Wairuru marae, carved before other houses, she
security of Ngai Tahu Whanui identity that I had not witnessed before. Many statements illustrated the desire by Ngai Tahu to hold a distinctive identity vis-à-vis North Island tribes. Some connected Ngai Tahu whakapapa to all Maori and some were assertions of whakapapa to First Nations people in North America. For example:

_There's no iwi in New Zealand that isn't within Ngai Tahu._ [T. Ryan, Manager Whakapapa Unit]

_I'm aware too of our European side and we've got to take notice of it._ [T. Ryan, Manager Whakapapa Unit]

_We have to be aware of the many differences between us._ [T. Ryan, Manager Whakapapa Unit]

_Be proud of all your tipuna. Don't choose one over the other._ [T. Ryan, Manager, Whakapapa Unit]

_You can't be Ngai Tahu without being Waitaha or Ngati Mamoe and they're all in here [1848 Census]._ [T. Ryan, Manager Whakapapa Unit]

_I'm Ngai Tahu and I'm proud to be white._ ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' woman]

[Ngai Tahu man]: _I'm just as proud of my First Nation whakapapa as of my Ngai Tahu whakapapa..._ [Terry Ryan]: _What tribe are you?..._ [Ngai Tahu man]: _I'm 1/20 Red Indian from Nova Scotia and so is Aroha....._ [Aroha, 'experienced Ngai Tahu' woman]: _Our people in Canada don't like to be called Red Indians. We are the First Nations of Canada._

---

was acting for her mana and that of her hapu, Te whanau-a-Maru, but when she gave in to Apirana Ngata's persuasion and gave money for the carving of Tukaki at Te Kaha she was conceding to Ngata's wish that her tribe, Te Whanau-a-apanui, have central marae to discuss the tribe's problems.

Little was new about this situation in the 20th century, save the need for a central marae for the tribe; Maori had been coping with multiple identities for centuries.

When Eruera spoke as and for Te Whanau-a-Ruataupare of Ngati Porou the switch from Te Whanau-a-Apanui was not unconscious; he could deliberately choose one of his lines of descent as more suitable than another on a particular occasion. What was important was that he belonged to both by descent'. [1998: 335]

As this example shows, Maori whakapapa and identity are both matrilineal and patrilineal.
I wanted to speak from one Indian to another Indian.... I am an honorary Cree Indian with a Cree mokopuna. [Ngai Tahu man]

The following excerpts from my interview with Kaiwhakahaere, Mark Solomon also illustrate the multiple nature of identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu:

I'm Maori and Pakeha. My mom's a Pakeha. I'm proud of my European heritage, I mean I don't exist without my mum.

I have two sides.... I can't see why Maori and Pakeha can't work together.

I'm of German, French, Danish, English and Maori descent. I have been brought up mainly with my Maori side. Most people know who I am through my family name. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

And from another 'experienced Ngai Tahu' man:

I don't know that's it's just about being Ngai Tahu, I think it's the overall Maori thing. Like through my mother I'm Te Atawa from up north and Tu Wharetoa which is a pretty strong tribe up there as well. ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' man on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: April 1997]

From my observations, it is the educated Ngai Tahu who have worked in the offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, some over 50 years of age,\(^{24}\) but mainly

\(^{24}\) For example, Sir Tipene O'Regan has said:

I was told by Te Arawa, in a bit of a dispute ... that I should shut my mouth because I was nothing but a Pakeha with a whakapapa. I didn't have a standing in the debate. And I said, 'well, I certainly wasn't going to claim that I was a Maori'. I wasn't! I was Ngai Tahu, and that was something that he couldn't deny. In other words I didn't have something that he could take. And I remember the realisation that came upon me at that time - I felt enormously liberated from any compulsion to front up as Maori....

I regard myself as Ngai Tahu. I regard myself as a New Zealander of Irish descent - so I value hugely the Western tradition that lies behind that Irish descent, and being a New Zealander ... but the thing that makes me uniquely of this place - is my Ngai Tahu descent. I'm not interested in that being a part of a general Maori descent in particular. [in H. O'Regan: 2001: 55]
the under-40 'young Ngai Tahu academics' who assert their Ngai Tahu identity to distinguish themselves from North Island iwi. For example, Hana O'Regan has written:

I always felt more Maori than I imagined my blood quantum allowed for. I had a passion for the language, the sound of it, it’s poetry. I felt Maori, yet this feeling, that sense of identity, didn't correspond with the perceptions held about me in the wider community. I was white, one-eighth Maori blood, and what's more - I was Kai Tahu - all of which presented themselves as obstacles to acceptance into the Maori community. [H. O'Regan: 2001: 19]

And George Te Au:

Ngai Tahu identity to me is very important, 'cause I can proclaim to the world, that not only am I a Maori - but my tribal identity is Ngai Tahu, and nothing else.' [in H. O'Regan: 2001: 55]

25 There is a theme in Hana O'Regan's book that is about asserting Ngai Tahu identity vis-à-vis North Island Maori and asserting Ngai Tahu above Maori as an identity, both from Hana and from the contributors.

Another example from a Ngai Tahu woman:

Growing up in my family the way I did, I had never really given much thought to who I was and where I came from. For many years that was my attitude. I was from New Zealand, I knew that I was part-Maori, but I never knew what that meant.

I came to the conclusion that being Maori is not about the colour of your skin. It is about family, heritage and ancestry. But I have more than one set of family, heritage and ancestry. Therefore I cannot place more importance over one part of my heritage than the other. My mother's ancestry relates back to Scotland, my father's father to Holland. Therefore, how does a person such as myself piece together my past to get a balance of who I should be today? I am not one of a kind, there are many Maori like myself. We are the New Traditionalists, descendants of not only Maori but many other races.

I discovered what tribe I was from in 1991. I had known before this, but until then it was only a name to me. I did not feel a part of Ngai Tahu, mainly because of the colour of my skin... ['Te Karaka': Winter 1999: 36-37]

Rheina Whaitiri, a Ngai Tahu woman has written:

Many links with North Island people were formed, through marriage and subsequently through the children. The Maori women of the deep south and the men from up north were doing what our people had always done. Moving in, and through conquest and marriage, changing the tribal make-up of the people. Our old people did not like this mingling of blood and warned against fraternising with ‘those North Island Maori’, those ‘head-hunters’, those ‘Boongs’. I chose a descendant of Te Rauparaha, which went down very badly. I had no idea who Te Rauparaha was and was not moved at all by the objections of my old people. Later, I found that Te Rauparaha had had intentions of taking over the South Island – so no wonder they were against it. [1998: 174]
New hierarchies of *mana* and 'cultural credibility' have developed to distinguish registered members within Ngai Tahu Whanui since the beginning of a 'national' identity. These include knowledge of *te reo* and Ngai Tahu *tikanga* ('Tahutanga'), according to Ngai Tahu Whanui versions.\(^{26}\) The development of these new Ngai Tahu Whanui cultural 'traits' also assert separate identity from North Island tribes, beside which Ngai Tahu have sometimes experienced a sense of cultural inferiority.\(^{27}\)

Interestingly, it is the younger (under 40 years) registered members who are now acquiring these resources, starting with the young academics employed within the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu centralised structures and trickling down through Ngai Tahu Development Corporation programmes and policies to Ngai Tahu Whanui children. Most 'experienced Ngai Tahu' did not have these resources when they were growing up. As a result, the cultural competence, voice, knowledge and status of *kaumatua* are being minimised. *Kaumatua* are called upon occasionally for the recording of their knowledge, but while the experiences of this generation bordered between the 'traditional' and the urban ways of the dominant culture, it seems their experiences are being called upon only inasmuch as this contributes to new developments of Ngai Tahu Whanui's story.\(^{28}\)

\(^{26}\) As explained further in Chapter Ten, 'time done' at the *marae* is a key criterion set by Ngai Tahu Whanui members to determine one's degree of cultural authenticity, one's degree of 'Ngai Tahu-ness'.

\(^{27}\) For example, Cath Brown wrote:

I notice that some of the most vociferous [North Island Maori who resent Ngai Tahu] because 'we have lots of Pakeha blood in us' - while they may look more Maori than me - can't speak Maori. And that's the criterion by which they seem to judge your Maoriness, is whether you have te reo or not ... We didn't match up to how they thought we ought to look, and how they thought we ought to sound when we spoke. [in H. O'Regan: 2001: 63]

\(^{28}\) As Tahu Potiki, C.E.O. of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu stated:

There are a few of them, they are unquestionably, undeniably Ngai Tahu and they carry a thousand years of history and knowledge when they do things, you know, about collecting seafood, or about cooking food, or about digging a hole, or working with the living ... They have an understanding of the language - and I guess that's part of it. It's about a conceptual understanding - like you speak to Uncle Mick, and you present something to him, that he - for whatever reason - perceives as a Pakeha idea.
I asked a young Ngai Tahu man who had been working for the Ngai Tahu Whanui for several years what would constitute _mana_ in Ngai Tahu today. He replied that it would probably be one's knowledge of Ngai Tahu culture – _tikanga_ and _Ngai Tahutanga_. He also commented that in his parents' generation, English, not Maori, was spoken. This is why most meetings are conducted in English, with formal _powhiri_, etc., in Maori - 'it is English with Maori woven in'. His generation has begun to learn Maori, and their children are now becoming bilingual. He also commented that many young Ngai Tahu men are beginning to adopt North Island Maori cultural practices on Ngai Tahu _marae_ as a way to assert Maori culture, for example, taking off one's shoes before entering the _whare_, something that has not historically been a part of South Island Maori culture [Interview: April 1997].

Ngai Tahu Whanui – must one ‘belong’ to ‘be’?

The structure that manages Ngai Tahu _whakapapa_, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, has evolved in particular contexts of time and political practice to take on the role of creating order and homogeneity among South Island Maori identities that have historically been characterised by both inter- and intra-tribal heterogeneity, chaos and challenge. The rise of the Ngai Tahu role with its associated gatekeepers, constitutes just one of many possible approaches to managing identities. The stories of Ngai Tahu individuals indicate that the introduction of the roll has impacted on the framing of their identity.

Ngai Tahu Whanui is a sub-set of the wider collection of South Island Maori who claim Ngai Tahu as part of their _whakapapa_ and identity. Beyond Ngai Tahu Whanui, there are individuals identified by the Whakapapa Unit who can claim Ngai Tahu identity but who have not registered their Ngai Tahu _whakapapa_ in the Whakapapa Unit. Koa Mantell, in her hierarchic scale of

---

And he'll give you a funny, screwed-up look, and he'll say, 'oh well, I suppose you'll do that brought up in the Pakeha ways', you know - that's how he sees the world. It's like his world view is Ngai Tahu. It's like his world view has been constructed with Maori, with te reo - or something - even though it hasn't been used. [in H. O'Regan: 2001: 64]

29 Refer to the identity hierarchies compiled by Terry Ryan and Koa Marshall earlier in this chapter [in H. O'Regan: 2001: 97-99].
‘Ngai Tahu-ness’ refers to these as ‘Quasi-Ngai Tahu: those who are Ngai Tahu by descent but are unaware that they are’ [in H. O’Regan: 2001: 97-99]. Koa Mantell and Terry Ryan also point to a group of Ngai Tahu who by right of whakapapa could be registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members but choose to ‘shun’ their Ngai Tahu identity. Koa refers to this group as ‘Repudiators’. They will deny having any such ancestry and therefore disclaim affiliation to Ngai Tahu. Terry Ryan refers to this group as the third of his three categories: ‘The third is the Ngati Porou, in particular - not so much Kahungunu but still Kahungunu, but definitely Ngati Porou – who shun, to be honest, any Tahu connection, because it wasn’t deemed politically correct.... Mantell suggests that descendants of ‘Repudiators’ are likely to fall into the ‘Quasi-Ngai Tahu’ category [in H. O’Regan: 2001: 97-99].

The assertion of collective Maori identities is very much situated in political practice through history [see Ballara: 1998, A. Anderson: 1998, T. O’Regan: 1993, 1991]. The rise in registered members of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board and, subsequently, of the Ngai Tahu Whanui, from around 2,000 in the mid-1980s to around 30,000 in 1998 is evidence of this.

Through the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals, the rich range of possibilities can be appreciated. From my participant observation, I have identified a category of those who choose to either not register their whakapapa in the Whakapapa Unit or to consider registration as necessary only to be eligible for

---

30 According to Angela Ballara:

The title of this book [Iwi] concerns the many ‘iwi’ of Aotearoa, but in both 19th- and 20th-century Maori terminology these descent groups could perfectly well be alternatively termed hapu. In a phrase derived from a 1929 source, large, numerous, modern tribes such as Ngati Kahungunu and Ngati Porou could be termed ‘nga hapu kaha o te motu’ (the powerful descent groups of the country). The same source includes the following phrase: ‘he hapu nui a Ngati Kahungunu’. Translated with the standard gloss this would mean: ‘Ngati Kahungunu is a large subtribe’. To Maori, early 20th-century ‘tribes’ were contemporary descent groups, derived from others back along the long line recorded in whakapapa, which were currently the more powerful hapu or corporate groups of the country. [1998: 272-273]
any benefits arising out of the 1998 Claims Settlement. These individuals are over forty years of age, have been involved in life at the marae and in the relationships represented by their whakapapa and have recognised the arrival of the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll and its associated gatekeepers for their situation in contexts of time and political practice. These individuals take part in Ngai Tahu life, if not in terms of attendance at runanga and/or Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu events, then in terms of whanaungatanga and keeping abreast of information about tribal development through these relationships and through the wider media. Some claim Ngai Tahu as their tribal identity, but consider it as one of several tribal identities by right of whakapapa. Becoming a member of Ngai Tahu Whanui is not central to their conception of their tribal or Maori identity because it is not considered as necessary in order to maintain such identity or their experiences as Ngai Tahu. For these individuals, registration of one's whakapapa in the Whakapapa Unit is viewed only for its utilitarian benefits, almost as a necessary evil, yet separate from their personal sense of tribal or Maori identity. For example, Jim Pohio stated:

*That was all the Ngai Tahu who were alive in 1848 [the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll]. So a person now has to show whakapapa to one or as many as they can.... No, that's my own. I don't go to them. No, sorry, the Whakapapa Unit is really only the keepers of records from 1848 up until now. I've got my own records which go back much further....*

*They've got me down as a member but not up to date the way they do it now. They want more information from us. They've got to administer a claim on behalf of their kaumatua lists. This is the application form. They ask you to fill in the details if you want to become registered. I've prepared it. I have not yet sent it in and I may not. Once there's a renewal, anyone following from me, they only need to go back to my record and they pick it up from there. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]*

Sophie Kaa, a Ngai Tahu woman living in the North Island and not involved in the tribal life of Ngai Tahu in the South Island, claims Ngai Tahu identity in her life history [as recorded by Judith Fyfe: 1990] in a way that sounds almost defensive, as if that part of her Maori identity has been questioned. Sophie's son refers to his mother's whakapapa in a piece in Wiki Ihimaera's book, 'Growing up Maori' [1998: 104-109]. He refers to his whakapapa as Ngati Porou, Rongowhakaata and Kahungunu, but does not include his Ngai Tahu
whakapapa. This example leads to questions as to the criterion for claiming identity, and whether Sophie Kaa has indeed registered her whakapapa with Ngai Tahu Whanui.

In several meetings of the Trust Board or Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meetings or annual tribal Hui a Tau, I have listened to a representative from the Chief Negotiating Team disparaging a challenger to some aspect of the leadership’s approach to claims settlement or tribal development or legitimacy of the current structure. The comments have always been in the form of denying or questioning the legitimacy of the whakapapa of these individuals.

It is not only individuals who at some stage in history have chosen to maintain their Ngai Tahu whakapapa independently of the Whakapapa Unit. In a 1993 Te Runanganui o Tahu meeting, I listened to a significant discussion on the preference of one runanga to receive and maintain the whakapapa records for their runanga. Just before the 1998 Settlement, this issue was raised by other runanga and was discussed at runanga meetings and at hui organised by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu has continued to follow the policy that an individual must register his/her whakapapa in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit in Christchurch. This is now laid down in the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. While the definition of Ngai Tahu Whanui in the Act refers to all Ngai Tahu who can claim whakapapa to an 1848 kaumatua, as recorded in the 1925 lists held in the Whakapapa Unit, access to rights and benefits is available only to those who register in the Whakapapa Unit.31

---

31 As well as individuals who may be eligible to become Ngai Tahu Whanui members upon registering their whakapapa in the Whakapapa Unit, the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals indicate another possible category of those excluded from this right. These are individuals who claim that their ancestors were Ngai Tahu but were somehow excluded from the 1925 and/or nineteenth century lists. As Syd Cormack, a Ngai Tahu kaumatua states in his life history:

My mother wouldn't have anything to do with Maoris, through her people being put out of Maori lists. Tete, Hinewhitia, and Ruakaio, Piki's daughters, were cut out for a start by Mantell, the government agent [in Mantell's 1848 lists for Kemp's Purchase], and then some of the Maori people themselves stood up and said, 'These people have no right to land.' Some other Maoris at Moeraki didn't like them. But that was the
An 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individual involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu pointed out to me another category of contemporary Ngai Tahu who may possibly miss out on the right to register with Ngai Tahu Whanui and hence, miss recognition of their Ngai Tahu identity. If a person's grandparent has not registered in the Whakapapa Unit, there is a possibility that this person could

fault of the court then, because the court should have asked, 'What is these people's genealogy?' And it would have known who they were then....

See, my Mum was bitter, so was my grandmother, for the simple reason they were kicked out. And it's just the magnitude of what went on, because they did it to both sides of the family.... they should have had large shares in Maori land from their lineage. But they had nothing. That's what made them bitter...

I've got the application in for the Waitangi Tribunal now, to have their [my family] names put back in the lists. You could ask for compensation, but I doubt if you'd get any. I knew of a lot of other people, I don't know whether I could name any now, because it's that long ago. The same sort of thing happened - their families were left out of the lists. Even Mantell, the government agent, he left nearly half out of the lists. When the court sat in 1868 to hear evidence of who should go into the reserves, the grantees, there was nearly twice as many people. They didn't extend the reserve any more, they just crowded the lot in. If they could show a reason, they went in. That's why quite a few were cut out - because others objected to them. If they weren't in the court, or couldn't prove up, that meant they were left out. They had to appeal to the court to get some of the names put back into the Ngai Tahu lists by 1920. Well, a lot of them didn't have the money.

There's that many things that show up now. [1997: 24-25]

Oh, there's lots of things. I listed about forty cases round the coast between Sand Hill Point on the western side of Te Waewae Bay and Otago, of wrongdoing by the Crown, handed them over to the Waitangi Tribunal.... A lot of skulduggery went on, even by Maoris, right throughout the piece, right from the start. Putting people out, leaving one branch of the family off, and that sort of thing. Might be a tiff at the time, or that side might be doing a little better than they are.

There's more. Kai Tahu doesn't want to acknowledge the Kaikoura people as Rangitane, only as Kai Tahu, because they're frightened they'll bring the Rangitane line into the south, and Kai Tahu's right up against them, with the Rangitane's counter claim to the Tribunal [see Evison]. The wife's people at Mangamaunu - the fortns - go back to Rangitane, and Waha Aruhe's wives at South Bay, they were Rangitane.

Those old people you talked to, they could give you a fairly good idea of what they were talking about and what happened. If you know enough about the history you can put their pieces of information back into the history. That's what I'm trying to do.... There's a lot of research needed yet.... When you read up in history and then you went and had a yarn to some of the old kaumatua about it, they said, 'Oh well, that's not right.' Even Herries Beattie [historian who researched South Island Maori settlement], he gives quite a bit that he can't understand. [Cormack: 1997: 143-156]
not register, i.e., if one cannot prove the whakapapa of one’s ancestors, and these ancestors are not already listed in the Whakapapa Unit, registration is not possible. This individual hints that maybe the Whakapapa Unit, as agents, should provide more assistance to such individuals [Interview: December 2001].

I have also contacted a young person who has recently become aware of possessing ‘Maori blood’ through a medical experience and upon calling the Ngai Tahu Whakapapa Unit for guidance as to how to find out about the whakapapa of her ancestors, was told there is no assistance available unless there are names of ancestors that match those in the Whakapapa CDRom.

Summary

This chapter has drawn on the narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals to critically engage the Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative by examining how whakapapa, the meta-themes of time and ‘The Claim’ and the privileged identities of the new ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ are considered in the personal narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ individuals.

Despite the multiple and contingent nature of considerations of identity for Ngai Tahu, acceptance of membership in a wider collective of other members by way of shared whakapapa is unquestioned. While ‘new Ngai Tahu’ are invited by the public narrative to consider this shared membership as a bond of shared whakapapa, the considerations of this are more complex for ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’. From my observation of Ngai Tahu settings and the narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, I have discovered that all Ngai Tahu who take part in local or centralised activities, feel part of a wider tribal identity. All consider this tribal identity to be based in some way in whakapapa. As in the public narrative, individual understandings of whakapapa and its metaphoric associations are then interwoven in the meta-themes and personal experience to produce a repertoire of identities.
While ‘new Ngai Tahu’ may increasingly accept the meta-themes as presented in the public narrative to ‘emplot’ [Somers: 1994: 616-617], their ‘national ethnic’ identities, ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ incorporate elements of the public narrative into the constitution of their personal ethnic identities to acknowledge membership in the new legal-political identity, but they also consider the meta-themes in different ways to include their place in the collective identities of whanau, hapu, other iwi and even as Pakeha. To identify the embeddedness of the privileged identities in contexts of history and political practice requires a sociological imagination brought about by experience of the whakapapa relationships (whanaungatanga) prior to the introduction of Ngai Tahu Whanui in 1996.

As stated in Chapter Six, drawing on Paine [2000: 153], the underlying assumptions of universalism and common citizenship are little compatible with, indeed often contradict, the assumptions of South Island Maori collective identities historically. For this reason, I was somewhat surprised to hear ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ acknowledge their membership in Ngai Tahu Whanui as part of their repertoire of whakapapa identities. Somehow, however, acknowledgement is given in a way that does not detract from their ‘unprivileged’ whakapapa identities. Interestingly, iwi and/or Ngai Tahu Whanui national identity are not overlooked. These are considered as relevant in the particular contexts in which they achieve practical ends, but this comes across in a way that presents iwi as a conceptual identity, rather than one that is relevant in the everyday lives of individuals, as hapu is.

However, as addressed in Chapter Four, while ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ individuals talk about the connection of their own lives to history, whakapapa and ‘The Claim’, they never critically engage – question the uses of - whakapapa beyond identifying discrepancies in the original lists. Whakapapa remains protected from absolute scrutiny, reinforcing its potency as a cultural resource and, in turn, contributing to its power as metanarrative in Ngai Tahu public narrative.
What I have also discovered is that it is difficult to distinguish how Ngai Tahu individuals talk about the privileged identities as entities separate from other aspects of their identities. Issues of identity, those privileged by Ngai Tahu Whanui and those excluded, whakapapa, history and ‘The Claim’ are multiple and complex.\(^{32}\) The fact that the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act incorporates provisions for new papatipu runanga membership and the resolution of boundary disputes reflects the complex historic fluidity of boundaries across runanga and hapu for South Island Maori.\(^{33}\) In August 2000, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu held a wananga scheduled for its members to determine and document the boundaries of runanga. This will be examined in Chapter Ten.

---

\(^{32}\) According to Irihapeti Ramsden, an ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ woman:

Ngai Tahu identity has always been a complex issue. Descent from Ngai Tahu people recorded in the 1848 census establishes the right of the individual to belong to Ngai Tahu, after that every option in the range of human experience applies. [in H. O'Regan: 2001: 10]

\(^{33}\) ‘There may, in accordance with section 17 of this Act, be incorporated in the charter of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu provisions that prescribe a procedure by which the members of Te runanga o Ngai Tahu or a person or body specified in those provisions may consider, after appropriate investigations and hearings, whether any changes should be made to the papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui or to their respective takiwa or to both’ [s 12(1), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996].

‘The person who, or the body which, has jurisdiction under any procedure incorporated in the charter under subsection (1) of this section to consider whether any changes should be made to the papatipu runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui or to their respective takiwa or to both shall not have the power to determine the membership or the takiwa of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu but shall have the power to advise the Minister of Maori Affairs that an Order in Council should be made under section 10(1) of this Act’ [s 12(9), Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996].
Chapter ten

'The location was significant':
Place as a meta-theme

Along with whakapapa and tribal identity goes a sense of place. [O'Regan: 1993: 334]

Thus, as often happened, a strong association with the land was recorded in whakapapa which, like the origin of place names, would be passed down in oral histories. [Parsonson: 2001: 31]

Introduction

My story began at a place of great significance – both in the history of South Island Maori identities and in the history of my time spent among Ngai Tahu. It seems fitting to end my story with a discussion of what I have found to be one of the most significant meta-themes implicated in understandings about identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu – the key role of place. Place as meta-theme commands an entire chapter in this dissertation because it has a two-fold significance in the presentations and understandings of identity, as I have observed them. As well as its significance in Ngai Tahu narratives – personal and public - the understandings and assertions of whakapapa and identity by Ngai Tahu are themselves embedded in geographic contexts.

When I carried out research in 1990/1991, my presence was restricted to attendance at central Trust Board meetings and annual Hui a Tau. Later, as I began attending Ngai Tahu marae around the South Island and positioning myself in these Ngai Tahu locales, I began to witness the added dimension that
the physical context of discussion and narrative brings. Hence, my notes are enriched by my participation in particular places of Ngai Tahu significance.

Place constitutes a key theme, a meta-theme in all Ngai Tahu narratives - personal and public. For the ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ of this research, the significance of place is inextricably embedded in and by all the metanarrative properties of whakapapa, history, kin relationships, political practice surrounding ‘The Claim’, and hence identity. For Ngai Tahu, and Maori generally, place is integral to identity. According to Bishop:

For Maori people, the process of whakawhanaungatanga identifies how our identity comes from our whakapapa and how our whakapapa and its associated raranga korero link us to all other living and inanimate creatures and to the very earth we inhabit. Identity is part of us. Our mountain, our river, our island are us. We are part of them and they are part of us. We know this in a bodily way, more than in a recitation of names. [1996: 215]

According to Ranganui Walker:

Maori land constitutes the main basis of the cultural identity of the Maori people. [1989: 41]

The term ‘tangata whenua’ is translated as ‘the people of the land’. The significance of physical landscape - place - for Ngai Tahu and the integration understandings of whakapapa, history, kin relationships, ‘The Claim’, and identity in place, is illustrated in the following narrative from Sir Tipene O'Regan:

What then, is the substance of this Maori cultural identification with landscape and the coast, with water and mountain, with species and resources? What is its nature and extent? Is it for real?

At the core of the Maori view of landscape is whakapapa or genealogy. It is whakapapa which connects people to each other and which connects people to the land. Our whakapapa connects us to our mythology and our mythology rooted in the land and in the sea. Ultimately we descend from our gods - whatever Darwin might have concluded. Our beliefs about how our mythical ancestors shaped the
land for occupation by our mortal and then our historic ancestors are central to our songs and our songs are central to our identity. The root of whakapapa in the landscape and in the coast ties us to the land and to the sea. Our forbears explored and mapped the land in their oral atlases, they systemised their observation of nature by creating a taxonomy based on whakapapa and they locked their view of creation onto that taxonomy.

I know the traditional stories and placenames of those regions and I love telling them to our young.

If we have failed to ensure that they have the capacity to walk the coast and the mountains of our island, to fly over its chiefly cloak of snow and look upon our place and know and care that, that is the womb from which we spring as a people. That this is the source of who and what we are - Ngai Tahu.... [T. O'Regan: 1999: 14-15]

This chapter addresses how place is presented in both the public and personal narratives of contemporary Ngai Tahu. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative incorporates particular presentations of significant place as a meta-theme. These versions are also integral to the management of whakapapa in order to privilege the identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui. This is integral to the management and governance of the new 'Ngai Tahu Nation'.

Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership, recognising the key role of place in understandings of identity for Ngai Tahu, organises and presents particular versions of significant Ngai Tahu place to delineate and assert the Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation as distinct from Pakeha and from other Maori iwi. How 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals view the importance of place converges at times with its treatment by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership, but in certain contexts they often challenge the leadership. This chapter will consider these issues from the starting point of a series of stories embedded collected about the 1998 Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu, at a place of historical significance for South Island Maori - Onuku, on Banks Peninsula.
Stories from this place - Onuku

In a biting easterly wind at Onuku Marae, the Crown and Ngai Tahu met face to face in a final act of reconciliation.

For nearly 150 years Ngai Tahu has been pursuing its claim against the Crown for breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. Yesterday Prime Minister Jenny Shipley said the official 'sorry'.

Several hundred Ngai Tahu were at the marae, situated in a picturesque coastal setting near Akaroa, to hear the apology.

The location was significant because on May 30, 1840, Ngai Tahu chiefs Iwikau and Tikao signed the Treaty at Onuku... [Christchurch Press: November 30: 1998: 1]

Present on that day, it was a powerful feeling for me to be standing at this place of such historical meaning to the tangata whenua of Onuku and of Te Waipounamu, to witness such an emotional event. The following excerpt from Evison outlines the significance of this place in the history of relations between South Island Maori and the Crown:

On the Ngai Tahu coast it was the Maori custom to be on the lookout. No Maori could afford to be careless of what vessels were on the coast. Everyone learned from childhood of the sudden violence that could arrive by sea. Te Rauparaha had made peace with Ngai Tauahuriri, but no-one could afford to take it for granted, let alone safely assume that we would not attack other hapu with the powerful assistance he might obtain from the new British settlement at Port Nicholson. On Banks Peninsula every settlement had a lookout from which the ocean could be scanned for 50km or more out to sea...

Therefore when a large, unknown sailing ship approached Banks Peninsula from the north on Monday 25th May 1840 her presence was soon known.... When morning came, a boat carrying men from the warship pulled ashore in the rain at Onuku. One of these men greeted the Maoris on shore in the southern dialect...They asked the chiefs to put their marks on a parchment written in Maori and belonging to the British Queen. This was to be a Whakaetanga (agreement) between Maori chiefs and the Queen. The tohu or marks of six northern chiefs were already on the parchment, and many other chiefs, it was said, had already signed other copies at Waitangi in Tai Tokerau (the north of the North Island)....
To Iwikau and Tikao the promise of peace was welcome, for warfare had been a curse to their generation...

After their first landing at Akaroa Bunbury and his party were confined to the "Herald" by a day of storms, but they visited Iwikau and Tikao again with the Treaty on the morning of May 30th. "After a little more explanation," wrote Williams in his journal, "they signed and received their blankets."...

This was the greatest gathering of Ngai Tahu since the threat of war had passed. Every rangatira was entitled to his say, and was expected to defend his whanau's rights to land, kainga, and mahinga kai. The senior chiefs held precedence on matters of policy, and were expected to express the views and defend the interests of their hapu as a whole. Watching over everybody was the spirit of Rakaihautu, the shaper of the land, the footpiece of whose digging stick towered across the harbour in the form of the tall crag of Tuhiraki, where he had planted it after completing his work in days gone by...

The traditional speech-making began with the spokesman for each division of the tribe reciting the names of the lands they claimed to hold, so as to allow their claims to be challenged...

Ngai Tuahuriri replied first. Paora Tau was their senior spokesman, Te One Te Uki ranked highly as an orator, matiaha Tiramorehu was their most learned tohunga, and John Tikao was their businessman. Their first concern was to test Kemp as to whether Governor Grey had kept his promise to restore to Ngai Tahu the "Kaiapoi" portion of the Wairau Purchase... [Evason: 1993: 254-259]

After attending on the day and then reading the coverage in the Christchurch Press, I decided to record the stories of two Ngai Tahu individuals closely involved in events that led to this particular outcome. Here is an excerpt from the story of Mark Solomon, Kaiwhakahaeere of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, about the day:

*How did I feel? Very proud of Ngai Tahu. For a lot of Ngai Tahu, myself included, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu would have walked away from the settlement if the Apology was not included. I was extremely proud of Ngai Tahu when the whariki was laid, sitting on the paepae waiting for the Crown to come on...it was good. And a lot of Ngai Tahu saw that as a good sign. [There was some symbolism in this] because it blew all the chairs flat and then the wind just dropped. So okay, it was time to get on with the Apology and start the healing.*
Yes, I enjoyed the whole process. The past is gone but we've come to a point where we can let our grievance go. My grandfather was an inaugural member of the Ngai Tahu Māori Trust Board. I grew up in a family that was heavily involved in Ngai Tahu politics.

The Apology - that settled a lot of things for me. I can't see why Māori and Pakeha can’t work together. It works in my whanau so I can't see why it can't work in society. I don't think there's any Ngai Tahu that can stand up today that will ever say that the Settlement was fair and just. In my time since I first became involved with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Treasury admitted that what they had taken from Ngai Tahu was valued at between twelve and fifteen billion and then to have to [settle] for $170 million, no one will ever convince me that was fair and just, but its enough.

My personal view is that if Ngai Tahu as a people can't take the opportunity of $170 million to turn their future around...while on one hand I say that I don't accept that it's a fair and just settlement, I believe...it depends on how you look at it, the Crown set themselves a time frame, one of the things that Ngai Tahu said right from day one with the Crown when we went into negotiations, we don't care, we're not asking for it all in one settlement, but they took the view that it all had to be cleaned up....

I disagree with [an 'experienced Ngai Tahu' woman whose story about the day I also recorded] view. We were quite aware that we had two tracks we could go down. If we had taken them to court we believe that we would have beaten them. But a court can only allocate compensation in cash terms. In the settlement as a whole we've got statutory rights on natural resources, we have a say on what happens within our rohe. With the Black box/Green box theory on Akaroa and Kaikoura, all we would have got was cash.¹ [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

I also interviewed a Ngai Tahu woman, whom I chose for two reasons: first, because of her whakapapa connections and close involvement with the daily running of both this marae and Wairewa, very closely linked both geographically, historically and through kin relationships; second, because of her absence on the

¹ The Black box/Green box theory refers to the distinction that was made in the negotiations process between unifying each of the territorial claims into one tribal claim for which a once-off economic settlement would be determined (Green box), as opposed to vying for the particular territorial claims of the areas of Banks Peninsula and Kaikoura (Black box). The ‘Black box’ was considered a sort of ‘trump card’ in the negotiation process. Its separate and territorial settlement was foregone only after a tribal settlement deemed to be satisfactory by the Ngai Tahu Chief Negotiators was reached.
day, which to me, was conspicuous. Onuku as the chosen setting holds particular significance for this woman. Here is her story...

In terms of going over to Onuku that day, I was disappointed for a number of reasons: One, because back in 1992 a stance was taken by Onuku and Wairewa that the Akaroa Purchase was not being fully addressed in the Deed of Settlement and our whanaunga at Onuku have let the Apology happen over there. To me that is tramping on our mana. I've said it at our meeting, that I will be there on Saturday but why would I be there on Sunday?

....Everybody was saying afterward how cold it was over there and I said, I don't really care actually, how can you go over to something, particularly when its in the area of the black box, particularly when it's about the Akaroa Purchase and go over there and say, gee didn't we do well?

....And then everyone came back and said, oh, oh, Stephen [Sir Tipene O'Regan] just about got choked by the koruwi. And I said well, that must be a message for him. That [taking the koruwi off and throwing it to the ground] was noted by everyone....To throw it down. How many other koruwi have tried to choke people and they threw it down on the ground. You see, when you wear a koruwi, we've got a whanau one. It's about the mana of who you are and what you're doing. I think there is a definite meaning to what happened. He would have known. [Experienced Ngai Tahu' woman on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: July 1999]

As this excerpt shows, the setting of Onuku holds significance for Ngai Tahu who have maintained relationships represented by the whakapapa knowledge they have grown up with there - whanaungatanga. Much of this significance arises out of a history of political events surrounding land claims issues from the signing of the Treaty 'then' to the 'now' of these situated stories. Political processes have seen the historical territorial claims for Onuku subsumed within a wider tribal claim. These political events form the context within which the privileged contemporary identities have been introduced.

While Mark Solomon, who claims Kaikoura as his runanga, acknowledges that Akaroa had a particular grievance, he does not speak about the significance of
Onuku as the place of the Crown Apology to Ngai Tahu Whanui. Solomon makes reference to the importance of having ‘a say on what happens within our rohe’. Here, ‘our rohe’ means the rohe of Ngai Tahu Whanui as set out in the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. However, the Ngai Tahu woman from Onuku, would consider her rohe to be that of ‘our whanaunga at Onuku’ – the local rohe of her Ngai Tahu kin who come from and reside at Onuku. There is a sense that the local mana of this rohe has been subsumed within a larger established rohe and that, hence, the Apology should not have happened at Onuku. This is why she chose to be absent on the day.

Interwoven with these two versions of the significance of place are two versions of the significance of time. For the woman from Onuku, consideration is given to the relationship of the day’s events to key political events of the past: the stance taken by Onuku and Wairewa in 1992 and, implicit in this, the rights that Onuku and Wairewa have historically held in this particular place back to the signing of the Treaty and before. For Mark Solomon, there is no consideration of incremental political events through history: ‘The past is gone...we’ve come to a point where we can let our grievance go... it was time to get on with the Apology and start the healing’.

The significance of these divergent views on issues of history, whakapapa and political practice as these are situated in place is further highlighted by the divergent viewpoints on the effects of the weather. Where Mark Solomon focused on the chairs that were set up for the Crown’s representatives and the manuhiri falling flat in the wind before they had a chance to sit, with no mention of Sir Tipene O'Regan choking on the korowai, the woman from Onuku focused on the symbolism of this second incident with no mention of the first. Each took one of these incidents as symbolic of a range of themes around the issue of justice being served in the claims process. Mark Solomon interprets the falling chairs to symbolise justice for Ngai Tahu vis a vis the Crown in Ngai Tahu’s rohe. The Ngai Tahu woman interprets the choking on the korowai upon its being
thrown to the ground as symbolising justice for Onuku vis a vis the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership in Onuku’s rohe. In my observation, the key divergence here hinges on the different interpretations of tangata whenua – people of the land – Ngai Tahu Whanui of Te Waipounamu or Ngati Irahehu (hapu) of Onuku, which in the management and presentation of significant place by Ngai Tahu Whanui, is subsumed within Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu as the representative body of all its registered individual members, regardless of ancestral whakapapa to hapu and local ancestral place, in which for ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, hapu as a kin group is inseparable from hapu as place.

Privileged places of Ngai Tahu Whanui and the interweaving of these in time, ‘The Claim’ and whakapapa in the public narrative

How place is carved up and presented in the public narrative is framed in particular presentations of history and whakapapa and political practices of the claims negotiations. For example:

In the depths of our sadness at losing young people and kaumatua our marae have continued to provide us with a centralizing focus in which whakapapa and history have continued to blend in the traditional way. [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 7]

The management and governance of the ‘Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation’ is framed in associations with particular bounded place. Ngai Tahu is presented as a historically united and homogeneous tribe, inhabiting a particular place, distinct from the tribal place of any other iwi, as tangata whenua. This rohe is Te Waipounamu2 – carved into eighteen distinct territories in keeping with the eighteen papatipu runanga recognised in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996. As this description from Sir Tipene O’Regan outlines:

---

2 From 1997, the South Island is referred to as ‘Te Waipounamu’ (The Greenstone Island). In the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report, only one reference is made to ‘Te Waipounamu’. Interestingly, this is in reference to a project by the then newly formed and short lived Ngai Tahu
The rohe potae (traditional area) of Ngai Tahu is all that part of Te Waipounamu south of a line curving from Te Parinui o Whiti (the White Bluffs east of Wairau lagoons) to Kahuraki Point (on the West Coast, north of Karamea), and includes Rakiura (Stewart Island) and offshore islands, notably Ruapuku and the Titi Islands. The Ngai Tahu tribal community is divided into traditional runanga, or sub-tribal groups. These are, in the main, multi-hapu and marae-based communities. Some are composed of fewer hapu than others. Virtually all contain whakapapa to Kati Hawea and others, who, together with Ngatai Mamoe and Ngai Tahu, form Ngai Tahu Whanui. [T. O'Regan: 1993: 152-153, 1991: 8-9]

These Ngai Tahu Whanui places are rhetorically linked in the public narrative with versions of the meta-themes of whakapapa, time and 'The Claim' to bring potency to the privileged identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui to manage and govern the citizenry of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation'. Thus, Ngai Tahu Whanui can claim manawhenua status over other iwi in this rohe, as tangata whenua of this rohe (area) while simultaneously subsuming the claims of Waitaha and Ngati Mamoe

Cultural Working Party [1996: 28]. Throughout this document, a few references are made to 'Ngai Tahu tribal boundary' and 'the South Island'. The 1997 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report makes no references to Te Waipounamu. The 1998 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report makes two references to 'the South Island' and two references to 'Te Waipounamu'. The 1999 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report makes two references to 'the South Island', one reference to 'the southern islands' and two references to 'Te Waipounamu'.

In a publication entitled 'Introducing Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Remembering the Past and Celebrating the Future', published in 2000 and circulated along with the 2000 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report as part of an information pack for new members, prospective employees and individuals interested in learning about Ngai Tahu, 'South Island' is referred to seven times, 'the southern islands of New Zealand' is referred to once and 'Te Waipounamu' is not referred to at all.

In Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu's 1997 'Crown Settlement Offer: Consultation Document from the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Group', 'South Island' is referred to four times and 'Te Waipounamu' is referred to four times.

Harry Evison's 1993 book Te Waipounamu: The Greenstone Island constitutes the first appearance in the course of my participant observation of 'Te Waipounamu' to describe the South Island. Previous to this, in oral and written discussion, the South Island had always been referred to as 'Te Waka a Maui', setting the South Island up in relation to the North Island 'Te Ika a Maui' [A. Anderson: 1998: 13]. In the historical writings that I have reviewed for this research, only once have I come across the word 'Te Waipounamu' used to refer to the South Island [Stack: 1877: 83].
as collective identities that have, through intermarriage and conquest become Ngai Tahu, occupying Ngai Tahu place. The South Island is presented as the place historically belonging to Ngai Tahu iwi since 1840, and before that to Tahu Potiki, even though Ngai Tahu's eponymous ancestor came from the North Island and never set foot in the South Island.

In the 1997 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu publication 'Tribal Profile' is the first reference to the South Island as Te Waipounamu. Presentation of Te Waipounamu as the territory belonging to Ngai Tahu iwi is interwoven with the metanarrative of whakapapa and the meta-theme of time, to further entrench its contemporary usage in an image of original, unchallenged Maori identity:

Tahu Potiki a Paikea is the ancestor we take our Ngai Tahu name from. His descendants arrived in Te Waipounamu ten generations ago and by intermarriage and conquest, merged with resident Mamoe and Waitaha. ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 3]

The ancient land Te Waipounamu and its surrounding islands have for forty four generations sustained iwi Waitaha, Kati Mamoe and more recently Ngai Tahu. Descendants of these iwi today number 30,000 and make up the fourth largest tribe of Maori in Aotearoa. ['Tribal Profile': 1997: 3]

These examples incorporate whakapapa, a binary notion of time beginning with the 'then' of Tahu Potiki and the theme of tribal identity. Together they assert Ngai Tahu's territory as both distinct from North Island iwi and as incorporating the other South Island Maori iwi - Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha. The key place, Te Waipounamu, of which Ngai Tahu has claimed ownership since 'then', distinct from the whakapapa and the geographical territory of other iwi, is interwoven with the whakapapa and meta-theme of time and to produce the meta-theme of a defined and delineated 'Ngai Tahu' place. A key theme of Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative is that Ngai Tahu iwi possess a bounded territory - Te Waipounamu - and hence claims manawhenua status over other iwi as tangata whenua of this rohe.
For all Ngai Tahu, places of significance to individuals, whanau, hapu and tribal identity are considered as inseparable from whakapapa and all its metanarrative properties. Within its metanarrative properties, whakapapa has historically incorporated both key understandings and strategic uses of the meta-theme of place for Ngai Tahu and Maori in general. This incorporation is triangular in that the complex relationship between whakapapa and place has been situated historically in political practice around land claims issues. Ann Parsonson makes this point. She writes about the historic function of oral traditions and histories in Maori Land Court hearings through the nineteenth century to ‘service as evidence’ [2001: 31] of historic land rights for hapu and iwi. These oral traditions required hapu and iwi spokespersons to ‘establish the nature and the history of their own relationship with the land’ [2001: 31]. Parsonson also points out the reciprocal effect of this process on shifting the uses of whakapapa:

The requirements of arguing a case in court had a marked effect on the histories that emerged. In traditional narratives, the prime purpose was to record relationships among the people, to tie everyone in by whakapapa, and to honour the mana of the great ancestors of the past. All those purposes are still evident in the court histories, but they are often overlain by an urgent awareness of the need to demonstrate to outsiders the basis of land rights.... [2001: 31]

In the public narrative, the privileged Ngai Tahu place(s) are therefore interwoven with the metanarrative of whakapapa.3

3 'Kuao [Langsbury] once said to me, eight or nine years ago when I was at Otakou, 'this is one thing they can never ever take away from you', and it was the marae of course. And I thought, that's right, they can't!' And I guess that is the same for everyone, that is one thing - no one can take that away from you - your whakapapa. Impossible. That's it' [Tahu Potiki in H. O'Regan: 2001: 54].

'... The marae within the tribal group gives me my turangawaewae - a place where I have the right to stand in terms of my ancestry, so I feel I am able to stand up with pride anywhere in the world.... The land for me has the same significance as the placenta that surrounds the embryo in the womb - the Maori word 'whenua' is the term used for both the land and the placenta' [Pere: 1993: 275].
Paine [2000: 81-82], Benedict Anderson [1991] and Craig Calhoun [1997] identify the key role of shifting understandings and presentations about time in the construction of discourses about nationalism. Situating national discourses in contexts of history frames ‘the new’ in associations with ‘the old’. Anderson also suggests that ‘the flipside coordinate of time as context for management of identities is space’. 4 For this reason, he acknowledges the historic uses of the ‘map’ as equally as significant as the ‘census’ in the management of persons and associated property:

I became uneasily aware that what I had believed to be a significantly new contribution to thinking about nationalism – changing apprehensions of time – patently lacked its necessary coordinate: changing apprehensions of space. [1991: xiii, xiv]

Calhoun identifies two key features of the rhetoric of nations as ‘boundaries, of territory, population, or both’ and ‘special historical or even sacred relations to a certain territory’ [1997: 4-5].

The meta-theme about place in the public narrative also carves Te Waipounamu into eighteen geographical territories that correspond to the eighteen papatipu runanga represented by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu. Kaiwhakahaere Mark Solomon outlines this:

*We have a papatipu system, we’re eighteen marae, no one can prevent any Ngai Tahu from attending. These people that are saying they're not having an input, they have an obligation also. If they wish to have an input, they have the forum to do it. The only people that really would be disadvantaged are those that are living overseas or those that are living in the North Island [as driving down once/month is prohibitive]. What Ngai Tahu has to come to terms with is how are we going to cater for those people? I attended a Ngai Tahu hui in Hamilton and I met a guy who is the Chief Executive [Tainui] and I asked him, how does Tainui handle it? How do you, what's*

---

4 Giddens also considers the two key resources for management in the assertion of power, as equally time and space [1984: 261]. My M.A. research addressed the particular forms of management of time and space adopted by the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board in the assertion of power vis a vis the State in the period leading up to the passing of the 1990 Runanga Iwi Act [Kelly: 1991].
the process for your people living outside the area to have an input. The way that Tainui does it, well Ngai Tahu has two lines, we can go along that line ourselves, and say if you wish to have a say in the politics, you do it on the marae, or do we look at modern technology so they can e-mail, fax, whatever, their viewpoint....[Interview: August 1999]

The carving up of a distinct territory for Ngai Tahu Whanui in both the administrative management of whakapapa and in the public narrative is situated in political practices since the mid-1980s, and particularly since 1990, as part of the Ngai Tahu Claims. Key to the assertion of a Ngai Tahu rohe divided into eighteen distinct areas, was the 1990 Runanga Iwi Act, the 1991 Waitangi Tribunal recommendations for the Ngai Tahu claims, the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 and the negotiated settlement that was finalised in 1998. These events are themselves entrenched in a history of political events surrounding land claims issues since the signing of the Treaty in 1840.\(^5\) As addressed in Chapters Two and Five, these events have formed the political context for the introduction of the new legal-political identities. For Ngai Tahu Whanui, management and presentation of tribal boundaries and associations with place are situated in contemporary political practice in the construction of the ‘Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation’, a phenomenon identified by Calhoun:

\(^5\) According to Angela Ballara, the many problems for Maori deriving from colonisation, including lack of control over land alienation, ‘motivated them to find communal solutions.... One of these was the exact delineation of tribal boundaries, a relatively new feature of Maori society.... the nature of early to mid 19th-century boundaries has been investigated by a number of scholars in the 1990s; they all come to similar conclusions, that before land sales, boundaries followed points of the landscape but were not necessarily linear. Although natural features such as the beds of rivers and mountain ranges were often specified, points between such features were often left vague.... Quite frequently their rohe were shared with or intersected by those of other descent groups. This was the case in most areas... [1998: 283-284].

Andrew Erueti and Alan Ward point out:

By the second half of the twentieth century, however, many Maori had come to accept the simplified accounts of land tenure and tribal boundaries [developed by the Crown from the second half of the nineteenth century] as custom. (Their experience, after all, had largely been shaped by encounters with the Maori Land Court and the large tribal trust boards.) .... In the Ngai Tahu claim... - the first great historical claim heard under the 1985 amendment – it was convenient for all concerned to pursue the claim against the Crown as expeditiously as possible, under the aegis of the Ngai Tahu Trust Board. However, the
Specific nationalist identities and projects have continued to draw on ethnic identities of long standing, on local kinship and community networks, and on claimed connections to ancestral territories. This has been a crucial source of cultural content, emotional commitment, and organizational strength for such identities and projects. [Calhoun: 1997: 29]

As mentioned in Chapter Five, the Crown signalled to the Ngai Tahu Negotiating Team that evidence of particular forms of tribal and corresponding territorial administration and governance which in turn would demonstrate Ngai Tahu’s manawhenua status in the South Island, would be a necessary precursor to receipt of settlement based on the Waitangi Tribunal’s findings.

Corresponding to these events has been a privileging of particular ‘Ngai Tahu’ place(s) in order to achieve a negotiated tribal settlement and to facilitate consent to Ngai Tahu Whanui’s contemporary administrative and management question of intersecting customary rights could not be ignored for much longer. When the Ngai Tahu leaders deposed their claim on the Tuahiwi marae north of Christchurch in October 1987, speakers on behalf of Rangitane and other tribes located in the north of the South Island lodged a cross-claim, asserting that the northern boundary of the Ngai Tahu territory was not as far north as the Ngai Tahu alleged, or at least that sections of the northern tribes had lived – indeed, still lived – within the territory claimed by Ngai Tahu as being under their mana.

The Tribunal’s jurisdiction was not considered to extend to disputes between Maori groups; it was concerned with claims by Maori against the Crown, and that is still the formal position in law... the Appellate Court heard the claim of Rangitane and others and ruled that Ngai Tahu, in the inter-tribal fighting of the late 1830s, had indeed established control – and hence their boundary – at the line they still claimed in 1987; other tribes did not have rights equivalent to ‘ownership’ below that boundary. The Privy Council, the final court of appeal, did not overturn this decision. The proceedings, however, aroused considerable concern among Maori observers, and the Appellate Court itself recognized that there might be individuals of either contending party living in the territory of the other. The concept of sharp tribal boundaries analogous to those of European states began to be recognized as ill-fitting to the complexity of Maori custom. Furthermore, as the Ngai Tahu claim was heard during 1988 and 1989, it became increasingly difficult to maintain the view that the Ngai Tahu iwi had subsumed all hapu in the region – deriving from several waves of migration – within some kind of corporate entity. At marae in south Canterbury and the West Coast in particular, the identity of specific hapu was asserted, and with it their distinct interests in lands and waters. [2001: 166-167]
infrastructure. Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and its supporting management structures receive consent from the Crown and Ngai Tahu to act as the representative leadership body of the tangata whenua of Te Waipounamu. While the Ngai Tahu Claim to the Waitangi Tribunal comprised nine separate territorial claims, the 'nine tall trees', the 1990 Runanga Iwi Act and subsequent negotiations between Ngai Tahu Negotiators and the Crown from 1991 to 1996 emphasised Ngai Tahu as a tribal collectivity with a distinct rohe. The Runanga Iwi Act carved up the South Island into runanga representing the tribe's 'grassroots' traditional political organisation. The Act set out the essential characteristics of iwi as:

(a) Descent from tupuna  
(b) Hapu  
(c) Marae  
(d) Belonging historically to a takiwa (territory in which the members are tangata whenua)  
(e) An existence traditionally acknowledged by other iwi. [Runanga Iwi Act 1990: s5].

Both the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act and the public narrative from 1996 asserted that Ngai Tahu is a united tribal identity distinct from other iwi, both geographically and in terms of distinct whakapapa. This idea was positioned in both the 1990 Runanga Iwi Act and the 1991 Waitangi Tribunal's findings in favour of the Ngai Tahu claims. In fact, even prior to 1990/1991, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board recognised the necessity of surveillance to maintain tribal distinctions in the South Island, where its registered beneficiaries may not have outnumbered Maori claiming whakapapa to other iwi or hapu. Previous research [1991] indicated that surveillance of iwi and sub-iwi boundaries would become even more important for the Trust Board, with devolution of the Maori Affairs Department and the proposed Runanga Iwi Act, because whatever collective body was chosen to represent the South Island as an iwi authority would be required to administer funds and programmes from government to taure here
Maori (Maori in the South Island who are not tangata whenua, i.e., not Ngai Tahu). In the process of 'gearing up' to function within the requirements of the Runanga Iwi Act, the Trust Board was considering in 1989 that Ngai Tahu runanga and corresponding marae would undertake the direct supervision of boundaries in order to maintain tribal and sub-tribal distinctions.\(^6\)

In this time frame and the political events of simultaneously arguing the nine Ngai Tahu claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and 'gearing up' to meet the requirements of the Runanga Iwi Act, and in keeping with the name of the Act, runanga and iwi were chosen over other possibilities - hapu, marae, whanau, as the preferred collective identities to manage and govern claims settlement and devolution of resources and responsibilities from the Crown on behalf of a Ngai Tahu iwi. The Runanga Iwi Act required that bodies setting up as iwi authorities define their internal representation and both internal and external boundaries on the basis of runanga. The privileging of runanga from this time was identified in a submission to the Royal Commission on Social Policy, prepared by the Trust Board's Executive Officer at the time, on behalf of Ngai Tahu:\(^7\)

\(^6\) An excerpt from the minutes of the 1989 Ngai Tahu tribal Hui a Tau indicates these considerations. The following statements sum up the importance of surveillance of boundaries for the Trust Board:

What started out as an argument over a quarter of our area is now effectively 30% of our total rohe... They invade us and our task is to push them back beyond our boundaries. Peace will be made when they are off the grounds that our Tupuna drove Te Rauparaha from and that they fought for in the early stages of the settlement with the Crown. [Annual Tribal Hui a Tau minutes: 1989: 5]

The concern is that [other tribes setting up runanga within the Ngai Tahu rohe] would be recognised by the Pakeha authorities... we would lose our mana in our own area because of our own people [i.e., other Maori people]. [Annual Tribal Hui a Tau minutes: 1989: 13]

\(^7\) According to Koa Marshall, 'cross-referencing by Ngai Tahu people into other runanga is acceptable where it may not be in the North Island' is because tribes in the North Island did not have the 'traditional' runanga structures which Ngai Tahu has relied on since the nineteenth century. For Ngai Tahu, runanga structures developed in the South Island in the mid-nineteenth century to represent concerns and negotiate with the Crown with respect to claims issues, on behalf of the Crown-created reserves which represented hapu, or sometimes several hapu. For the purposes of the Runanga Iwi Act 1990, the term runanga was used to refer to an iwi authority, whereby the Crown requested every iwi (or a body representing two or more iwi) to
Ngai Tahu hapu are unlike hapu of North Island tribes because they are not located solely in one region. Ngai Tahu has been characterised by a system of multi-hapu papakainga (traditional bases of Ngai Tahu people which were not separated along hapu lines), and the reason for this is that Ngai Tahu was originally essentially a hunter-gatherer society moving from one region to the next in pursuit of 'traditional' foods. Consequently, Ngai Tahu people rarely identify with only one hapu: 'It is enough for Ngai Tahu iwi to state that they are tangata whenua to Te Waipounamu, and they can walk from one end of the island to the other. Ngai Tahu are so interrelated that no simplistic definition of Ngai Tahu social structure will work.' [Submission to the Royal Commission on Social Policy by the Ngai Tahu Social Policy Task Force: 1988: 16]

Runanga are primarily based upon genealogical connections to the people of a given area. Cross-referencing by Ngai Tahu people into other runanga is acceptable where it may not be in the North Island. [Marshall: Interview: 1990]

These privileged structures and corresponding territories are reinforced in the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. The Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 sets out the takiwa of Ngai Tahu Whanui as 'the area of Te Waipounamu south of the northernmost boundaries described in the decision of the Maori Appellate Court in a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal by Henare Rakihia Tau, 12 November 1990'. The Act also sets out the name and takiwa of each of the current eighteen privileged papatipu runanga. Boundary dispute mechanisms and new membership application processes outlined in the Act give Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu power to adjudicate on such issues, with a final right of appeal through the Maori Land Court.8

8 'The names and takiwa of the Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui which are in operation at the commencement of this Act are set out in the First Schedule to this Act [s 9 (2) Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996].

There may, in accordance with section 17 of this Act, be incorporated in the charter of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu provisions that prescribe a procedure by which the members of Te
While most Ngai Tahu Whanui members are young and urban, with the largest number living outside the South Island, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu does not recognise Otautahi runanga either in the Act or on the governing body. Otautahi runanga has existed in various forms since the beginning of the process of devolution of the Maori Affairs Department began in 1989. This runanga addresses the social service needs of South Island urban Maori, mostly Ngai Tahu living in Christchurch. In legislation and governance, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu recognises Tuahiwi as the papatipu runanga whose rohe covers Christchurch. Tuahiwi marae is located about 20 kilometres north of Christchurch, not easily accessible to young, urban Ngai Tahu. Prior to the introduction of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act in 1996, there was an intermediary tribal council, Te Runanganui o Tahu. For some time this predecessor to Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu consisted of nineteen members. Otautahui urban marae was represented. However, Otautahi was excluded from membership under the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act due to political challenges between Tuahuririri marae and Otautahi, over recognition of traditional manawhenua status over the rohe of Christchurch, and associated rights. Many individuals are related through whakapapa across the two runanga, but the legal-political recognition does not exist. The same applies to Rehua marae in Christchurch.

Before the passing of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act and since its passing, there have been other boundary disputes within Ngai Tahu. Mangumanu has

Runanga o Ngai Tahu or a person or body specified in those provisions may consider, after appropriate investigations and hearings, whether any changes should be made to the Papatipu Runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui or to their respective takiw or both [s 12(1) Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996].

The person who, or the body which, has jurisdiction under any procedure incorporated in the charter under subsection (1) of this section to consider whether any changes should be made to the papatipu runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui or to their respective takiwa or to both shall not have the power to determine the membership or the takiwa of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu but shall have the power to advise the Minister of Maori Affairs that an Order in Council should be made under section 10 (1) of this Act. [s12(9) Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996].
challenged Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to be recognised as a distinct *runanga* with a distinct *rohe* separate from Kaikoura. The individuals from Mangumanu are related through *whakapapa* to Kaikoura Ngai Tahu but on the evidence presented, it was decided by Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu that Mangumanu is subsumed within Kaikoura *rohe*. It is interesting that, even though the Act was passed in 1996, the first *wananga* for Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu members to set out the boundary distinctions for its member *runanga* took place in August 2000. While I have not been present at any of these *wananga*, members inform me that distinct boundaries between and across the eighteen *papatipu runanga* are not yet clearly defined.

The protection of the Ngai Tahu Whanui *rohe* as set out in the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act remains as a priority for the current leadership. Challenges to the authenticity of the boundaries continue to arise; both those asserted as by other *iwi* residing in the South Island and those asserted as the traditional boundaries of the eighteen *papatipu runanga*. It has been identified that the security of these boundaries, even in legislation, is subject to challenge and negotiation. As the following statements indicate, definition, recognition and defence of tribal and *papatipu runanga* boundaries is a continuous process in which vigilance is required:

This is something that we will have to do in every generation. If Ngai Tahu wants to be an *iwi* in 25 years time we must have a rohe. [T. O'Regan: Notes from Ngai Tahu *Hui a Tau*: November 2000 in 'Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu’ January 2001 Meeting Index of Information Papers’]

The pa is not secure yet. [T. O'Regan: Waitangi Day, Onuku *marae*: 2000]⁹

---

⁹ Interesting that the reference here is to *ptr*, which is a traditional name for Ngai Tahu sites around the South Island [A. Anderson: 1998, Evison: 1993]. It is also a word that implies an association with battle because *ptr* were traditionally set up as battle fortifications [Evison: 1993].
As an historic analysis would show [see Parsonson: 2001, Erueti and Ward: 2001, Evison: 1993, Ballara: 1997, A. Anderson: 1998], the history of South Island Maori relations has been characterised by negotiation, challenge and dispute over issues of boundary, both between and within iwi. As Ann Parsonson writes,

In a society of close-knit communities the presentation of court cases was itself part of the continuing history of the people and their relationships with each other. [2001: 39]

These are and continue to be situated in political practice around claims issues, particular understandings and presentations of history, and the metanarrative properties of whakapapa. As Erueti and Ward state:

The claims process has had the effect of pitting Maori claimants not only against the Crown but also against each other. Maori groups never were wholly discrete entities sitting within tidy land boundaries, but complex clusters of lineages connected by intermarriage and political alliance, and with intersecting and overlapping rights to land. [2001: 163]

Even with recognition by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership of the privileged place of whakapapa and the meta-themes of time and 'The Claim' in the lives of Ngai Tahu individuals, presence at the privileged place(s) of one's ancestors and hence, one's whakapapa, has not been set as a requirement for registered members to exercise rights, such as voting rights. There is no explicit requirement for a registered member of Ngai Tahu Whanui to be involved with a papatipu runanga in any way. The range of involvement by members covers a continuum (as addressed later in this chapter). For Ngai Tahu living outside the Ngai Tahu rohe or away from papatipu runanga, any involvement with the tribe beyond the receipt of Ngai Tahu Whanui publications is required to be maintained through the papatipu runanga system. Therefore, an individual must choose one of the eighteen papatipu runanga to be in contact with, either by
attendance at monthly meetings or some form of correspondence that
overcomes the difficulties of physical absence. As Kaiwhakahaere Mark
Solomon explains:

Okay, it isn't the traditional way. The traditional way is that the head of a
whanau is the one who speaks. Even so, they still would have discussed it
with their whanau. No spokesman can just stand up on his own and say,
'my whanau will do this', without that interaction, but even though that is the
tikanga way of doing it we come under an act of parliament and parliament
states that everyone who has a whakapapa right has a right to a vote.
There are some Ngai Tahu who disagree with it - Pakeha law and Maori
lore - i-o-r-e. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

In addition to the marae that correspond to the eighteen papatipu runanga, some
papatipu runanga have begun to set up 'satellite groups' for their members, in
order to overcome the barriers of distance to attend marae meetings. Te
Runanga o Ngai Tahu has set up 'whanau groups' in areas outside the South
Island:

The Runanga Development Manager also maintains contact with Ngai Tahu
networks outside the rohe, usually known as whanau groups. The whanau groups
are a good way for Ngai Tahu living away from their papakainga to keep closer
links with tribal issues and events. One Papatipu Runanga has taken the step to
establish satellite groups for their members who are looking for regular input into
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu discussions. This is a very good way of ensuring wider
participation in runanga decision making. If you are interested in being part of a
Ngai Tahu network in the area that you live in, please contact the Runanga
Development Manager at Ngai Tahu Development Corporation.

Suzanne's work involves the Papatipu Runanga, Ngai Tahu in various areas and
individuals or groups who seek information about Ngai Tahu. If you would like to
know more about what is happening with the Papatipu Runanga, Ngai Tahu culture,
heritage or communication... [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1996: 29]

These 'whanau groups' however, maintain their link to the tribal whole through
the established papatipu runanga system. They are not given status in the Te
Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act, or on the governing body of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu.

Over 70% of all Ngai Tahu live in urban centres, with the majority of this population living outside Te Waipounamu, mostly in the North Island of New Zealand and the eastern coast of Australia. Yet, the expectation by Ngai Tahu Whanui continues to be that individuals must travel to one of the privileged places identified by the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act as the takiwa of the papatipu runanga of Ngai Tahu Whanui:

*If they wish to have an input, they have the forum to do it. The only people that really would be disadvantaged are those that are living overseas or those that are living in the North Island [as driving down once/month is prohibitive].* [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

The 1997 tribal ballot was open to all Ngai Tahu to vote, via post, from anywhere in the world. In fact, at meetings of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and runanga that I attended in the months leading up to the postal vote, the deliberate effort to encourage votes from as many Ngai Tahu living outside the rohe as possible was discussed. At one runanga meeting during this time, a Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu officer involved in the processing of Ngai Tahu Whanui membership applications (whakapapa) indicated that the Whakapapa Unit had only then begun to work on developing a runanga register to correspond to the register of individual members. Discussion turned to the issue of a mandate for the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu to cease work on this register in order to turn attention to the goal of processing individual membership applications as quickly as possible. Work is still in progress on developing a runanga register [T. Ryan: Interview: June 2002]. Until recently, a Ngai Tahu individual approaching the Whakapapa Unit to register and receive his/her whakapapa has received no guidance as to which of the eighteen papatipu runanga one should affiliate to.
In summary, how place is defined, managed and presented by the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership is set in particular presentations and uses of *whakapapa*, history and the political practices of the claims negotiations. The management and governance of the Ngai Tahu Whanui nation is embedded in associations with particular bounded places. The *rohe* of Ngai Tahu Whanui is privileged as Te Waipounamu – carved into eighteen distinct territories in keeping with the eighteen *papatipu runanga* recognised in the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996.

'Place' in the personal narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals – framed in understandings of time, 'The Claim' and *whakapapa*

South Island places of ancestral and historical significance figure prominently in the personal narratives about *whakapapa* and identity of 'experienced Ngai Tahu'. But while considerations of place in the personal narratives intersect in many ways with uses and presentations by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership, in particular contexts, there is divergence. *Whakapapa*, history and territorial land claims are inseparable from the key places claimed by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' as places of one's ancestors. Passed down along with the names of one's *whakapapa* are the strong associations with particular place(s). Ann Parsonson acknowledges this:

Thus, as often happened, a strong association with the land was recorded in *whakapapa* which, like the origin of place names, would be passed down in oral histories. [2001: 31]

Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative recognises the significance attached by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' to key ancestral places and hence its meta-theme about place is interwoven in the meta-themes of time and 'the Claim' and in the metanarrative of *whakapapa*. However, while Ngai Tahu individuals acknowledge the privileged places of Ngai Tahu Whanui identity - the South
Island and its eighteen *runanga* regions - the 'experienced Ngai Tahu' of this research refer to the place(s) of their ancestors in terms of the South Island or a section of it.

One's place(s) is determined by the place of one's ancestors, often considering lateral rather than direct descent lines to these ancestors. 'Experienced Ngai Tahu' use phrases that refer to the place(s) where their ancestors have walked and lived or of the vision they have of these places in their own memories and daily activities. Knowledge of these places, either by way of 'time done' or information passed on by *kaumatua*, have formed the first entry point into tribal identity, and 'experienced Ngai Tahu' therefore continue to recognise and often defend these key 'sub-tribal' territories ahead of any tribal or legal-political identity. In many of the narratives of these individuals, the recent political context of the framing of privileged place(s) of Ngai Tahu Whanui is acknowledged.

As addressed in Chapter Nine, for 'experienced Ngai Tahu' living close to the *marae*, *runanga* identity is acknowledged simply as a sort of community committee, an intermediary body between local individuals and the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, which meets monthly to discuss *runanga* business. Some recognise the historical function of *runanga* in their lifetimes or in the lifetimes of their parents, to collectively address territorial claims issues. For 'experienced Ngai Tahu', the significance of the local place where the *runanga* meets has more to do with associations with the land, *marae* and guardianship roles, than with legalistic boundaries or Ngai Tahu Whanui membership requirements.
If connection to land is through whakapapa, many Ngai Tahu argue that they have access to any marae or runanga in the South Island, but these access rights are talked about in terms of defending one’s claims-based pan-tribal rights rather than experiencing whanaungatanga. For ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, prior relationships to the local territories of one’s whanau and hapu are the primary familial connection. Jim Pohio acknowledged the unity of whakapapa to the eponymous ancestor that all contemporary Ngai Tahu share. But he considers this connection in terms of hapu, and hapu is considered in terms of land:

*His [Tahu Potiki] descendants who led us onto lands on the South Island identify our hapu and define our hapu lands.... Well, Ngai Tahu really is a general term but when you come back to particulars it comes back to which part of the South Island do you have a right to stand and which is the ancestor that put you on that land? Tahu Potiki does not appear as the ancestor who links me with our different lands.* [J. Pohio: Life History: 1997]

But this does not deny assertion of a lateral (sideways) whakapapa connection to other Ngai Tahu kaumatua listed in the Blue Book, and hence to the other papatipu runanga, as the following examples demonstrate:

*I suppose my spiritual ties are here in the South Island, not Tuahiwi, all the way through. I’ve got links with virtually every runanga, every area in the South Island, Stewart Island. That’s where my people left me rights and that’s where I can claim association.... My mother came from here, well Akaroa, Banks Peninsula area. So if my mother was alive she could pick virtually any runanga on the South Island as could my father. I could virtually too....* [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

---

10 This parallels the phenomenon of presenting oral narrative in the land court for defence of land rights. As Eruei and Ward write, ‘As with all evidence, it is necessary to have regard to the contexts and circumstances in which it was created, and the particular interests and purposes of the witnesses’ [2001: 165].

11 According to Ann Parsonson:

[in the nineteenth century history of land claims] it was the tupuna who were important to the bases of cases, not the hapu; subsequently the various hapu who were considered to be included by their descent from those tupuna were listed.). Traditional narratives were given in court to support the take brought forward. [2001: 26]
If I go onto a marae representing Kaikoura I will go on as Kati Kuri, but I'm acknowledging my whakapapa links there.... I've only just chosen to stand at Takahanga. I had as much right to stand at any of those and they all acknowledge this not because of me personally, they know exactly who I am, that I have whakapapa. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

For many Ngai Tahu, hapu or whanau is acknowledged before runanga, Again, runanga boundaries are acknowledged, but only for their legal-political force. In fact, they acknowledge that papatipu runanga boundaries do not necessarily 'fit' the reality or implications of access to land and often are subject to dispute.12 The following excerpts illustrate how 'experienced Ngai Tahu' view externally imposed boundaries, including those imposed by the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act:

I had no problems up here, conscience-wise, morally or anything else. We just went through boundaries, outside or inside, it didn't matter. A lot of the land was leased to European people within the Reserve. But we went outside the Reserve of course, hunter-gathering, night time, day time, whenever. We were all kids and we'd go on our own. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

In my experience we have never ever got a map and drawn our boundaries; there isn't confusion about boundaries for the people who live it; like, I'm quite clear where our boundaries are and it's not to get out a map and say, from here to here to here is ours. When it does come to boundaries, whilst we're quite adamant about where our boundaries are, at the end of the day, it's all holistic in saying that the hapu of Ngati Irakehu includes Taumutu, Rapaki, Koukourarata, Onuku and Wairewa.... When I'm in the North Island, I'm Ngati Irakehu. I never used to have the confidence to say that, I always said Ngai Tahu; now I have the confidence to say Ngati Irakehu.... You can't package whakapapa into boxes. ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' woman on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Interview: July 1999]

12 This is consistent with analysis by Ranganui Walker:

Boundaries between tribal lands were marked by physical features such as hills, rocks or prominent trees. Land discovered by the founding ancestors and occupied for a thousand years was hallowed by ancestral bones buried there and blood spilt in its defence. [1989: 38]
Here, *hapu* as place and the experienced associations take priority over the privileged legal-political identities and also over *iwi*. The position of place and territorial claims in *whakapapa* in the personal narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ is implicit in the last excerpt.13

Jim Pohio refers to ‘Ngai Tahu’ as a recent construction; that historically Ngai Tahu was a group of pa settled from the north down (starting with Kaikoura, then Tuahuriri), the philosophy being to consolidate and then move on [J. Pohio and K. Pohio: Interview: May 1997]. Here, place in the form of pa, takes priority over the privileged contemporary identities.

For *kaumatua* and the original Ngai Tahu claimant to the Waitangi Tribunal, Rick Tau, in an interview in 1997, the *kaitiaki* status and rights associated with particular pa must take priority over the privileged contemporary identities. He expressed the opinion that Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu must respect the *kaitiaki* rights and knowledge of people brought up in the village/pa. In his words, ‘TRONT can’t steal from beneficiaries with property rights to give to others’ [Interview: April 1997]. He insisted that *rangatiratanga* refers to the rights to local places and resources bestowed by family *whakapapa*:

*We will only pass on important knowledge to those we choose to give it to (both historically and now), i.e., only your families know where the natural resources are....*

*There is this misfounded belief that it belongs to something called Ngai Tahu, but it doesn’t....*

*I never went to another region unless my father took me, and he taught me where the food areas are and which families have those rights. I also knew* 

According to Hana O'Regan:

There is a belief that whakapapa links a person inextricably to the area where his or her tupuna dwelled. It is not necessary to trace descent right back through the tribal histories and stories to Papatuanuku in order to establish a direct link with the land. That link has already been established by a person’s whakapapa to the tupuna who are buried in that region, the tupuna who named and shaped the land, who bestowed upon the place its stories and histories. [2001: 51]
about water, and I would always know who to pass this info on to and when. [R. Tau: Interview: April 1997]

Monty Daniels, another Ngai Tahu kaumatua and past member of the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board, Upoko for Wairewa and Onuku, expresses a similar perspective:

_I think it’s good that we’re going to get a claim, but our part in the Claim is being ignored.... The Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act contains some misleading information about our takiwa.... We need to think here about Irakehu, and my own personal belief is that we assist any runanga that’s part of Irakehu [Onuku or Wairewa]. _[M. Daniels: Wairewa runanga wananga: October 1997]

Jim Pohio advocates the priority of specific territorial identities and associated rights, as these have been set in history and whakapapa for South Island Maori. They take priority over the privileged contemporary identities and the political practices of the contemporary leadership:

_In respect of those interests that had already been determined and issued with a title, each had their own individual part of the reserves, and that's all they were entitled to. Of course, as each generation came along, the ownership became more multiple and fragmented with a share down to the sixth decimal place with a couple of zeros to start with in many instances....

_I did realise then the environment I was growing up in was a Crown Reserve or a Native Reserve or whatever you call it. It was a really limiting and constricting environment. Once I moved out of it I've never been back since in any form. I've visited and stayed, but I've never ever wanted to come back and live in Tuahiwi... there's sentimental attachments with the people, the land I've grown up with, but...they serve no purpose as I could see...

_Content has nothing to do with it. See this is what... the European mindset seems to be on racial components as percentages. It doesn't work that way with my people. We identify each other by where we come from, the land we stand on, not the people that run around as classes or breeds....
Well, Ngai Tahu really is a general term, but when you come back to particulars, it comes back to which part of the South Island do you have a right to stand and which is the ancestor that put you on that land. Not Tahu Potiki....

The family, sub-tribe, but it always takes me back to the land. When I look at people, the only thing I want to know is the land he comes from, not the colour of his face or skin. And then, his ancestral link with the land. Even if he’s only a [fraction], that’s still his link with the land. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

Another Ngai Tahu individual indicated to me the significance of whakapapa and history that are associated with particular places:

I think what it boils down to is that whakapapa is so important, and the urban Maori do whakapapa back to somewhere. Like [my daughter] lives in Auckland, yet I think that she identifies very strongly with Wairewa and Te Arawa, and to be included in an urban group doesn’t hold much meaning. There’s no land as such, it’s just because she happens to be living there, but her heart and soul is in those two other areas. An example for her, on her TV programme she was doing an item on going back to her roots, and it was quite an interesting story. It showed her buying her tickets and getting on an airplane and going to Wairewa, and there were some lovely pictures of her with Mom and Dad and [my son]. I was included, I wasn’t even asked. And she said, ‘My little brother and I are going out to the lands that we come from’ and showed the mountains. This was an urban woman going back to the land....

That would be true, too. I feel that I go in [to the whakapapa] through particularly Wairewa. I know that there is a family connection, a very strong one through Onuku, but my great great grandfather lived at Onuku, that’s James Robinson Clark. Now, that’s my great great grandfather, which isn’t that far back, I don’t see that as being that far back. I mean, I remember my grandfather, I didn’t meet my great grandfather, so anyway, I do feel the connection with Onuku, and while I’m not registered there, Dad is and [my sister] is, I’m not sure about the rest of the family. But I primarily go in through, come in through Wairewa, and I do feel a definite connection there. I spent time out there when I was a kid, and I’m familiar with the area, and I feel quite strongly about the whole....

I don’t identify particularly with South Westland... because it hasn’t affected me personally. ['Experienced Ngai Tahu' individual involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: Interview: April 1997]
I chose Kaikoura because that's where my family is and that's where I grew up. They actually asked me prior to that to stand there to make that, my heart is in Kaikoura, that's where my family is. I acknowledge all my connections. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

The marae is a place where whakapapa connections are recited regularly and lived in an embodied way (whanaungatanga). According to Mark Solomon:

If you define it into individuals who have knowledge of who we are as a people, in the old days those histories were repeated publicly repeatedly. You went onto a marae and you recited your whakapapa links of how you interrelate with the people you're visiting. Whakapapa were more a living thing that were spoken of all the time. Today they're not. Very few people have that access. [M. Solomon: Interview: August 1999]

In summary, the narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' individuals demonstrate that while the privileged places of contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui identity are acknowledged, the understandings and functions of these places and their associated identities are embedded in contexts of particular times, understandings of whakapapa and political practice. 'Experienced Ngai Tahu' refer to the place(s) of their ancestors, that is, of their whakapapa, in terms of one or more local Ngai Tahu places, not in terms of the South Island or a section of it.

Face-to-Face at 'place'

I'm hoping that...sir, we'll be able to talk to you closer to home about home. [Ngai Tahu kaumatua and Upoko: Crown Apology Roadshow, Nga Hau e Wha marae: Christchurch: October 1997]

I have observed the tendency for the new Ngai Tahu Whanui leaders to rely on communication technology to overcome the need to meet 'face-to-face' at the
marae to discuss issues which 'experienced Ngai Tahu' identify as the traditional way of communicating and problem-solving. This established way of communicating face-to-face is situated in the traditional form of whanaungatanga - present at the marae of one's ancestors and one's whanau.\textsuperscript{14} Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative contributes to a new form of media that attempts to overcome the barriers of distance and ignorance of whakapapa, whanaungatanga and culture experienced by the majority of 'new Ngai Tahu'.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} Giddens views contexts of co-presence as having the status historically of 'carrying contexts' for interaction, and this is true even of nomadic societies [1984: 143]. He claims that 'traditional' societies are marked by the predominance of presence or of very high presence-availability [1981: 92]. By this he means the ability to gather the members of the community together into one locale, be that locale fixed or changing. 'Traditional' societies relied more on such forms of gathering for supervisory purposes, because they did not have access to the means of rational information accumulation characteristic of modern societies.

Giddens explains that in such societies the 'society' is based in the locale of the 'community', and hence a 'society' is a 'community' in two ways: in terms of time-space proximity, or high presence-availability; and in terms of cultural homogeneity, which is based in the similarity and continuity of 'traditional' practices and the significance of kinship as a medium of collectivity organization [1984: 100-101].

Giddens states that, 'in all kinds of tribal society tradition and kinship relations hold sway as the basic media of societal integration' [1981: 160]. In societies that are dominated by 'tradition', neither 'tradition' nor 'time' tend to be distinguished as separate from the continuity of events which they help to mould [1981: 93]. The level of time-space 'distanciation' in such societies is low because they do not have access to the authoritative resource of surveillance via 'coded information' by which to transcend limitations of time and space. Surveillance via direct supervision is possible only in restricted settings due to the segmental character of such settings, but even then such surveillance rarely involves the precise coordination of timing and spacing that is found in modern organizations. Hence, they rely on 'tradition' and kinship ties [1981: 161].

\textsuperscript{15} This absence of presence at place, it could be argued, sets the context for the presentation of a conceptual nation, as presented in Ngai Tahu Whanui. As B. Anderson writes:

It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion [Seton-Watson, 'Nations and States']. 'All that I can find to say is that a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation, or behave as if they formed one.' We may translate 'consider themselves' as 'imagine themselves'. [B. Anderson: 1991: 6]

The concept of 'meanwhile' - in the place of 'place presence', registered members reside in the security that 'meanwhile', even though they don't experience face-to-face communion, the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' exists. Anderson uses the novel and the newspaper as the two forms of imagining which first flowered to provide this representation of 'imagined community' [1991: 24].
There continues to be a firm preference by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' for traditional face-to-face forms of communication, which requires presence at traditional marae settings. To avoid this form of communication denigrates the mana of both the persons and the kaupapa. Bishop refers to 'Maori preferred methods of problem-solving' in which it is 'important to be able to front up in a hui situation in order to debate the issues 'face to face' (kanohi ki kanohi), where all involved are able to give voice to their concerns, emotionally and spiritually' [1996: 197].

Anderson identifies that it was 'the convergence of capitalism and print technology on the fatal diversity of human language [which] created the possibility of a new form of imagined community' [1991: 46].

At a Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meeting at Kaikoura [1996], Terry Ryan from the Whakapapa Unit indicated his disappointment with the trend that was continuing to grow in which enrolment applications were being processed without a face-to-face meeting. This was identified as a new phenomenon and one which Terry Ryan indicated to be in contradiction to the very meanings traditionally associated with whakapapa. He indicated his skepticism about having whakapapa put on CDRom.

---

16 Bishop provides the following example:

A 'known face'... enabled people to speak their mind. Monty and Marie both considered that a 'mailed-out' questionnaire would only receive 'safe' answers, if any at all....

Marie: They had to look at our faces and hear what we had to say. I mean you're not going to spill your heart out to someone about what you want for your kids, something really precious to you, to just any old person.

Russell: Why would they do that in a Maori context?

Monty: Because at those first hui we said, 'This is what we are doing. How do you want us to do it?' They were in charge of the venue, they chose the venue, they chose the agenda, they chose the invitation, the process of having people turn up. The other thing is, if it's set correctly then the kaupapa will follow. You use the wrong kaupapa and you kill it dead.

Russell: And the kaupapa feeds on itself at a hui, doesn't it? It goes around and people get up and say, 'Yeah, I want to support that', and 'I don't agree with that bit but I totally support this but' and people get worked up more, don't they? [1996: 197-198]

Ann Salmond has published a book about the significance of the hui – as conducted at places of ancestral significance – marae – in managing and maintaining social and political relations within Maoridom [1975].
According to one young Ngai Tahu man who had been working in the offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and was also very involved at his local runanga, showing one's face on the marae and 'doing the time' are still viewed as key components to one's Ngai Tahu identity:

"We're [The Whakapapa Unit] more stringent on those where there's no face-to-face conversation [where communication is by post or by phone], because we rely on what we gain from face-to-face conversation.... Kanohi ki te Kanohi, 'eye-to-eye'. [Interview: April 1997]

There is concern by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' that this place-presence is being replaced by the convenience of modern technology: telephones, fax machines, letters, and the publications put out by the leadership - the public narrative. There is recognition by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' that many 'new Ngai Tahu' lack cultural credibility or mana, because of reliance on such forms of attachment to their new identity. Jim Pohio referred to these individuals as 'postage stamp Ngai Tahu'. James Daniels jokingly referred to the Whakapapa Unit 0800 number as '0800-Who am I?'

The following excerpt from my field notes illustrates this tension around the key role attached to place in face-to-face communication:

*Mangumanu individual to C. Crofts: We have tried to talk and you have not been willing to talk in the latter stages. You have refused to acknowledge our letters. You have tried to send alternates, but you have not come to talk. C. Crofts responded, Obviously letters have gone astray. But we just need to talk seriously. [Annual Hui a Tau: Tuahuriri: 1996]*

Doing the time
'Time done' at the marae is also acknowledged by 'experienced' Ngai Tahu as a key variable in the perception of the degree of authenticity of Ngai Tahu identity and associated rights to speak and contribute on the marae. Here, the key themes of whakapapa, time and place are inextricable. The narratives of Ngai Tahu individuals who have 'done the time' at places that hold historical significance for their connection to nineteenth-century ancestors indicate that, along with degree of whakapapa, 'doing the time' is identified as a key measurement of one's degree of cultural identity and, hence, mana.

In 1993, Koa Mantell [who was Koa Marshall prior to 1993], an employee of the Ngai Tahu leadership, developed a model to describe the patterns of identification within Ngai Tahu. She suggested that the group which could be considered the most authentic, 'Integral Ngai Tahu' are characteristically 'native speakers' and have been brought up or lived the majority of their lives in a 'Kai Tahu environment'. She develops a range of levels of identity in this hierarchy, including:

'Participant Kai Tahu': those who are highly active in Ngai Tahu society and who play an important part in whanau, hapu and iwi organisation and management. Participation may take a leading political, social or cultural form or it may be in each of these areas. These people may not necessarily have been immersed in a Ngai Tahu environment all of their lives and are therefore their way of life is likely to have been significantly influenced by the wider New Zealand society.

'Associated Ngai Tahu': those who involve themselves in Ngai Tahu activities, especially at the marae and runanga but on a less regular basis than 'Participant Ngai Tahu'. They may work within or for Ngai Tahu directly such as in Ngai Tahu enterprises or management structures, in marae kitchens, or indirectly such as in the areas of language and cultural development.

'Contributors and Consumers': those who identify as Ngai Tahu and are likely to be registered on the Ngai Tahu beneficial roll. They are likely to contribute financially and attend and support major community events on an irregular basis.

17 In an interview with me [May 1997], Jim Pohio talked about how he felt that at that moment in Ngai Tahu's development too much time was wasted with individuals asserting their power, their whakapapa status, and their stories about history, as a sort of 'one-up-manship', rather than getting on with working together as a team towards a united goal.
'Peripheral Ngai Tahu': those who have minimal participation in Ngai Tahu activities and events. They might attend Ngai Tahu weddings or takiaue, but will only if they are close to the people concerned and not because they belong to the Ngai Tahu community.

'Group six': those whose 'Ngai Tahu-ness' may have no cultural bearing on their lives beyond the broad identification with the ethnic group. This group may identify as Ngai Tahu, but have no concrete connections to anything Ngai Tahu.

'Repudiators': those for whom a Ngai Tahu identity is seen as a negative characteristic. They will deny having any such ancestry and therefore disclaim affiliation to Ngai Tahu.

'Quasi-Ngai Tahu': those who are Ngai Tahu by descent but are unaware that they are. Descendants of Repudiators are likely to fall into this category. [in Hana O'Regan: 2001: 93-94]

Terry Ryan identifies three categories of people of Ngai Tahu descent:

Category one are the families we've always known at all the kaikas and pas throughout the island ... They've always been involved on the marae, and their parents, and their grandparents before them - they've never let it go. Those are the acknowledged names....

You have a new phenomenon here with our more Pakeha side, who, for different reasons, are now coming to the fore, out of the woodwork. I get a little frustrated because they come in and demand - more or less - four hundred years in one minute, without understanding the wairuatanga involved and the beauty of it living in you. And I find I get a bit uptight. And yet it's a healthy sign, because they're acknowledging... that's a category of Ngai Tahu who isn't a Ngai Tahu in thinking, but the bloodline is there....

The third [category] is the Ngati Porou, in particular, not so much Kahungunu but still Kahungunu, but definitely Ngati Porou - who shun, to be honest, any Tahu connection, because it wasn't deemed politically correct... [in Hana O'Regan: 2001: 97-99]

Hana O'Regan concludes that Terry Ryan's and Koa Mantell's models suggest that 'being Kai Tahu' can be evaluated in terms of degree; that one can be more or less Kai Tahu than someone else, but that this isn't in terms of degrees of
blood (something she criticises for being a 'Pakeha' [in the sense of someone devoid of whakapapa] way of analysing [2001: 99-100]. 'Doing time' at 'place' are key to these degrees.

'Doing time' at the marae is of utmost significance to 'experienced Ngai Tahu' as a measure of mana and cultural credibility, providing rights to speak and to impart knowledge to newcomers. Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative attempts to eliminate the hierarchy inherent in whakapapa as a measurement of one's cultural authenticity, and hence Ngai Tahu identity, in favour of establishing egalitarian identity as defined by registration of whakapapa with Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and consequent privileging of the individual over whanaup and hapu. This fits with the development of a discourse of nationalism, which regards all registered members as equal citizens regardless of their degree of whakapapa, experience, or 'time done' at the marae. It shifts the traditional emphasis on mana as based on a degree of whakapapa to emphasis on equal status guaranteed to all registered citizens. 'Experienced' Ngai Tahu measure the identity of fellow members by the degree of whakapapa to the 1925 list of kaumatua. Others consider the degree of whakapapa is irrelevant, that all Ngai Tahu registered members are equal in their whakapapa and associated rights, but these individuals measure the right to speak on the marae by the length of 'time done' at the marae. All 'experienced' Ngai Tahu individuals I have spoken with use one or both of these measurements in their talk of identity and associated rights of registered members.

Jim Pohio spent a great deal of his lifetime working as a fisherman in the Chatham Islands but later in life he spent more time in Christchurch, following the Ngai Tahu claims. When I asked him about his involvement in the Chatham Islands fishing claims, he indicated that his rights to be involved in Chatham Islands issues had dissipated because he had left:

\[18\] See map – Figure 1, Page 364.
My family, they've been involved in [fishing issues in the Chatham Islands] right from day one. For myself, I can't really become involved unless I return and stand on the land. [Pohio: Life History: 1997]

The 'experienced Ngai Tahu' of this research feel strongly that it is necessary to live and 'walk' the physical place of one's ancestors in order to incorporate local place as part of one's identity. The management of contemporary identities by Ngai Tahu Whanui incorporates particular versions of privileged local place. While Ngai Tahu Whanui registered members have rights to assert associations with one or more of the eighteen runanga, for 'experienced Ngai Tahu', living at a particular place and 'doing the time' is of nearly as great importance as possession of whakapapa. The following narrative excerpts illustrate this:

And then, to make it stronger I suppose is the fact that I can picture Wairewa.... Because I live here and I can see it - Ngai Tahu ....If I was up north I think I would be different because it's very much a, when we talk about a feel, it's literally being on the land and being able to see it. So that probably makes it more...I perhaps feel more strongly about it than the Te Atawa/Tu Wharetoa connection up north. Although when I'm up there I do feel an affinity as well, partially because of the people more than the land there....

[Does it matter where you are in the South Island?]

Yes, I think it does. I don't feel that I belong as strongly [at other runanga, e.g., Kaikoura] as I do at Wairewa. And I liken it to being on a rugby team not playing on home ground. It is quite territorial too. And I think that's been nurtured or cultivated by the various areas. When I say the rugby team as well, it's like we're playing for the same team, that is Ngai Tahu, and the sport is perhaps Maoridom, full stop. But I'm in that team called Ngai Tahu and you can bring it right down to say the backwards against the forwards, there's a cultural difference there in a rugby team. One of the things I like about rugby is that you can do things for yourself and you know that if your team loses, I can also step aside from that and think, well, I played well and I think that I outplayed my opposite so I'm relatively comfortable with the fact that we lost but I know I did all right. And this is similar to the Wairewa/Onuku connection. [Experienced Ngai Tahu' man on the Board of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu: April 1997]
The best way to learn history is to walk it, and then it's up to us to pass that information on. [Experienced Ngai Tahu woman: Wairewa runanga wananga: October 1997]

Another runanga person: 'We could be...taking people on...treks, explaining our history, rather than others explain our history, because of our takiwa, of who we are.' [Wairewa runanga wananga: October 1997]

In an interview with me, Te Maire Tau talked about the need to live surrounded by the landscape of one's whakapapa and tipuna because the physical landscape one sees every day influences one's outlook. That is why he wants to raise his family at Tuahuriri. He talks about urban Maori as detached from their identity because what they see daily is detached from their whakapapa, history and ancestors. He referred to me as 'on the outside looking in' [May 2000].

Another Ngai Tahu individual from Te Taumutu told me that 'at Taumutu we have people who are dark but are Pakeha. They're not Maori.' He said that he has actually minuted where people have called themselves 'Pakeha'. He described these people as 'those who have lived away from the marae and have come back - 'born again Ngai Tahu'. He continued, 'We call these people Pakeha because we feel threatened if someone comes along and tries to act as a guardian of our culture when they haven't done the time.... those who come in who have had some relationships within Ngai Tahu just ring off names and connections, but those more 'Pakeha' ones get hung up on having the proper documentation'. So, 'when newcomers ('new Ngai Tahu') come along to the runanga, they take a silent backseat, until they've learned the ropes' [April 1997]. He comments that mana is 'over time, it's your knowledge base, your interaction within Ngai Tahu and your support for your iwi.'

In a conversation, James Daniels told me of his ambition to rise to a higher position of leadership within the current Ngai Tahu Whanui structure. He also said that, as someone who spent his childhood on the marae surrounded by the
place of his ancestors, but who then walked away from this and was referred to as 'the white sheep of the family' for most of his adult life, he now perceives the greatest challenge to achieving his ambition is to win the respect of those I refer to as 'experienced Ngai Tahu'. In order to do this, he believes he must be seen to be 'doing the time' at the marae [January 2000]. It is interesting to compare these comments with my observations at Onuku for the 1997 Dawn Opening of the Whare, in which many of the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership did not stay overnight on the marae, with the 500 or so Ngai Tahu individuals who attended. Instead, these leaders attended by day, cell phones in hand, and retired to a hotel in Akaroa for the evenings.

Challenges to the contemporary Ngai Tahu Whanui interwoven with identity in 'place'

As pointed out earlier in this chapter, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu maintains the power to adjudicate boundary disputes, as laid down in the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act. This contributes to the privileging of Ngai Tahu Whanui and papatipu runanga with their bounded territories.

There is a range of day-to-day engagements with place that I have observed that highlight some of the tensions among contemporary Ngai Tahu, particularly between Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership and 'experienced Ngai Tahu' who are involved on local marae. In my observations, these 'experienced Ngai Tahu' hold and ascribe mana according to a different set of criteria than the contemporary Ngai Tahu leadership. The life experiences embedded in local places are fundamental to this set of criteria for 'experienced Ngai Tahu'. In fact, I use the term 'experienced Ngai Tahu' to refer to individuals who have 'done the time' at the places of their ancestors as recorded by whakapapa. For these individuals, mana arises out of whakapapa, lived experience (whanaungatanga) and seniority at the marae. 'Doing the time' is associated with the hapu and whanau lands of...
one's ancestors. While 'experienced Ngai Tahu' acknowledge the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership structure as suitable in particular settings, such as at Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu meetings, they see the marae as the place where traditional criteria for mana take precedence over any legal-political determinants of authority.\textsuperscript{19} As this 'experienced Ngai Tahu' woman involved in Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu states:

\textit{Like at the River, my father always has the last say. Whether he's right, wrong or otherwise, he always has the last say on our marae, and so he should: he is the Upoko. Rick Tau has the say out there because he's the Upoko. Bill has it up at Kaikoura and even though he might only get up and say, 'kia ora', he still does it. He did it at the Heads of Agreement. And the Crown was at Kaikoura for the hui a tau. That was interesting because even though everyone got up and spoke, Stephen and everyone, the mana of Takahanga was kept in tact because Mark got up and spoke. [Interview: July 1999]}

In my experience as participant observer, the marae has been the setting in which the contradictions and challenges of mana between 'experienced Ngai Tahu' and the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership have been most clearly exhibited.

The choice of Onuku for the 1998 Crown Apology facilitated an opportunity for both Monty Daniels and Rick Tau to utilise setting as a tool to make a visible statement about their disappointment with the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership over the negotiated settlement. It was interesting to see that Sir Tipene O'Regan led

\textsuperscript{19} According to Ranganui Walker:

\begin{quote}
No individual has turangawaewae (standing) in the territory of another. As a guest in another tribal area, an individual is expected to conform to the customs and usages of the tangata whenua.

The bastion of cultural conservatism is the marae, where all inter-tribal ceremonies are regulated by the basic dichotomy between tangata whenua (hosts) and manuhiri (guests). There, the mythology, traditions and spiritual connections between the land, the living and the dead are reiterated and unified time and again in the rituals of encounter. [1989: 46]

Without land rights in the tribal territory, turangawaewae [standing or status] is attenuated and is retained only on the basis of kinship and standing on the marae. [1989: 41]
\end{quote}
the manuhiri onto the marae that day and then proceeded to take on the senior role as speaker for the day. When he stood up to speak and the rest of those on the marae side stood, both Monty Daniels and Rick Tau remained seated. In turn, when Monty Daniels and Rick Tau took their opportunities as speakers, Sir Tipene O'Regan remained seated. These actions were visible statements about challenges to mana, according to the setting.

At the 1996 tribal Hui a Tau at Tuahiririri, the Upoko, Rick Tau, was in attendance but did not speak. Like all Hui a Tau I have attended, this hui was chaired by members of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu and the Chief Negotiating Team. This overrides the mana of the Upoko of the marae in question. At each Hui a Tau, the marquee is set up with a table of Ngai Tahu Whanui leaders sitting at the front, a microphone in the middle, facing the 'audience' of Ngai Tahu individuals. This separates the leadership from the membership and is very different from the definition of traditional 'hui' [cf. Salmond: 1975].

At the 1996 tribal Hui a Tau I observed that Charles Crofts, a member of the 'A Team' of claims negotiators and Kaiwhakahaere of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu at the time, stood up and declared at about noon on the final day that there would be one more question for the day. Several individuals had had a chance to ask questions and make points during the open forum session, but there were still some individuals still waiting for an opportunity. One woman stood up after the 'declared' last speaker and approached the microphone. Charles asked her to sit down. She refused. A stand-off ensued which lasted a few minutes, with Charles showing his anger and frustration and declaring that no one had the right to challenge his right to declare the hui finished. In the end the woman sat down. Rick Tau, Upoko for Tuahiririri, did not speak.

When the 1995 Crown Fiscal Envelope Hui for the South Island was in the organisational stage, the original intended venue was Nga Hau e Wha marae.
Ngai Tahu leadership had the *hui* moved to Tuahuriri, a Ngai Tahu runanga *marae*. Discussion prior to the *hui* indicated a concern that, due to the challenges by non-Ngai Tahu to the proposed fiscal envelope settlement, there might be animosity and challenge displayed on the day. By moving the venue to Tuahuriri, a Ngai Tahu *runanga marae*, control was returned on the day to the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership. Non-Ngai Tahu were required to wait outside, as *manuhiri*.

Prior to the postal vote for the proposed Ngai Tahu settlement in 1997, the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership arranged a series of *hui* for Ngai Tahu Whanui members around the South Island. These were called 'roadshows' rather than *hui*. A roadshow implies one-way communication, from presenters to audience, whereas *hui* traditionally entailed two-way discussion for the length of time that it might take to come to agreement. The Crown Settlement Offer *hui* for Christchurch was staged at Nga Hau e Wha *marae* - a non-Ngai Tahu *marae*. At this point in the negotiations process, there was an increasing number of challenges coming from Ngai Tahu individuals, *whanau* and *hapu* and *runanga*. Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership might have been required to defer *mana* to the *marae* leadership at any Ngai Tahu *marae*. Nga hau e Wha provided a neutral 'place', where the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership had the right to set up its roadshow as a one-way presentation to an audience who were given only rights to listen. Where movement of the 1995 Fiscal Envelope *Hui* from a Ngai Tahu *marae* from a neutral non-Ngai Tahu *marae* was done to quiet the voices of non-Ngai Tahu, in this case movement of the Crown Settlement Offer *Hui* (a solely Ngai Tahu tribal issue) was conducted at a non-Ngai Tahu, neutral *marae*. This silenced the voices of specific Ngai Tahu *whanau*, *hapu* and *runanga* who were required to defer to the voices of the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership.

On this occasion, Monty Daniels, Upoko for Wairewa and Onuku had questions for the presenters (the 'A Team' negotiators) with respect to the exclusion of
Onuku's territorial claim from the negotiated settlement package that was being presented. The following discussion ensued:

Sir Tipene O'Regan (Chief Negotiator) introduces one of the 'B Team' to present the negotiated settlement package.

Sir Tipene O'Regan: We will attempt first to summarise the Draft Deed for this morning and after lunch will open up for questions. Copies of the Charter, the Deed, the Ngai Tahu Act, and a draft of 'Te Karaka Special Edition' are available on the tables.

Monty Daniels stands up: It won't be cohesive for us if the presentation goes first, followed by questions and it's for us that this is about and this is typically not the way we do things.

Sir Tipene O'Regan: It's not practical timewise to do it that way. We let ourselves get sidetracked yesterday on the Coast and therefore missed getting out all we wanted. A quick comment may be okay, but then you must leave it to the presenter and ask questions at the end.

Monty Daniels: There are at least nine runanga represented here and therefore should have the right to discuss, and many runanga have come with some fine-tuned submissions, and Irakehu has only a few words represented in the Draft Deed of 18,000 words.

Sir Tipene O'Regan: My answer is No, just as it was to our relation Wiki earlier and I'm sure you will all appreciate my uncharacteristic restraint [laughter in the audience].

Monty Daniels sits down and Sir Tipene O'Regan continues...

What we're putting to you is the best package we have been able to negotiate.... and you have to make your own judgments in terms of the ballot. We have done well. I know there are some who think we could do better but that's your concern, not ours....

Monty Daniels: I would just like to ask a pertinent question, sir. I stand here on behalf of Te Irakehu. I ask, what happened to the Black Box.... The Crown has admitted guilt and yet somehow it has slipped through three teams of
negotiators to mean nothing. I'm hoping that in
November, sir, we'll be able to talk to you closer to home
about home.

Sir Tipene O'Regan: You have raised a big question, incapable of being
answered here. Litigation is stupid.... We will
explain a little bit about what Black Box means...

Monty Daniels: Kia ora.

Sir Tipene O'Regan cuts off Monty and introduces one of the negotiating
team to present the package. [Field notes: Crown Settlement Offer Hui:
October 1997]

Sir Tipene O'Regan and Charlie Crofts ('A Team' Negotiator and Kaiwhakahaere)
were invited to Wairewa marae for a meeting in early October 1997 to discuss
the issue of the exclusion of the Banks Peninsula territorial claims from the
negotiated settlement. I attended this meeting of a small group of Ngai Tahu at
Wairewa marae. At the beginning of the meeting we were waiting for one or both
of the negotiators to arrive. After a few minutes of waiting, a fax was received
from one of the negotiators, apologising for their inability to attend. Monty
Daniels responded with disgust, stating that the negotiators were afraid to attend
because they knew that when they come to the marae, their role is to sit and
listen and to defer to the Upoko and the people of the marae.

As such examples from my participant observation show, the marae is the setting
in which the contradictions and challenges for mana between 'experienced Ngai
Tahu' and Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership have been most clearly exhibited.

Summary

My retrospective story began with my presence at Onuku, a place of great
significance for my own participant observation experiences and in the history of
South Island Maori whakapapa, land claims and Ngai Tahu identity. It seems
fitting to end this story with my presence at a significant ancestral place and a
discussion of what I have found to be one of the most prevalent meta-themes
implicated in understandings about identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu – place.
Place as meta-theme commands an entire chapter in this dissertation because I
have found that, as well as its key role in personal and public narratives,
considerations and presentations of all the meta-themes of identity addressed in
this dissertation arise out of the positioning of actors in contexts of place. In the
public narrative and for Ngai Tahu individuals the significance of place is
inextricably interwoven with all the metanarrative properties of whakapapa,
history, kin relationships, ‘The Claim’ and hence identity.

Ngai Tahu Whanui places are rhetorically linked in the public narrative with
versions of the meta-themes of whakapapa, time and ‘The Claim’ to bring
potency to the privileged identities of Ngai Tahu Whanui and to manage the
citizenry of Ngai Tahu Whanui. For Ngai Tahu Whanui, management and
presentation of tribal boundaries are positioned in contemporary political practice.
Understandings of place and the framing of considerations of all the meta-
themes in significant place(s) for ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ individuals at times
converges with these themes in the public narrative, while at other times and in
other places, the particular versions and uses of significant place(s) by Ngai
Tahu Whanui is challenged by individuals. The significance of whakapapa,
history, and territorial land claims are inseparable from the key places claimed by
‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ as places of one’s ancestors. While Ngai Tahu
individuals acknowledge the privileged places of Ngai Tahu Whanui identity - the
South Island and its eighteen runanga regions - often the recent political contexts
of emphasis on these particular bounded territories are noted by ‘experienced
Ngai Tahu’.

For ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’; mana arises out of whakapapa, lived experience
(whanaungatanga) and seniority – all of which are done at the marae. 'Doing the
time' is considered as a significant indicator of one's degree of Ngai Tahu identity
and the 'time done' is at the marae – the hapu and whanau lands of one's ancestors. Time, place and whakapapa are thus interwoven in this assessment. The 'experienced Ngai Tahu' feel strongly that it is necessary to live and 'walk' the physical place of one's ancestors in order to incorporate local place as part of one's identity.

'Time done' at the marae is also acknowledged by 'experienced Ngai Tahu' as a key variable in the perception of the authenticity of Ngai Tahu identity and associated rights to speak and contribute on the marae. In my experience the marae has been the setting in which the contradictions and challenges for mana between 'experienced Ngai Tahu' and Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership have been most intensely exhibited. What possibilities for the future of the 'Ngai Tahu Nation' that may arise out of these challenges will be explored in Chapter Eleven, where the issue of identity for the majority of registered Ngai Tahu Whanui members, who are 'new Ngai Tahu' will also be discussed. They are not in communion with their kin or the wider collective at the traditional ancestral places (whanaungatanga). For them, the traditional way of interacting and 'doing identity' has shifted to reliance on a conceptual collective category.
Chapter eleven

Weaving Whakapapa: metanarrative and meta-themes – past, present and future

They will have legal standing but in terms of cultural and tribal identity they will have nothing to stand on. They will no longer be possessed by their whakapapa to the place. As a consequence they will no longer possess the heritage that it carries - they will no longer be Ngai Tahu. [T. O'Regan: 1999: 15]

The pa is not secure yet. [T. O'Regan: Waitangi Day: Onuku: 2000]

The goal of the theoretical exercise is to bring together narrative and identity in order to better understand social action. [Somers: 1994: 607]

From 1998 to 2001, Ngai Tahu leader Sir Tipene O'Regan presented two analyses of the functions of whakapapa for Ngai Tahu Whanui. First, he presented whakapapa as the adhesive that binds the collective, defined as 'DNA', all that remains to unite the members of Ngai Tahu Whanui together now that the cultural adhesive of 'The Claim' has faded into history. In 2001, however, he raised the question of whether or not whakapapa will be enough to bind them together.

When Sir Tipene O'Regan referred to whakapapa in his 1998 lecture as the adhesive binding together the collective membership in the post-settlement era, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu had begun a process of shifting out of what I would characterise as the 'battle rhetoric' of the mid-1980s to 1996 associated with securing a settlement with the Crown. Since then, the Ngai Tahu Development Corporation has been engaged in pursuing a number of policies, programmes and strategies aimed at familiarising 'new Ngai Tahu' with 'tribal' stories about history, whakapapa, 'The Claim' and Ngai Tahu place. Research has identified
this as a key priority for Ngai Tahu [Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Annual Report: 1999]. The strategic plan for Ngai Tahu Whanui for the next twenty-five years – Vision 2025 – sets out such policies and programmes as a priority for tribal development.

I suggest that, as Ngai Tahu Whanui moves into its 'post-settlement' era, the meta-themes in the narratives about identity that are set out in this dissertation will continue to be significant. For Somers [1999, 1994, 1993], Rapport [2000], Plummer [1995] and Bishop [1996], it is through the narrative form that we actually come to understand and constitute our identities, 'emplotting' [Somers] our own individual identities within a sequential context of time, place, and historical event.

The presentation and circulation of a public narrative incorporating all the meta-themes of identity for contemporary Ngai Tahu is an effective management tool in the building of a 'Ngai Tahu Nation'. I suggest that 'New Ngai Tahu' who are otherwise geographically and culturally dispersed, will continue to rely on the range of narratives – from personal to public, to metanarrative – to provide 'a place to cognitively reside' [Rapport: 2000] in their new national identities.

The history of South Island Maori identities has been characterised by heterogeneity, fragmentation and contestation. The majority of 'New Ngai Tahu' live in urban settings, outside the Ngai Tahu Whanui rohe and away from the traditional setting of the marae that was historically integral to the formation and circulation of face-to-face stories and identity. As suggested by Calhoun and Benedict Anderson, there is a need to unite the new members into a collective, sovereign unit and this is accomplished by a 'national' story. According to Calhoun [1997] and Benedict Anderson [1991, 1983], 'national' stories to draw upon themes about ethnicity, tradition, history and ancestral place.
Margaret Somers also identifies the primary role of themes to prioritise events and give them meaning, in the act of framing narratives [1994: 617]. Thus, the meta-themes and metanarrative of whakapapa will continue to play a significant role in the management of the new ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ through narrative. How the meta-themes of this dissertation are framed by contemporary Ngai Tahu, particularly ‘new Ngai Tahu’ is a topic for further research. It is through the narrative method and the circulation of personal narratives that the multiple and shifting nature of identity for Ngai Tahu is considered. As Somers states, ‘choosing narratives to express multiple subjectivities is a deliberate way of rejecting the neutrality and appearance of objectivity typically embedded in master narratives’ [1994: 630].

In my opinion, the metanarrative of whakapapa will always be at the heart of stories about identity for Ngai Tahu. As this dissertation has shown, whakapapa is more than DNA for Ngai Tahu. It is narrative, identity, kin, ontology and worldview for ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’. Biology is just one of the many metaphors with which it is associated. For ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ and in the public narrative, metaphoric associations with whakapapa include: blood, bones, heart, the head, spirituality, the gods, original being, pregnancy, kin, the natural environment, weaving, and narrative. As Bishop writes, whakapapa is for Maori the paramount narrative for the embedding of identity in time, place and surrounding for Maori. It is through whakapapa and its narrative properties that individuals learn of their total integration and connectedness to one another [1996: 236]. And as Bishop identifies, whakapapa is more than genealogy. It is also the multiple forms of storytelling for Maori: recitation, oral history, raranga korero and hui [1996: 192].

The meta-themes identified in this dissertation have been used by ‘experienced’ individuals and the leadership to introduce and establish a place for the contemporary privileged identities of the new ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ and to fit these within the repertoire of South Island Maori identities that have existed since 1840.
In order to attach nobility and legitimacy to these recent legal-political identities, they have been presented in the public narrative, through the use of a range of rhetorical techniques [Kratz: 1993], in a story of history and original identity. Therefore, I would argue that a particular meta-theme about time that links the 'then' of original tribal identity to 'now' will continue in the public narrative.

One wonders if 'The Claim' will continue as a meta-theme for Ngai Tahu, now that a settlement with the Crown has been reached. Since 'The Claim' has acted as an icon of cultural identity for both 'experienced Ngai Tahu' and in the narratives of the contemporary leadership, it could be assumed that this meta-theme will disappear as Ngai Tahu move into their post-settlement era. However, 'The Claim' may well continue to figure in the narratives of 'new Ngai Tahu', as it was the introduction of South Island land claims in the nineteenth century and the settlement of a Ngai Tahu tribal claim in 1998 that mark the introduction of Ngai Tahu Whanui as an identity. Whether or not 'The Claim' continues to hold the position of meta-theme remains to be identified by further research.

The association of the events surrounding the history of 'The Claim' with the meta-theme of time may mean that as the significance of this historical event shifts in Ngai Tahu narratives, so too will the binary approach to time that sets 1840/1848 as 'then' and 1996/1998 as 'now'. But, as Calhoun and Benedict Anderson argue, history and 'temporal depth' are fundamental features of 'the rhetoric of nation' [Calhoun: 1997: 8]. For Calhoun, such a story presents 'a notion of the nation as such existing through time, including past and future generations, and having a history'. As time moves, so too will the 'now' of the public narrative, a story that sets up a continuous historical development from past to present will, I suggest, continue. It is also possible that as 'now' shifts from the 'now' of this research, and 'The Claim' shifts in importance, a time frame for 'then' may also shift. One possibility is that the public narrative begins to
frame 1996/1998 as the 'then' of a binary presentation. Another possibility was suggested at the 1998 Crown Apology Hui at Onuku marae:

Our whakapapa is not on the internet of the world. No way. It's up to us to say to our mokos, 'don't do this. Don't do this' and when I hear that our mokos want to change from 1848 to 1770. Why change this? We'll be starting from scratch like North Island Maori'. [T. Ryan, Whakapapa Unit Manager: November 28, 1998]

Here it was suggested that the 'then' of Ngai Tahu Whanui origin be cast back further in history in order to establish even more legitimacy to Ngai Tahu Whanui's manawhenua status vis-à-vis other iwi, to effectively manage contemporary identities. Again, how this story unfolds could be the subject of further research.

The definition of what constitutes the geographical place of Ngai Tahu Whanui may also be subject to change, but as Calhoun and Anderson argue, the presentation of distinct, discrete collective boundaries is a fundamental feature of 'the rhetoric of nationalism' [Calhoun: 1997: 4-5, B. Anderson: 1991: 173-174]. The protection of the Ngai Tahu Whanui rohe and, hence, Ngai Tahu Whanui identity as discrete and distinct from other iwi continues as a priority for the current leadership. However, 'The pa is not secure yet'. Challenges to the authenticity of the boundaries continue to arise, both those asserted as Ngai Tahu Whanui's vis-à-vis other iwi and those asserted as the traditional boundaries of the eighteen papatipu runanga. I have shown that the security of these boundaries, even in legislation, is subject to challenge and negotiation.

The following excerpt from a recent article in the 'Christchurch Press' illustrates how, even in the post-settlement era, the metanarrative of whakapapa and the meta-themes of a binary approach to time, significant ancestral place framed as 'tribal' place, and 'The Claim' continue to figure prominently in assertions by the
contemporary leadership. They do this to protect its discrete boundaries and hence tribal manawhenua rights from others:

Ngai Tahu is setting up its campaign to protect its sovereignty in the lower South Island.

In its latest magazine Te Karaka, the iwi rallies members to support its “battles” over Ngai Tahu’s northern boundary and fisheries issues.

The iwi has approved a strategic plan and budget to fight its northern boundary dispute, and calls on all its members to join the fight.

“...this kaupapa needs to be driven and participated in by Ngai Tahu Whanui in every forum and at every opportunity available. This cannot be just a ‘project’ managed by the Christchurch Office of Ngai Tahu,” Te Karaka reports....

The tribe is also contacting each Te Tau Ihu iwi, and hopes to build on shared whakapapa links to moderate their challenges on Ngai Tahu’s sovereignty.

The tribe holds that Te Tau Ihu iwi claims on land within Ngai Tahu’s region threaten its sovereign tangata whenua status, and ultimately its Treaty of Waitangi settlement with the Crown. [Christchurch Press, May 15 2002]

Here, the ‘battle rhetoric’ characteristic of the public narrative in the time frame leading up to the claims settlement has resurfaced. ‘The Claim’ has returned in the public narrative, but its ‘two-edged’ characteristics are brought once again to the forefront. ‘The Claim’ is presented once again as an icon of tribal unity since the ‘then’ of the Treaty of Waitangi. Yet, it was the settlement of 'The Claim' that led to the passing of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996, introducing legal identity for Ngai Tahu Whanui, along with exhortations in the public narrative for Ngai Tahu Whanui to put behind them the ‘taniwha’, the ‘monster that has consumed our tribal lives down through the years as generation after generation has struggled for justice” [T. O'Regan: 'Crown Settlement Offer' document” 1998: 5].
Here, *whakapapa* again becomes a two-edged sword. Through the period of my research, the pursuit of ‘The Claim’ and the corresponding legal-political identity was based on an argument about Ngai Tahu tribal *whakapapa* as distinct from the *whakapapa* of other *iwi*. Now, Ngai Tahu Whanui individual members are called upon to appeal to the *whakapapa* they share with other South Island *iwi* in order to secure their claims and, hence, distinct tribal identity and corresponding *manawhenua* rights. These political uses of *whakapapa* contribute to its metanarrative potency as cultural resource.

While this dissertation has identified three meta-themes embedded in the metanarrative of *whakapapa* that have predominated in personal and public Ngai Tahu narratives over the research period, a theme about a new privileged identity – Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation – has been introduced. The national identity of individual member referred to in the collective as Ngai Tahu Whanui is framed in the above excerpt as the audience of the ‘battle’ call. This replaces the traditional South Island Maori identities of *whanau* and *hapu* while simultaneously subsuming the other prominent tribal identities of Ngati Mamoe and Waitaha. Calhoun identifies this phenomenon of nationalism:

> Individualism is important [to presentations of nationalism] not just metaphorically, but as the basis for the central notion that individuals are directly members of the nation, that it marks each of them as having an intrinsic identity and that they commune with it immediately and as a whole.... The individual does not require the mediations of family, community, region, or class to be a member of the nation. Nationality is understood precisely as an attribute of the individual, not of the intermediate associations.... While it does not preclude other self-understandings, within most nationalist ideologies it is held to override them at least in times of national crisis and need. [1997: 46]

While the new legal-political identities flatten the hierarchical power relations that have previously existed among South Island Maori in favour of a ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ of individual citizens, it in turn produces new hierarchies. A new power relationship is introduced in which the leadership of the collective nation
manages the registration and uses of whakapapa information to include some in membership and exclude others. As Somers suggests, metanarratives set up conceptual gatekeepers who utilise the power of the metanarrative to determine membership [1999, p136]. Any South Island Maori who does not meet the legal criteria set out in the Ngai Tahu Act as a requirement for membership in the nation is excluded from citizenship status.

The personal narratives of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ indicate that Ngai Tahu Whanui identity, while recently introduced and situated in historical and political events, is considered among their repertoire of identities. As Benedict Anderson writes, ‘a nation exists when a significant number of people in a community consider themselves to form a nation’ [1991: 6]. I suggest that whakapapa and versions of the meta-themes of time and significant ancestral place will continue to hold significance in the personal and public narratives of Ngai Tahu. How the history of ‘The Claim’ as meta-theme plays in Ngai Tahu’s future will be situated in questions around whether or not the claims settlement will be ‘full and final’ and in the positioning of this theme in the networks of narrative and event of local settings. But certainly, newly arrived is the developing theme of ‘Ngai Tahu Whanui Nation’ as this is interwoven in the meta-themes of time, ‘The Claim’ and key ancestral place, and the metanarrative of whakapapa. Whether this newly introduced theme becomes a ‘meta-theme’ in the management of identities for Ngai Tahu could be a subject for further research.

Another question that remains to be investigated is if and how the metanarrative of whakapapa and the meta-theme of place will shift when the majority of Ngai Tahu registered members do not reside in the places of their ancestors.\(^1\) The

\(^1\) According to Giddens, it is ‘place presence’, contributing to a sense of community, which characterises traditional societies. Giddens views contexts of co-presence as having the status historically as ‘carrying contexts’ of interaction [1984: 143]. He claims that ‘traditional’ societies encompass the smallest of human societies and are marked by the predominance of presence or of very high presence-availability [1981: 92]. By this he means the ability to gather the members of the community together into one locale, be that locale fixed or changing. ‘Traditional’ societies
majority of Ngai Tahu reside outside Te Waipounamu. Members of the Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership have identified that a significant challenge for Ngai Tahu in the future will be how to keep the majority of the collective connected to the whole – ‘the Nation’, as I have characterised it – when most do not live close to their runanga and marae. This research has pointed out that the places of ancestral significance for ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ – the local marae of their whanau, hapu and runanga – differ from the presentation of significant ancestral place in the public narrative and the management of the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ through the tools of the Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act 1996 and the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll. The introduction of the Ngai Tahu Whanui roll and of its precursor, the Ngai Tahu Maori Trust Board roll of beneficiaries, were political events embedded in land claims issues that shifted the forms and uses of whakapapa in order to manage the identities of culturally and geographically dispersed individuals.

Giddens explains that in traditional societies the ‘society’ is based in the locale of the ‘community’, and hence a ‘society’ is a ‘community’ in two ways: in terms of time-space proximity, or high presence-availability; and in terms of cultural homogeneity, which is based in the similarity and continuity of ‘traditional’ practices and the significance of kinship as a medium of collectivity organization [1981: 100-101]. Giddens states that, ‘in all kinds of tribal society tradition and kinship relations hold sway as the basic media of societal integration’ [1981: 160].

In societies that are dominated by ‘tradition’, neither ‘tradition’ nor ‘time’ tend to be distinguished as separate from the continuity of events which they help to mould [1981: 93]. The level of time-space ‘distanciation’ in such societies is low because they do not have access to the authoritative resource of surveillance via ‘coded information’ by which to transcend limitations of time and space. Surveillance via direct supervision is possible only in restricted settings but even then such surveillance rarely involves the precise coordination of timing and spacing that is found in modern organizations. Hence, they rely on ‘tradition’ and kinship ties [1981: 161]

For ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, place-presence has formed a significant part of their identities as Ngai Tahu. Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership recognises the importance of place. For ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ and in the management of identities by the contemporary leadership – the Offices of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu - the metanarrative of whakapapa is inextricably interwoven with the meta-themes of place, time and ‘The Claim’ to frame identities, both those prior to Ngai Tahu Whanui and the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ that has been framed since the introduction of the 1996 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu Act.
For most ‘new Ngai Tahu’, whakapapa is in the form of a piece of paper that gives their identity as a ‘Ngai Tahu individual’, where the piece of paper becomes a metaphor for one’s whakapapa and for all its traditional metaphoric associations, held in common with approximately 30,000 other ‘Ngai Tahu individuals’ who reside around the world.

Whakapapa and its metaphoric associations are interwoven in a particular way with the meta-theme of place. Historically, whakapapa was recited at places of ancestral significance, and it was through relationship with kin at these places that one knew one’s whakapapa (whanaungatanga). As Ryan’s dictionary [1995] identifies, whakapapa is ‘tête-à-tête’; ‘intimate talk’. The ‘intimate talk’ of whakapapa requires the presence of individuals in a particular place. For some ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’, the requirement for presence at ancestral place in order to exercise rights of membership is still important, as illustrated in this statement made by Terry Ryan at the 1998 Crown Apology Hui at Onuku marae:

*The whakapapa remains. It has to. But the benefits part needs to be addressed. Te ahi kaa principle needs to be in place. Keep the fire burning. [T. Ryan: November 28, 1998]*

Here, Terry Ryan espouses the need to continue the traditional system that maintained whakapapa-based rights to possess land – te ahi kaa – keep the fire burning, symbolising continuous uninterrupted occupation or presence, through the descent lines.

Mark Solomon stated in an interview with me that in the time leading up to the passing of the 1996 Act, Ngai Tahu had to make a decision about which approach to take regarding residence requirements for its members. They had to choose between a traditional approach requiring members to be present at the marae of their ancestors in order to have access to rights and privileges, including voting rights, or a contemporary approach whereby ‘place presence’
and face-to-face interaction with fellow members of the collective would not be required. He said that Tainui (a large North Island iwi and the second iwi to negotiate a Treaty settlement with the Crown) had chosen the traditional approach, but Ngai Tahu has not required this. Hence, Ngai Tahu citizens can maintain their identity and associated rights by postage stamp. Mark Solomon refers to this as the difference between relying on ‘traditional lore’ and relying on ‘the law’.

As I have argued in this dissertation, Ngai Tahu Whanui public narrative today takes the place of the traditional raranga korero function of whakapapa, offering its registered members what Rapport refers to as ‘a place cognitively to reside’ [2000]. Here Benedict Anderson’s concept of ‘meanwhile’ [1991: 24] will take on significance: in the absence of ‘place presence’, there will be a requirement for registered members to reside in the security that, meanwhile, even though they don’t experience face-to-face communion, the Ngai Tahu collective nation exists. The uses of particular meta-themes and metaphoric associations with whakapapa will continue to be significant in the public narrative to provide this security for ‘new Ngai Tahu’. As a result, the meta-theme of place has also become a ‘two-edged sword’. While Ngai Tahu Whanui management of its national identity attempts to organise this within particular geographic boundaries, ‘new Ngai Tahu citizens’ are not bound by place. Individuals born or residing outside Te Waipounamu, the majority of ‘new Ngai Tahu’, may still claim membership in the nation. Thus, the collective nation is bound by place but individual members are not. This is also another example of how place troubles whakapapa and an interesting topic worthy of further research.

Now that the rapid pace of enrolments has slowed down, Terry Ryan, who has been the ‘face’ of the Whakapapa Unit and crucible of whakapapa knowledge since 1976, is beginning to move away from the role of processing and scrutinising whakapapa enrolments. Terry Ryan is the contemporary ‘head’ of whakapapa knowledge of historical and political events for Ngai Tahu, holding in
his memory the names and whakapapa connections of approximately 30,000 registered members. This knowledge is stored now on a CD-Rom in the Whakapapa Unit of Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, but this marks a shift in the forms and functions of whakapapa for Ngai Tahu. Terry Ryan is increasingly being called upon to share his knowledge in assisting other New Zealand iwi to set up tribal registers, as Ngai Tahu Whanui is the only tribal group to have such a register:

_We get visits from other Trust Boards. They come down south. It’s not that long ago no one came down south. We welcome them. I get a kick out of it. It’s a lovely feeling. Ngai Tahu has got it. Ngai Tahu is unique. Don’t try to be like them. Let them try to be like us. Be proud to be white._ [met by roars of laughter and clapping by audience]. [T. Ryan, Manager Whakapapa Unit: Crown Apology Hui: Onuku marae: November 28, 1996]

The particular management of whakapapa adopted by Ngai Tahu through the twentieth century has been unique in New Zealand. Other iwi have not had a roll that has been maintained since the censuses of the nineteenth century, possibly because members of other iwi have stayed closer to their ancestral places. Another question worthy of further research is how whakapapa is managed to define identity by other New Zealand iwi and hapu and how the historical contexts of these examples have differed from the Ngai Tahu situation.

As both Margaret Somers [1994] and Corrine Kratz [1993] argue, one cannot assume the understandings that individuals bring to such issues as tradition, identity and, in the case of this research, whakapapa, history, significant ancestral place and the Ngai Tahu claims. They must be investigated through the narratives of individuals. In my research experience, it was through moving to the marae, away from meetings of the centralised Ngai Tahu leadership, and listening to the narratives of 'experienced Ngai Tahu' that I began to see the rigid categorical entities within which contemporary Ngai Tahu collective identity was being framed in the public narrative.
As South Island Maori identities shift into what has been characterised by Ngai Tahu Whanui leadership as the ‘post-settlement’ era, the public narrative will continue. How and by whom whakapapa will be managed and the place of the meta-themes in the management of identities remains to be seen. How the voices of ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ and the sociological imagination they bring to these issues will be incorporated also remains to be seen. How ‘new Ngai Tahu’ understand and interpret shifting political events and multiple narratives in their own stories about South Island Maori identity remains the subject of further investigation. According to Somers, the circulation of counter-narratives has the power to challenge master narratives that encompass and dominate individual identities [1994: 630].

According to Anne Kane, leaders, or ‘cultural entrepreneurs’, ‘do attempt to use cultural resources for strategic purposes….However, interpretation is a key component in the process of meaning construction; and it is unlikely that recipients of cultural messages interpret them exactly the way the issuer intended’ [1997: 255]. But, as Somers [1994: 629] and Calhoun [1997] write, there is only a limited repertoire of available stories and themes that will work in public narratives that serve to invite individuals into the collective whole. In my Participant Observation, it was by moving from settings of the centralised Ngai Tahu leadership to the marae of ancestral significance to ‘experienced Ngai Tahu’ that I was able to discover the understandings and interpretations of the meta-themes of the public narrative for ‘Ngai Tahu Whanui citizens’.

While the continuation and development of meta-themes in Ngai Tahu Whanui narratives raises new questions to be investigated, the introduction, at least in the narrative form, of a ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ also raises interesting questions about how this fits both in the New Zealand national context and for other historical collective South Island Maori identities. From my observations, Ngai Tahu Whanui has developed, over the period of this research, a new legal-political identity, framed as national, and as historically tribal and original. This story has
developed out of a story about the additional and special rights of tangata whenua, as set out in Article Two of the Treaty of Waitangi – often referred to as 'Article Two rights'. Article Two rights are presented as special and additional to the 'Article Three rights' of citizenship available to every New Zealander. How these two national identities continue to be framed and lived by 'new Ngai Tahu', the majority of whom live away from the traditional places of their ancestors, in urban settings around New Zealand and other parts of the world, presents fascinating questions. There is also the possibility of collective identities within the ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’ to produce counter-narratives, incorporating whakapapa and the meta-themes, in stories about whanau, hapu or runanga as the tangata whenua identities entitled to Article Two rights within New Zealand, rather than iwi presented as Ngai Tahu Whanui. The working out of these layers of national identity within the wider ‘New Zealand Nation’ will also present fascinating material for further research. This is particularly so given that the situation for New Zealand and its ‘iwi Nations’ is unique in the world due to the Treaty of Waitangi and its varying interpretations around the issues of tino rangatiratanga (sovereignty) and governance, The working out of these layers of national identity constitute subjects for research.

Versions of the meta-themes may shift and change and new meta-themes may develop. But these meta-themes will continue to be interwoven with whakapapa in the stories – both personal and public - to constitute understandings and framings of identity for the citizens of the contemporary ‘Ngai Tahu Nation’. In the words of Sir Tipene O’Regan:

...in telling the stories there is a sense of possession and of being possessed, of belonging. That sense is viewed through the prism of descent – whakapapa that goes back to the gods that made that landscape and the ancestors who dreamed them into existence... [1999: 15]

Taonga Tuku Iho na nga Tupuna
The Past Before Us
Figure 1: Map of New Zealand

Figure 2: Map of Ngai Tahu Whanui *papatipu runanga*
Figure 3: Map of Kemp's Purchase 1848

Glossary of Maori terms

Unless otherwise stated, all definitions are according to the researcher’s understandings gained from participant observation of Ngai Tahu settings over the period 1990 to 2002.

ahi kaa
‘keep the fires burning’, refers to land occupation rights

Aoraki
Mt. Cook, Ngai Tahu’s traditional mountain

Aotearoa
New Zealand

atete
‘power to hold’ [Parsonson: 2001: 25-31]

atua
‘god’; ‘supernatural’ [Ryan: 1989]

haere mai
welcome

haere mai tua
welcome in return

haka
traditional Maori dance with chant

hapu
traditional Maori lineage group based on kin relations between several whanau recorded by whakapapa and attachment to ancestral place

heke haere
depart, migrate

hui
traditional Maori consultative gathering at marae

hui a tau
annual tribal hui

iwi
tribe

kaha
‘power to hold’ [Parsonson: 2001: 25-31]

kaikorero
‘speaker, announcer, advocate’ [Ryan: 1989]

kainga
traditional settlement, village

Kaiwhakahaere
leader, head, chairman
kaumatua  elder
kaupapa  purpose, cause, topic, manifesto
kaupapa Maori  a Maori way of doing things
kaupapa whakahuataka  opening idea
kawa  protocol
kei te pai  fine, okay
komiti  committee
koru  spiral, metaphor for origin of life and whakapapa
korowai  chiefly cloak made from muttonbird feathers
mahinga kai  natural food sources
mana  power, prestige, status
manawhenua  customary rights in land
manuhuri  visitors
marae  traditional ancestral place of meeting and living for whanau and hapu
mauri  spirit, life force
moko  traditional face tattoo, metaphor for whakapapa
mokopuna/moko  grandchildren
noho tuturu  “continuous occupation’, as the court put it, over many generations’ [Parsonson: 2001: 25-31]
pa  traditional fortified site
paepae  seat for orators [Ryan: 1989]
Pakeha  European settlers
Papa, Papatuanuku  Mother earth
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>papatipu runanga</td>
<td>contemporary sub-tribal collectives for Ngai Tahu with some basis in traditional runanga structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pounamu</td>
<td>greenstone/jade; traditional Ngai Tahu taonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poutokomanawa</td>
<td>‘centre pillar’ [Ryan: 1989]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangi</td>
<td>sky, original Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raranga korero</td>
<td>‘stories of genealogical figures and events’ [Bishop: 1996: 25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rohe</td>
<td>boundary, geographical area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>runanga</td>
<td>‘Maori council, assembly’ [Evison: 1993]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take</td>
<td>‘basis of claims’; ‘basis of rights transferred from one generation to the next brought before the court, linked always with noho tuturu [Parsonson: 2001: 25-31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>take tipuna</td>
<td>‘rights to land passed on through whakapapa (genealogies) [Parsonson: 2001: 25-31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takiwa</td>
<td>territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata whenua</td>
<td>people of the land, local owner-occupier, original inhabitant [Evison: 1993: xvii], with access to authority or title over land, and the rights of ownership and control of usage of resources on the land, forests, rivers, etc. [Evison: 1993: xv])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangi</td>
<td>funeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taniwha</td>
<td>water monster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taonga</td>
<td>cultural treasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapu</td>
<td>sacred, spiritual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taua</td>
<td>war party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te Ika a Maui</td>
<td>North Island of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te Waka a Maui</td>
<td>South Island of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te reo</td>
<td>Maori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tau Ihu</td>
<td>Maori collective group residing at top of South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Waipounamu</td>
<td>The Greenstone Island, South Island of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taina</td>
<td>younger sibling of the same sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tikanga</td>
<td>custom, values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tino rangatiratanga</td>
<td>self-determination; full authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tipuna/tupuna</td>
<td>ancestors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tohunga</td>
<td>spiritual leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuakana</td>
<td>older sibling of the same sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upoko</td>
<td>leader, head of runanga or hapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiata</td>
<td>traditional song, verse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wananga</td>
<td>a learning hui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakawhanaungatanga</td>
<td>‘a rediscovery of identity and familiness and of one’s place in the world’ [Bishop: 1996: 63]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whanau</td>
<td>extended family sharing whakapapa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whanaungatanga</td>
<td>concept of all kin with shared whakapapa living around the marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whangai</td>
<td>adopted child(ren)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whanui</td>
<td>contemporary term used to refer to the widest collective of South Island Maori historically sharing whakapapa known as Ngai Tahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whare runanga</td>
<td>runanga meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wharenui</td>
<td>traditional meeting house for hui, centre of marae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whenua</td>
<td>birth, land, placenta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Ngai Tahu Whanui place names/papatipu runanga [See Figure 3, page 366]

Arowhenua
Awarua
Hokonui
Kaikoura
Kati Waewae
Koukourarata
Makaawhio
Moeraki
Onuku
Oraka Aparima
Otakou
Puketeraki
Rapaki
Te Taumutu
Tuahuriri/Tuahiwi
Waihao
Waihopai
Wairewa
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