

Working Papers on University Reform

Working Paper 17:

Researching Academic Agency in the Cultural Production of Indigenous Ideology in New Zealand Universities

By Elizabeth Rata



Danish School of Education,
University of Aarhus

April 2011

Title: *Researching Academic Agency in the Cultural Production of Indigenous Ideology in New Zealand Universities*

Author: Elizabeth Rata

Published by: EPOKE, Department of Education, Aarhus University, 2011

© 2011, the writer

1. Edition

ISBN: 978-87-7684-930-6

Working Papers on University Reform
Series Editor: Susan Wright

This working papers series is published by the research programme 'Education, Policy and Organisation in the Knowledge Economy' (EPOKE) at Department of Education, Aarhus University. The series brings together work in progress in Denmark and among an international network of scholars involved in research on universities and higher education.

EPOKE aims to establish the study of universities as a field of research in Denmark. The field has three components:

- 1. Inter/national policies to develop a global knowledge economy and society – their global travel and local negotiation*
- 2. New forms of organisation – their migration between private and public sectors, including universities, and their pedagogies*
- 3. University teaching, research and knowledge dissemination, as shaped by these organisational and policy contexts.*

Central questions include: How are different national and transnational visions of learning societies, knowledge economies, and new world orders spurring reforms to the role and purpose of universities and to the policies and practices of higher education? How do reforms of universities and other knowledge organisations introduce new rationalities of governance, systems of management and priorities for research and teaching? How do managers, academics, employees and students negotiate with new discourses, subject positions and forms of power within these changing organisational and policy contexts? How are their work practices changing, in terms of the politics of knowledge, conduct of research and pedagogy?

EPOKE draws together ideas and approaches from a range of academic fields – anthropology, comparative education, ethnology, history, the history of ideas, political science and sociology – and collaborates internationally with other higher education research centres. EPOKE holds seminars and there is a mailing list of academics and students working in this field in Denmark and internationally.

Further information on EPOKE, current projects, and other working papers in the series are at <http://edu.au.dk/forskning/omraader/epoke/>. To join the mailing list, hold a seminar or have material included in the working paper series please contact professor Susan Wright at suwr@dpu.dk or at the Department of Education, Aarhus University, Tuborgvej 164, 2400 Copenhagen NV, Denmark.

**Researching Academic Agency in the Cultural
Production of Indigenous Ideology in New Zealand
Universities**

By

Elizabeth Rata
School of Critical Studies in Education
Faculty of Education
University of Auckland
e.rata@auckland.ac.nz

Copyright:
Elizabeth Rata

Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Political Economy Approach.....	5
3. Class Context of Cultural Actors.....	8
4. Bicultural Discourses.....	11
5. Brokerage Stages.....	12
6. Treaty Auditing.....	17
7. From Treaty to Indigenous Discourse.....	20
8. The Cultural Production of Indigenous Ideology.....	22
9. Tradition in Cultural Production.....	27
10. Researching Māori Academic Agents.....	32
11. Research Areas.....	37
Building Agency Infrastructure.....	37
Networks.....	38
Academic Succession.....	39
Controlling research.....	42
The Ethics Example.....	44
Institutional and Government Recognition.....	47
12. Researching Agents' Intentions.....	48
13. Criticism of Indigenous Ideology.....	53
Dannette Marie and Brian Haig.....	55
Christopher Tremewan.....	56
14. Conclusion.....	57
Bibliography.....	60
Glossary.....	67

1. Introduction

This Working Paper develops the framework for an ethnographic Research Project¹ about the cultural production of indigenous knowledge by Māori ‘neotribal’ academic agents in New Zealand universities. The paper has five aims: The first is to theorise Māori cultural politics in the university by applying the ideas about neotribal capitalism² that I have developed in previous research.³ This theory conceptualises neotribalism as a localised version of global neoliberalism.⁴ Like neoliberalism, neotribalism is characterised by the privatisation of public resources into corporate ownership or control, by the devolution of public services into that same corporate control, and by a traditionalist ideology justifying privatisation and devolution.

Both ideologies operate within the context of post-industrial capitalism, a period in the world economy characterised by the decline of the liberal-democratic nation-state as the structuring political unit, the fragmentation of the middle-class, and the emergence of a settlement between non-democratic political units and capitalism. The settlement ‘signals the possibility of a “New Middle Age” (Minc, cited in Friedman, 1994), which would be characterised by doubly oppressive social and economic structures: the oppressive political and social relations of traditional societies with the exploitative economic relations inherent to capitalism’ (Rata, 2003b). In New Zealand, neotribal modes of regulation, particularly education, create the social conditions that guarantee the stability of capitalist accumulation. My proposed Research Project is about the ways in which these social conditions are created.

Localised versions of neoliberal ideology draw on traditions specific to the locality. For example, the ‘freedom ideology used to support neoliberalism in the United States draws on the traditional American belief in ‘freedom’ but restricts it to refer to economic ‘freedom’

¹ My Research Project contributes to a larger University of Auckland Project about the impact of the university reforms on the character of research and the conduct of researchers. In turn that Project is part of a European Union Marie Curie International Research Staff Exchange Scheme (IRSES) between the universities of Aarhus, Bristol and Auckland.

² . . . Rata argues for a view of modern tribes as organisations of capitalist accumulation that are legitimised through a “neotribalist” ideology that recreates present-day class relations in pre-colonial terms’ (Schroder, 2003: 435).

³ See Rata, 1996, 2000, 2003.

⁴ Previously, (Rata, 2000, pp. 225-232; 2003), I used the term ‘post-fordism’ rather than ‘neoliberalism’ to describe how neotribal elites establish tribal modes of regulation to organise and administer the social relations between Māori individuals and groups and the capitalised tribal means of production. Because a mode of regulation is an ensemble of values, knowledge, beliefs, cultural practices as much as it is an ensemble of administration and regulation, the elites are able to establish ideological and political control in association with their economic control’ (Rata, 2003: 46).

only. In the New Zealand neotribal case, 'indigeneity' is emerging as the key justifying concept. Both 'freedom' in the United States and 'indigeneity' in New Zealand are effective ideological concepts because they both appeal to tradition. In periods of economic decline, as Jonathan Friedman (1994; 2000) points out, evoking tradition, or looking to the past for an imagined stability rather than enduring the anxiety of an unknown and threatening future, becomes increasingly attractive. Hence the success of a number of traditionalist ideologies, from Salafism Islamism in Egypt to neoliberalism in the US, to indigeneity in N.Z.

The second aim of this Paper is to explain the ways in which that traditionalist (indigenous) ideology serves as 'a strategy of political legitimisation' (Schroder, 2003: 436), one that justifies the reframing of public resources and services into neotribal (*iwi*⁵) corporate control. The third aim is to explain and justify the focus of the Research Project on neotribal academic agents. These are intellectuals who develop indigenous ideology and institutionalise it in the university as 'indigenous knowledge and methodology' or 'kaupapa Māori'. According to Richard Lachmann (2000), the source of social change is established when an emergent elite enters into a new relationship with power. The mechanism of the relationship is brokerage because it is in the brokerage function that the pressure point of transformation occurs. (See section 5 for a detailed discussion of brokerage). This is the reason I analyse agency in terms of brokerage strategies to ask what roles, functions, networks and relationships are exercised by indigenous academics. While the brokerage strategies of elite emergence are common to capitalism throughout historical periods and across the world, the agents or compradors come from their own local histories. Traditionalist ideologies, such as indigeneity, are well placed to exploit history in this way since history supplies the material for traditionalism.

The fourth aim is to identify the strategies, processes, actors, networks, practices, policies and effects that contribute to the materialisation of the role played by academics in the development of the indigenous ideology. What is the actual content of academics' work as they establish the ideology as the 'natural' way of understanding how Maori are to be understood?

The final aim is to develop an ethnographic methodology that can be used to investigate that materialisation. In preparing this Working Paper I have become increasingly

⁵ The shift from 'tribe' to the Māori word *iwi* since the 1990s is one of the linguistic devices of an emergent ideology as it seeks to control the discourse. The meanings of Māori words are in the glossary. See Rata, E. (2011 in press) Discursive Strategies of the Maori Tribal Elite, *Critique of Anthropology*, 31:4.

aware of the extent to which the research into the nature of cultural production is a difficult ethnographic task. Jonathan Friedman (2000: 645) describes 'culture as attributed meaning', saying 'it must be actively maintained as meaning in order to continue to exist'. He notes however, that 'what it is that makes such attributed meaning *shared meaning* is a complex issue, related to the way in which social worlds are organized and enforced for larger groups of people. Power is converted into authority and the latter into forms of socialization; the formation of subjects and of subjective experience'. My specific task for the proposed Research Project is to understand how 'indigeneity' has become *shared meaning* in the New Zealand university. This will require investigating the nature, extent, and effects of neotribal academic agency in, firstly, producing the material which justifies indigenous ideology, and then secondly, in controlling that cultural production process and the product 'indigenous knowledge'. Because it is in the exercise of management that an ideology becomes hegemonic, I will need to study specific compliance and auditing regimes that now operate in New Zealand universities. The example I refer to in this paper is the University of Auckland's ethics process.

Jessop (1990) and McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly (2001) have noted that such investigation requires the identification of the actors, their identities, actions, institutional positions, and the network structures. In doing so it is impossible to avoid naming those agents and inquiring into their motives. The naming of individuals is justified by restricting the investigation to their public roles. Investigating motives and intentions is difficult but not impossible. Friedman (1994) recognises that cultural change is embedded in the political and material existence of real people with motives, beliefs and interests. 'All cultural creation is motivated. And the motives lie within the contemporary existences of creating subjects' (1994: 13). This means that any ethnography of the production and management of cultural knowledge must necessarily be informed by a political economy perspective in order to link the actors' motives to the political and economic interests of the class the actors represent. Major political and economic motives lie behind the cultural production and control of indigenous ideology because knowledge is a major economic resource in contemporary global capitalism.

Because the linking of political economy⁶ and ethnography investigation is the methodological approach to be employed in the proposed Research Project, I begin this paper with an account of the politics of neotribalism and indigeneity in New Zealand. This is followed by a discussion of the ways in which specific agents' deeply embedded motives are materialised into intentions and actions, as well as into the effects of those actions on others. Throughout this discussion I comment upon possible methods that may best be applied to investigating agents' intentions, motives and effects and provide a number of examples. The most detailed example is the 2003 Māori Tertiary Education Framework (see section 12). The Framework was developed by the indigenous academics whose agency I propose to investigate. Its analysis provides a useful means to probe their motives by investigating the intended goals recommended for Māori tertiary education. A second example which I develop at some length is the analysis of the University of Auckland Ethics regulations (see section 12). There I argue that 'ethics' now appears to mean management of a political position rather than principled action to ensure sound scholarship. Both these examples use discourse analysis methods. However I also refer to examples where participant observation approach might be used. This would require data to be collected from university conversations, committee proceedings, interviews and email messages; all practices that reveal the daily practices of the university to show policy enacted in the practice of academic work.

2. Political Economy Approach

Neotribal or indigenous politics in New Zealand is conceptualised as a localised and ethnicised version of global neoliberalism because: Firstly, the intention of cultural politics is to privatise public resources into corporate neotribal control and /or ownership and to acquire control of the modes of regulation, such as education, through processes of devolution. My interest is confined to investigating the processes underway in New Zealand's public universities to transfer control over the production and regulation of indigenous Māori knowledge to neotribal academic agents. Secondly, neotribalism promotes the devolution of public services into tribal control. In the university, devolution occurs through processes that

⁶ See Jonathan Friedman (2000) for a discussion of the application of political economy to ethnography in anthropology.

bring the tribes into the institution. These range from requirements to consult with local tribes through to the local tribe's direct inclusion in decision-making⁷. Thirdly, cultural politics is about the transfer of political control over the regulation of social relations from the public sphere to neotribal corporations. This process occurs in the university in a number of ways. For example, there are policies based on kinship ideology that control the relationships between those who undertake Māori research and their research subjects.

Fourthly, the traditional ideology that justifies retribalisation politics conceals both the privileging and exploitative relationship of the neotribal elite to tribally owned resources, and the processes that diminish the public sphere by devolving regulatory authority to tribal corporations. This occurs as kinship and indigenous identity replaces class consciousness. Tribal members tend to identify with the political interests of the tribal elite, rather than in terms of their own class interests or in the interests of national identity⁸. These privatisation and devolution processes all contribute to diminishing the public sector generally, and the public character of the university specifically.

My study of the role that retribalisation politics plays in neoliberal privatisation processes is about how, by whom, to whom, and with what effect a tribalised academic elite has acquired control of Māori knowledge in the university. While the argument put forward in this Paper justifies the importance of undertaking ethnographic investigation, it also discusses how difficult such a task will be. The neotribal hegemony and the managerial⁹ and auditing compliance systems, such as compliance with the Treaty of Waitangi¹⁰ that institutionalises this hegemony, are the subject of my proposed Research Project. But they are also the context within which I work. In referring to the reason why 'audit culture is so difficult to contest',

⁷ See examples on pages 13, 14, 15 and 41

⁸ For example, the Durie Principles, which inform Māori education policy, do not refer to 'New Zealand' or to the 'nation'. The 'three shaping visions' are: 'to live as Māori. To actively participate as citizens of the world. To enjoy a high standard of living and good health'. (Māori Tertiary Education Framework, 2003: 7).

⁹ During the 1990s, New Zealand universities established the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) to administer university acknowledgement of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as required by legislation. Other positions have also been established at various levels throughout the institution though these differ from one university to another. In the main, most university committees, such as ethics committees will contain a Māori representative.

¹⁰ The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, was an agreement between the majority of Māori chiefs and the British Government which ceded sovereignty to the British. Effectively a 19th century instrument of annexation, the interpretation of the Treaty has been, since the 1970s, subject to the historical revisionism of neotribal politics.

Cris Shore and Sue Wright mention how difficult it is ‘to find that Archimedian point outside of the system that enables us to critique it’ (2008: 291). The difficulty is doubled in this research not only for the reasons the writers identify, but also because the subject of my investigation, the indigenised academic elite, is protected from scrutiny by those very instruments of compliance (Marie and Haig, 2006, 2009).

The University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Manual and Application Form (2009) is an example of a neotribal compliance instrument. From August 2009, ethics authorisation is required not only for research using Māori participants, as previously, but for research into a ‘topic of particular interest to Māori’ (Application Form, 2009: 12). Previously, kaupapa Māori research models (e.g. Smith, 1997) concerning the relationships between researchers and participants, particularly the neotribal requirement that Māori research must be *for* the participants and based upon an idealised general conception of a revived traditional culture, had restricted the development of critical research. As early as 1998, Steven Webster noted ‘the ethnographic silence on contemporary Māori society since the 1970’s (1998: 28). I undertook ethnographic research during the 1980s and early 1990s, however the institutionalisation of cultural politics during the 1990s has restricted my research to the analysis of public documents only, for which ethics clearance was not required. However, the new requirement concerning ‘a topic of interest to Māori’ may close down that avenue given the critical nature of my research and the fact that I do not use a *kaupapa Māori* methodology.¹¹

In addition, applicants must declare their tribal affiliations - or lack of these - to the university ethics committee (Application Form, 2009). This requirement to state one’s racial/ethnic¹² heritage itself is, of course, a much more profound ethical issue than the compliance requirements themselves. (See page 46). This means that the Working Paper, along with the proposed Research Project being developed in the paper, contain an inherent tension. That is, ethical clearance from the university is dependant upon the research adhering to the very policies and practices which I criticise in this Working Paper. The study is about the contribution of neotribal cultural politics to the neoliberalisation of the university, but because

¹¹ The requirements for this methodology are discussed on pages 35 – 41.

¹² See page 21 for a discussion of ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’.

of the compliance demands concerning Māori research, it is itself, most unfortunately, an exercise in cultural politics.

3. Class Context of Cultural Actors

In order to link neotribal actors' motives to the political and economic interests of the class the actors represent, this section locates neotribal academics within the intellectual fraction of the new professional class. That class's genealogy is in what David Cannadine (2008), describes as 'unprecedented government support for a national university-based intellectual class in the post-war decades'. In New Zealand, the shift by this class from class to identity politics originated within the context of the world-wide response to the global economic downturn from the early to mid-1970s and was shaped by this context. Many left-wing humanists of the new professional class turned in disillusionment from class to identity group politics as the prosperity that had improved the lives of working class people throughout the developed world came to an abrupt close with the economic crisis of the 1970s and beyond. The enthusiasm of a 'babyboomer' generation that had initially thrown its weight behind left-wing class politics was directed instead to the group identity politics of feminism, gay rights, and ethnicised cultural rights, and also to issue-based politics, such as anti-nuclearism and conservationism. New Zealand's biculturalism was one version of this huge shift in left-wing commitment from class to identity politics.

From the late 1970s, these mainly university educated members of the new middle class moved into positions of power and influence in the professions, especially in teaching, health, and social services, and in government, as officials and politicians. They brought with them the new commitment to identity politics, one that has become a powerful discourse in education. A large number with settler descendant backgrounds took on a political identity as 'pakeha'¹³ in response to their colleagues who were increasingly identifying politically as

¹³ Until the 1980s, the word 'pakeha' was the descriptive term used mainly by Māori for British settlers and their descendants. Michael King's *Being Pakeha* (1985) was the 'event' which propelled biculturalists within the new professional class to self-identify as an ethnic group, as Pakeha. Many, particularly social science academics and teachers applied the term 'Pakeha' to themselves. This process saw the word acquiring the upper case 'P'. In fact the use of upper or lower case was hotly debated in the media at the time. Interestingly, the Ngati-Pakeha process (many in this group referring to themselves as belonging to the 'Pakeha tribe') reached its peak at the beginning of

Māori (King, 1985). ‘Victimhood was subsequently understood as oppression by colonisation, the patriarchy, and “Western” culture generally, an oppression experienced by ethnic groups, indigenous peoples, women, gays, and religious minorities’ rather than being derived from the capitalist exploitation of working class people (Rata and Openshaw, 2006: 10).

It has been argued that identity politics, despite being promoted in the name of the dispossessed, is in fact a political movement of the new middle class (Friedman, 1994; Kuper, 1999; Appiah, 2005). It is in this vulnerable class’s response to the erosion of its relatively privileged material conditions in the contracting global economic order that identity politics has benefited an emergent new middle class elite. In New Zealand cultural politics was led by a second generation of Māori university graduates. According to Thomas Fitzgerald (1972) most second generation ‘Māori graduates live exclusively in non-kin-based, non-tribal, urban areas’ and ‘many were incompletely socialised in the Māori subculture’. However, Fitzgerald describes how ‘the achievement of economic security permits the exercise of a new kind of cultural choice’ and he identified the ‘latent manifestation of culture for these particular individuals’ (p, 41) as the consequence of that security provided by the economic prosperity of the post-war years.

The movement was initially pan-Māori and directed towards social justice issues, such as the revival of the Māori language and the improvement of Māori educational achievement, problems that had become highly visible by the post-war concentration of Māori in the newly established suburbs of New Zealand’s cities. The support by many liberal-Left New Zealanders for social justice goals became the basis of ‘inclusive biculturalism’. This was the idea of a Māori–pakeha cultural relationship that would bring Māori culture fully into New Zealand civil society. This was biculturalism as ‘difference within unity’.

However, the 1985 Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act, which allowed historical grievance claims by tribes¹⁴ to be made to the Waitangi Tribunal (a government body established by the

the 1990s. It has waned since that time. The use and abandonment of the term as a self-referent by academics would be a useful focus in the ethnographic study.

¹⁴ The legal status given to tribes as appellants in the Treaty of Waitangi historical grievance settlement process led to active retribalisation. At the individual and family level, people began researching their genealogy and re-establishing tribal connections. The tribes embarked on writing tribal histories to codify a self-definition which

1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act), was one of several significant events which changed biculturalism in fundamental ways. Tipene O'Regan, leader of the South Island's Ngai Tahu tribe, describes the shifting roles of emergent leaders from pan-Māori to tribal politics. He 'was one of the young generation from the Māori Graduates Association . . . (that) was concerned, as the second generation of Māori university graduates, to drive change with our people. We were very effective for a time. Then we all began answering the call of our own tribes and regions. We've driven our case through the Waitangi Tribunal, and are on our way to having our legal personality recognised.' (O'Regan, 1994: 43). Importantly, O'Regan links the development of the new tribal infrastructures to its economic function as a corporation controlling resources acquired as a result of Treaty of Waitangi historical grievance settlements, saying that 'the growth of a stable decision-making structure is critical if the iwi's¹⁵ assets are not to be placed at risk' (1994: 47).

By the late 1980s two distinctive strands of biculturalism had emerged: 'inclusive biculturalism' and 'exclusive biculturalism'. The former is the idea of 'bicultural citizenship' for all New Zealanders, the recognition and inclusion of Māori culture and language into all areas of government, and the commitment by government to the Treaty of Waitangi. 'Exclusive biculturalism' is primarily the cultural politics of tribal sovereignty (*tino rangatiratanga* or ethno-nationalism).¹⁶ The idea of Māori cultural revival and pan-Māori social justice directed towards the full inclusion of Māori into New Zealand society remained the concept of biculturalism for many New Zealanders. This understanding has ensured their ongoing support. In contrast, the shift to retribalisation led in a different direction for the revived tribes. Biculturalism, in this interpretation, increasingly referred to the cultural politics of retribalisation. Claims were made by the revived tribes for political power and for the transfer to the neotribal corporations of major economic resources such as land, water, and,

would secure them to a particular territory for which claims could be made. For accounts of a family's retribalisation and of the re-definition of Ngati Kuri see Rata, 2002.

¹⁵ *Iwi* - tribe

¹⁶ Christopher Tremewan's (2006) study of the Anglican Church in New Zealand shows 'how 'a re-constructed indigenous elite using the arguments of cultural authenticity to take over a colonial institution, the Church of England, points to deeper political dynamics of ethno-nationalism' (p. 98). There 'is no doubt that ethno-nationalism (*tino rangatiratanga*) is the force behind elite political strategies'. According to Whatarangi Winiata, the leaders of the Māori Party: "Failure by our nation to take steps in this direction so as to change the management of our affairs and ways of governing ourselves, will create the circumstances where the fury of *tino rangatiratanga* will produce the true believers, namely, those who will die for the cause. Time is running out. (Winiata, 1998: 1 cited in Tremewan, 2006: 98).

increasingly in the last decade, commodified knowledge. The latter is a particularly valuable resource because knowledge serves two functions. In addition to its value as a commodity, knowledge is the means by which the traditionalist ideology is produced that justifies retribalisation politics.

4. Bicultural Discourses

Although exclusive biculturalism and inclusive biculturalism have separate political and economic development goals, both projects have their origins in the same global conditions and in the same new professional class that led the inclusive bicultural movement. It includes both Māori and non-Māori academics. This means that the academic discourse which promotes cultural politics retains the rhetoric associated with progressive, class-based politics. Both inclusive and exclusive biculturalism are informed by social justice rhetoric and the mainstreaming of Māori language and culture. The shared language gives the appearance that cultural politics and class politics have the same progressive goals. Until the end of the 1990s, such redemptive goals were delivered in a Marxian-Gramscian discourse, one frequently embellished with the romanticism of Paulo Friere. The codifying of identity ideology into various forms of what increasingly became called ‘indigenous knowledge’ (also called *kaupapa Māori*, *matauranga Māori*, *tikanga Māori*, Māori epistemology and Māori knowledge) in the second half of the 1990s came out of this eclectic theorising. It drew on Marxian-Gramscian ‘resistance’, Freirian ‘conscientisation and transformation’, with post-modern epistemological relativism added to the mix.

Graham Smith, a leading Māori academic, provides an example of this Marxian-Gramscian-Freirian language in his references to the political goal of codifying Māori knowledge (*kaupapa Māori*). ‘Kaupapa Māori strategies involve a complex arrangement of conscientisation, resistance and transformative praxis, which collectively seek to transform these twin crises related to education and culture’ (Smith, 1997: 27). (By ‘twin crises, Smith refers to the decline of the Māori language and also to the persistent educational underachievement of Māori children.) That task of codifying knowledge was accomplished by a number of Māori academics during the 1990s, mainly in the production of master’s and

doctoral theses. The most influential was Linda Tuhiwai Smith's doctoral thesis (1998), which was published as *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* in 1999¹⁷.

The indigenous theorising that came out of the original left-wing discourse maintained the progressive vocabulary but directed those words towards the political and economic interests of the emerging neotribal elite. Terms such as 'crisis' and 'transformation' justified the devolution of Māori education into neotribal control and away from state controlled public education. 'Emancipation' and 'resistance' now meant release from Western colonisation into indigenous understanding. According to one masters' thesis: 'Kaupapa Māori is concerned with the struggle for autonomy over Māori well being, for it allows the freedom to argue that there are equally valid and normal ways of behaving, thinking and living other than those of the western world' (Tocker, 2002: 12). By the turn of the millennium, the influential writings of Māori academics such as Smith (1996; 1999) and G.H. Smith, (1997) had ensured bicultural discourse, while retaining its emancipatory left-wing vocabulary, now referred to retribalisation politics.

5. Brokerage Stages

The early alliance between Māori intellectuals and the liberal-Left (indeed Māori intellectuals emerged within the same class as a result of the same conditions) proved crucial for the successful development of brokerage strategies that have institutionalised neotribal ideology in the university (Rata, 2003). With the reduction of the intellectual class to 'proletarianised civil servant status' (Cannadine, 2008: 6) from the 1980s, a small group from amongst the ranks of senior managers and academics has emerged to broker its own new relationship to the external business class. Neotribal academics are no different from other groups in pursuing this course. The very act of brokerage, of institutionalising neoliberal policies and practices in large and small ways, transforms these groups into a comprador bourgeoisie, that is a fraction who emerge as an elite by acting as intermediaries for external capital (Poulantzas, 1976;

¹⁷ *'Decolonising Methodologies : Research and Indigenous Peoples* (1999) 'received international attention and is now used as a text across a range of disciplines and institutions. It has been translated into Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Italian and Bhasa Indonesian'. Many of Professor Smith's publications are credited with having helped to create the academic field of Māori and indigenous education'. (*Waikato News*, 2007). I discuss Peter Munz's strong critique of its scholarship, what he calls 'the mischief of this book' (1999: 4) on page 48-9.

Rata, 2000). Here, within the corporatised university, those individuals who occupy the brokerage roles then become an elite-for-itself with its own interests and ambitions.

It is unsurprising that one of the latest of capitalism's emergent elites is to be found in the university. It is one of the central institutions in contemporary capitalism that global corporate interests needed to acquire in order to secure positional advantage in the developing the new 'business' of academia. The university's strategic importance to corporate business lies in three areas: It is where the latest and most valuable resource, 'knowledge' is created. It is where the knowledge resource is commodified and placed into the global knowledge market. And of equal importance, the corporatised university is where the ideology of the knowledge market is created and maintained. The university produces its own hegemonic discourses. In the case of neotribalism, these interests are justified by an indigenous ideology.

The shared class origins between the biculturalist and neotribalist elites created the networks and positions within which brokerage mechanisms, such as Treaty compliance requirements, were enacted. Material resources and intellectual ideologies from previously unconnected Māori and government social sites were linked by the activities of the brokers from both sites. Such activities, which characterised biculturalism during the 1980s and 1990s, mediated the relationship between Māori cultural revivalists and government biculturalists in new ways that provided substantial benefits to the brokers. Citing Burt (1992), McAdam et al. argue that the brokerage process is itself transforming: 'Brokerage produces new advantages for the parties, especially for the brokers' (2001: 142).

The 'recognition of difference', a key idea in inclusive biculturalism, made possible the first stage of brokerage of neotribalism by establishing the concept of two separate parties. The networks created initially in the new intellectual class's shared university education in the 1960s and reinforced in the commitment to identity politics in the 1970s provided entry for neotribalists to move into positions of influence and power as representatives of tribal revivalism. A second, and equally important brokerage stage, was the transformation of cultural difference into the idea of two distinct political entities; the liberal-democratic government on the one hand and the revived tribes on the other justified by the bicultural interpretation of the Treaty of Waitangi.

The idea of a revived tribe with traditional kinship social relations of production ignores the destruction of tribal socio-political structures from the early colonial period. Steven Webster (1998) uses evidence from the 19th century economy to show how quickly and completely Māori entered the capitalist economy, a process which destroyed the traditional socio-political structure as completely as capitalism's intrusion had done elsewhere, including in Europe. In similar vein, Lyndsay Head's account of early colonial Māori history refers to the creation of a 'false distance between metropolitan and indigenous culture'. She shows how the '19th century government's ability to define the terms of the market construed society' 'meant the destruction of Māori society's former political structure' (Head, 2006: ii). My own research into the political economy of the contemporary tribe, 'neotribal capitalism' also describes the historical rupture between the redistributive kinship-based social organisation of the traditional tribe and the contemporary corporate 'neotribes' (Rata, 2000, 2003).

However, because inclusive biculturalists accepted the idea that the traditional tribal socio-political structure had been revived, the brokerage of neotribal ideology and people into government institutions could occur. This acceptance of tribal revivalism overturned the idea of the 'late fifties and early sixties held in official circles that 'tribe' was an anachronism' (Kawharu, 1989: xii). Yet the entity recognised was not, in fact, the revived traditional tribe but a contemporary economic corporation with class relations of production. However, the idea that the traditional tribe is 'revived' enabled the emergent Māori elite to claim direct links to the past, and, more importantly, the inheritance of the past. The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi serves as the document of inheritance. Its contemporary interpretation and institutionalisation as a partnership¹⁸ between two political entities, 'iwi and the Crown', became the main brokerage site for neotribal political and economic interests during the 1990s. (The Treaty's diminishing influence from 2000 which led to indigenous ideology being developed as the justification for neotribal claims is discussed below.)

The interpretation of the Treaty of Waitangi as a 'partnership' with 'principles' was the third brokerage stage. It built on the first two stages by developing specific mechanisms and processes for the institutionalisation of tribal politics. The most outstanding example of

¹⁸ 'Partnership' dates only to the 1987 Court of Appeal decision which likened the relationship between the tribes and the government to a partnership (TPK, 2001: 78).

brokerage is that which began the Treaty process of getting the principles integrated into the workings of major institutions like universities. For this reason and also because it describes two of the most influential brokers at work, I describe this example in some detail.

The 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act referred to 'principles', although without saying what the principles were. It was not until 1986 that the idea that the Treaty had principles was given teeth. The history of the inclusion of Treaty of Waitangi principles in legislation (almost all legislation now refers to it) began when, in 1986, Ministers were considering the State Owned Enterprises (SOE) legislation, then in Bill form. In the climate of Treaty revisionism that reached its peak in the mid to late 1980s, concern was felt that the passage of this Bill might lead, or be perceived to lead, to infringement of Māori rights that were believed to be guaranteed by the Treaty. This was because the Bill proposed transferring Crown assets to new State-owned enterprises so that they became assets of the enterprises and, in their semi-privatised state, no longer available for Waitangi Tribunal claims for privatisation by the tribes.

That concern led the Deputy Prime Minister, Geoffrey Palmer, to travel to meet Sir Hēpi Te Heuheū, the paramount chief of Ngāti Tuwharetoa (a central North Island tribe), at his home. Te Heuheū expressed that concern directly to the Deputy Prime Minister, and told him that it would be allayed if the Bill were to provide as the Act now does; 'Nothing in this Act shall permit the Crown to act in a manner that is inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi (States-Owned Enterprise (SOE) Act, Section 9). (Berthold, 2003).

Sir Hēpi Te Heuheū was a member of the neotribal elite while Geoffrey Palmer (now Sir Geoffrey) represented the liberal-Left elite who institutionalised biculturalism in such a comprehensive way in the 1980s and 1990s. Interestingly, 20 years on, Palmer appears to be less gungho about the Treaty. In a 2006 speech he advised 'a pause' after which the country 'will be able to assess how the resources in health, education and from settlement assets and the policies of devolution have worked in practice. The Treaty is not now, never has been, and never will be a silver bullet to solve everyone's problems' (Palmer, 2006, No. 23). Despite Palmer's hindsight disclaimer, the treaty *was* regarded as the 'silver bullet' in the mid-1980s to the turn of the century. By the 1990 sesquicentennial of the 1840 signing of the Treaty, the

latter had leaped from prior obscurity to 'oracle' status (Sharp, 2002) as the talisman for a bicultural New Zealand (Rata, 2003).

There is now widespread acceptance amongst the governing class (consisting of those of the post-war new middle class who entered academia, politics and government) of the neotribal interpretation of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi (Rata, 2004). This interpretation includes the commitment to the post-1987 idea that the Treaty is a 'partnership' between the 'Crown' and *iwi* (tribe), to be enacted through the insertion of 'treaty principles' into legislation and policy. For example, the Ministry of Education's 'Iwi Education Partnerships' (Ministry of Education, 2003) was a five-year plan (2003 – 2008) intended to strengthen 'the Ministry's response to the education of Māori' in terms of 'partnerships' 'between iwi and the Crown' (p. 1). According to the policy document: 'Partnerships are relationships between the Ministry of Education and either iwi, or other iwi based and formed Māori education organisations' (p. 1).

In addition, Treaty principles are incorporated into the university by statute. The requirement of the 1989 Education Act that it is the duty of University Councils to 'acknowledge the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi' (Section 181(b)) became institutionalised at all levels of university operation. One example of this is from the University of Auckland's Strategic Plan where it commits to 'fulfill the responsibilities and obligations of the University under Te Tiriti o Waitangi' (Treaty of Waitangi) (University of Auckland Strategic Plan, Objective 10, 2006). This includes recognising tribal interests. 'The University will place greater emphasis on the development of productive and mutually supportive relationships with mana whenua,¹⁹ iwi Māori, and Māori organisations. The University will develop relationships to identify shared aims and aspirations and to develop, implement, and monitor programmes which achieve those aims and aspirations' (Objective 10).

Another example of the exercise of neotribal control in the university is from the agreement negotiated between *Ngai Tahu* (the largest South Island tribe) and several South Island tertiary institutions. The *Ngai Tahu* Agreement provides generic guidelines for tertiary institutions to meet their obligations as Treaty partners. Its 'prime concern with Treaty-based Guidelines is to declare a position on what is knowledge and what is not' (Tau 2003: 10). The indicators,

¹⁹ The increasing use of the term *mana whenua* in recent years attests to the development and acceptance of indigenous ideology. *Mana whenua* refers to the tribe that is indigenous to the local area and, on that basis, claims special authority and rights in addition to Treaty rights.

which will be used to monitor the institution's progress, show the tribe's movement into a governance position in state institutions. Despite acknowledging that the tribe is an economic 'corporation' (p. 21), the indicators give *Ngai Tahu* considerable control in respect to governance and operational matters, including staffing and curriculum. Two indicators demonstrate that control. First, 'the Treaty Partner is involved in the process of appointing staff deemed to be significant for Māori' and second, 'staff who teach Māori (or any other non-Western world views) can demonstrate their understanding of alternative world views where other specialist practitioners can evaluate them' (p. 66). This Agreement demonstrates the extent of traditionalist brokerage in tertiary education and the use of neoliberal management techniques to ensure compliance.

6. Treaty Auditing

Public management processes of neoliberalism include the monitoring and auditing of strategic goals. Shore and Wright describe how 'the discourse of audit has become a vehicle for changing the way people relate to the workplace, to authority, to each other, and, most importantly, to themselves' (1999: 559). This is the case with the audit culture in New Zealand universities. Treaty accountability and audit processes affect the operations of the university at every level and across teaching and research. The University of Auckland's Strategic Plan demonstrates in some detail how the mechanisms of monitoring and auditing operate. The 'actions' required under Objective 10 include: 'develop and implement strategies to assist all staff and students to have a knowledge and understanding of Te Tiriti o Waitangi relevant to their disciplines'. Another 'action' states how this performance will be audited. 'Regularly assess the performance of the University against its responsibilities and obligations under Te Tiriti o Waitangi.' (University of Auckland Strategic Plan, Objective 10, 2006).

I include here two examples from the Faculty of Education where I work to illustrate how the 'actions' of the Strategic Plan are operationalised at the level of course content and delivery. (These examples also exemplify the type of material that would consist of the ethnographic data in the proposed Research project.) One is the recent establishment of the role of Director Māori-Medium Education whose task is 'to advise on the incorporation of Māori perspectives

and needs in the design and delivery of courses and programmes' (Faculty of Education Email, 19 February 2009). A second example is from a teaching course booklet 'Research Methods in Educational and Community Settings' (Faculty of Education, University of Auckland, 2004: 2). This states that 'inherent in the module is a commitment to Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the partnership between Māori and Pakeha'.

How the Strategic Plan 'actions' will be audited is a point of entry for ethnographic study. Here are three examples of that auditing process, two from teaching and one involving applications to the university research ethics committee. The Bachelor of Education (Teaching) Programme (to which I contribute) is reviewed and evaluated periodically by external monitors. In 2006, the monitors requested information about 'how the Māori worldview within the conceptual framework has been threaded through the delivery of courses' (Email communication, 2006). The information comes from explaining what material has been taught to students as well as from the delivery approach such as the use of 'Māori pedagogy'.

The second example is also from my own experience as the coordinator of a large stage one sociology of education course in the Bachelor of Education (Teaching) programme. The learning outcomes require students to be able 'to critically examine the contemporary influence of Te Tiriti o Waitangi for education in New Zealand' in order 'to understand the relevance of the Treaty of Waitangi today' (Faculty of Education, EDUC 140 Course Booklet, 2009). The selection of teaching staff for the course is a difficult and highly sensitive issue. Māori academics are preferred for the teaching of the Māori component of the course. That a particular racial heritage is preferred for a university lecturer, while not a policy requirement, is another example of the pervasive influence of cultural politics.

The 2009 University of Auckland Ethics Requirements provide the most disturbing example of the pervasiveness of treaty ideology into every area of academic work. An applicant wishing to conduct research that will 'have impact on Māori persons as Māori' (Application Form, 2009: 12) is required to obtain the authorising signature of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) or his nominee (2009: 3). The section 'Treaty of Waitangi' also has the question: 'Explain how the intended research process is consistent with the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi' (Application Form, 2009: 12). In addition, 'if the research involves participants

who are recruited because they are Māori (or the research involves a topic of particular interest to Māori) the Māori researcher should list his or her tribal affiliations (pepeha); if the researcher is non-Māori he or she should state his or her background' (Applicants' Manual, 2009: 11).

It is here, at the teaching and research coalface, that ethnographic research will be useful in finding out how monitoring and auditing against the Strategic Plan goals occurs in the everyday life of academics. The research, both in the doing of it and in the findings will provide greater understanding of questions such as: What will happen to research that is critical of the Treaty of Waitangi yet requires approval from the university ethics committee? Is it even possible to conduct such research into that possibility? What are the implications for Māori research in general as a consequence of these prescriptions? Who decides what is 'of particular interest'? In terms of university teaching, what is the effect of treaty compliance on the material that lecturers include or exclude from their teaching? What will happen to the researcher whose research is of 'particular interest to Māori' and who refuses to state his or her racial heritage? And the most important question: What are the ethical and moral implications of the requirement that applicants to the university ethics committee provide their race? (I discuss the race component in 'tribal affiliation' on page 46.)

The Treaty of Waitangi has been a particularly successful mechanism in the intellectual elite's ability to claim the historical inheritance and the economic resources and political power that accompanies the claim. The early shift in biculturalism in the mid-1980s to Treaty of Waitangi settlements to the tribes rather than pan-Māori social projects paved the way for the neotribal corporations. These new corporations are supported by neoliberal government and business interests because they share the same goals; to increase Māori productivity using previously under-used Māori resources, and to lessen the burden of Māori dependence on government support by devolving responsibility for Māori development to the tribes. In the process, the neotribal elite operate as do all capitalist elites, by advancing and safeguarding their interests through effective brokerage strategies and justifying ideologies.

7. From Treaty to Indigenous Discourse

The thoroughness with which the Treaty principles inserted neotribal ideology into the university exemplifies the effects of elite networks and of the efficacy of the brokerage process. Both the use of Treaty ‘principles’ and the notion of a ‘partnership’ are key strategies in the neotribal elite’s control of Treaty implementation, including into the university. This is where the idea that there are two quite distinct bounded ethnic groups is essential to the politics of partnership, not only because it justifies such politics, but also because it is in the brokerage between partners that the neotribal elite justifies its existence as leaders (Rata, 2003). They are the individuals who ‘cross’ between the Treaty partners, representing one to the other, despite their shared location in the ruling class. In doing so, they secure the positions of privilege and power of that class.

Given the success of Treaty politics and the importance of Treaty discourse to maintaining the comprador status of neotribal brokers, what then is the explanation for the fairly rapid shift in the last decade to an indigenous discourse? Already, in 2002, Jeremy Waldron (2002: 81) described an intellectual climate where ‘the discussion is over as soon as someone mentions the word “indigenous” and associates a set of claims with it’.

The rise of indigenous discourse to replace Treaty discourse as a key neotribal strategy first appears in a 2003 education policy document. The document shows how the shift in discourse originates in the first Hui Mātauranga Māori (National Māori Education Forum) in 2001, convened by Māori academic, Mason Durie. Annual Hui Mātauranga in the subsequent decade have developed the strategy further. The 2003 Ministry of Education Statement of Intent for 2003 – 2008, developed by Mason Durie, which referred to the ‘development of Iwi Partnerships [as] a key Ministry action’ does not refer to the Treaty of Waitangi at all (Ministry of Education, 2003: 1). This is a huge shift in strategy. Durie’s explanation is sufficiently important to quote at length because it shows clearly that the use of the Treaty was an intentional strategy in tribal politics as was the shift from Treaty to indigenous discourse.

The Treaty has been a helpful vehicle for the promotion of Māori interests.

Yet the Treaty does not embody the sum total of indigenous rights. . . .the

Treaty is not always the most useful document to define the extent of indigenous rights. In contrast to the Treaty, where 1840 represented a new beginning, indigenous rights have a longer memory. The principle of indigeneity will not be welcomed by all New Zealanders. While there is a measure of acceptance that Treaty grievances should be settled, and inequalities in society should be eliminated, there is less enthusiasm for accepting that being indigenous confers special rights on a particular group. It seems to clash with the notions of democratic citizenship. Māori can lay claim to a set of indigenous rights and that right has implications for the type of education Māori children might expect. In exercising their indigeneity, Māori might wish to establish closer relationships with many other groups, apart from the Crown, including other indigenous peoples, even to sign treaties with them. The Treaty of Waitangi gives expression to one relationship – with the Crown – but it would be short sighted not to explore other relationships and to see how other groups living in modern states are able to reconcile conflicting principles of citizenship and indigeneity’ (Durie, 2001).

Indigeneity and the related customary rights discourse have an advantage over Treaty discourse because they mobilise time and space to reconfigure the meaning of traditional resources. By linking the present to a primordial past and by linking the Māori experience with that of all indigenous peoples, a time-space continuity is naturalised. This enables the notion of property in an accumulative capitalist system to be fixed to the concept of resources in a redistributive traditional economic system. As a strategy for property claims, indigeneity is more steeped in traditionalism than is Treaty rhetoric. It succeeds by ascribing ‘a timeless and sacred quality to what was simply prior occupation’, the ‘rhetorical heightening of the unexceptionable fact of having been here first’ (Oliver, 2001, pp. 222-3). *Kaupapa Māori* theory (‘indigenous knowledge’) has the major role in the production of this traditionalist ideology, hence its importance to the retribalised elite.

The ideology of a deep and permanent distinction between Māori and non-Māori is the main reason for the rapid development of indigenous knowledge in the university because it

establishes the necessary condition for academic brokerage. Two separate social groups, with a distinctiveness located in primordial origins, require leaders to represent one group to the other. It enables brokers to maintain their comprador status as the political representatives of a social group, a status that is permanently fixed in the separation. It is here, in the class interests of the brokerage elite that the shift from the highly effective Treaty strategy to an indigenous ideology may be found.

8. The Cultural Production of Indigenous Ideology

In this section I develop the idea of the production of indigenous knowledge in order to identify research questions and ethnographic methods for their investigation. The main question is about how knowledge about Māori is being re-produced and controlled in universities as ‘indigenous knowledge’. The resource is important to neotribal politics for three reasons: Firstly, it justifies brokerage between two racially separated groups; secondly, the production and control of indigenous knowledge is itself a brokerage site. It is where academics brokers acquire positions and represent the interests of the indigenous. Thirdly, knowledge is a valuable resource in contemporary capitalism.

In addition, the location of the production of indigenous knowledge in the university is also an important neotribal strategy. The production is stabilised within the regulatory mode of *kaupapa Māori* policies and practices. This exemplifies Jonathan Friedman’s (2000) insight that ‘the stabilization of meaning into institutional forms (is) related to the stabilization of communication itself’ (p. 654). The status of the university, as the place where scientific knowledge is created, enables the ideology to be perceived as scientific knowledge rather than ideas that serve a ruling class’s interests. That is, the ideas are believed to be subject to rigorous scrutiny and available for critique and change.²⁰ The perception of an ideology as scientific knowledge, contributes to the increasing hegemonic status of indigeneity. Given that the idea is based on the permanent distinction between one social group and another, this is an important area for my investigation. I would like to examine how the ideology becomes a

²⁰ See pages 49-50 for an account of the reasons why kaupapa Māori knowledge is not available for scrutiny.

doxa by interviewing academics who identify as indigenous and non-indigenous as well as examining the development of policy and discourse.

The cultural production of ‘indigenous knowledge’ is the ‘political instrumentalisation of traditions’ (Babadzan, 2000: 132). The main idea to be ‘produced’ is that of a fundamental racial difference, yet without the unaccepted term ‘race’ being used. This is the reason for New Zealand’s emphasis on the idea of the social construction of ethnicity. For example, Statistics New Zealand (2005) defines ‘ethnicity’ (as) the ethnic groups or groups that people identify with or feel they belong to. The use of ‘ethnicity’ to replace ‘race’ was an attempt in the post-1960s’ period to reject racism by rejecting the biological or genetic component attributed to race, and to understand descent-group identity in terms of socially constructed values, beliefs and practices alone. Terms such as ‘cultural affiliation’, ‘tribal affiliation’, ‘tribal identity’ and ‘cultural identity’, which appear in university documents such as the University of Auckland Ethics Manual (2009) are used to strengthen this social construction idea.

However, socially constructed ethnicity still contains a genetic or biological component. Yinger (1985) regards ‘ethnicity’ as meaningless if it excludes the notion of group belonging that has a genetic or biological base. The concept of a group’s shared genetic heritage does not, of course, mean that ‘human races’ constitute distinct human populations. The low level of genetic variability and of structuring of the human species is incompatible with the existence of race as a biological entity (Pena, 2005). But ‘race’ and ‘ethnicity’ still have conceptual validity as referents for a group’s shared genetic heritage – one that changes constantly as groups migrate and inter-marry. Ironically the social construct concept actually works against its anti-racial intention by maintaining a distinction between social groups that is located in a shared genetic heritage understood in primordial terms as unchanging.

The production of a fundamental difference between Māori and non-Māori body is achieved by redefining indigeneity as an essentialised status. This approach gives capitalist elites (those within indigeneity as well as external elites) an ideology that resists criticism because it appears progressive and is used to justify claims in rights-based discourses. Its narrative as a defence against dispossession aligns with progressive politics. Yet a political economy

approach to the idea rejects the essentialism of that approach. Tania Li (2010), for example, explains how indigeneity is used as an ideology of management of people to land. She describes indigeneity as ‘communal fixing’, that is, as the ideological and practical management of people to land in response to capitalism’s constantly changing requirements which may involve both land possession and dispossession. The fixing of indigeneity in legal and administrative regimes, even in those cases where the process was designed to ensure stability and protect populations, produces unintended consequences that are not progressive. The permanent fixing of the collective is one such consequence. For Li, ‘protection and incarceration are two sides of the same coin’. It is an incarceration of permanence powerfully illustrated in Peter Sutton’s recent analysis of the consequences of decades of protection for Australian Aborigines (2009). De-politicising groups of people into fixed primordial categories places them permanently outside history and locked into a timeless indigeneity.

The ‘indigenous’ knowledge being developed in New Zealand universities (also known as *kaupapa Māori*, *matauranga Māori*, *tikanga Māori*, Māori knowledge, and Māori epistemology) codifies the belief that Māori are fundamentally different from non-Māori people, with separate knowledge, world views and ways of being. As a separate socio-political entity, the group can claim separate political status and from that, rights to economic resources. So while the cultural production of indigenous knowledge creates a commodifiable capital resource it is more than a resource. It is also a means to acquire and to justify the acquisition of capital resources. Hence its key strategic importance to the neotribal elite. The cultural production of an essentialised difference between Māori and non-Māori is not only necessary for on-going brokerage but a key strategy in the wider neotribal politics of ethno-nationalism.²¹ It is vital to the notion of a political partnership between the tribes and the government, which is itself, a pre-condition for the constitutional recognition of a governance role for the tribes.²²

²¹ Judith Binney is one of a number of biculturalists who justify tribal claims for ‘legal autonomy from the Pakeha Government’ by comparing the claim to Scottish autonomy from Westminster. Binney ‘believes there is nothing to be feared from a separate Tuhoë nation operating within New Zealand. Such precedents exist around the world, she says from Scotland to Ireland to Catalonia’ (Masters, 2009: B7). However, this argument ignores the fact that a person who is not descended from the indigenous people of Scotland may become a citizen of that country. To become a member of the proposed Tuhoë nation, would require biological tribal descent.

²² An example of tribal political intentions is from two Māori conferences in the 1990s, repeated at the 2005 Young Māori Leaders’ conference: ‘Articulated desired outcomes for Māori’ at The Hui Whakapamau 1994 and Te Ora Rangahau Hui of 1998 included ‘Māori ownership of laws and policies’ and ‘Māori control of things Māori’ (7th Young Māori Leaders’ Conference, 2005). A second example, from September 2009, shows several iwi

There has been a century and a half of a unified liberal-democratic political system in New Zealand, beginning with the 1852 Constitution Act. There is also widespread intermarriage and social integration. David Cannadine reminds us that in ‘the current rush to recognise the historical fact of differences between groups’, one should not ignore the existence of ‘a sort of common humanity’ as an ‘important but neglected perspective’ (2008: 34). Yet the ‘common humanity’ that is also a fact of New Zealand’s history is not so much ignored by indigenous ideology, as rejected. That this is the case is demonstrated by the development of a university-wide ‘Indigenous Knowledges, Peoples and National Identity Research Initiative’ at the University of Auckland. The Initiative takes for granted the belief that Māori, as an indigenous people, are significantly different from non-Māori, with different knowledge, interests, ways of learning and ways of being, that must be under the control of the representatives of Māori academics. Preliminary papers from the Indigenous Knowledges, Peoples and National Identity Research Initiative include such statements as: ‘Research for, by and with indigenous peoples but shouldn’t exclude others who wish to work in partnership’. They refer to the ‘creation of new knowledges and identities’ and focus on ‘indigenous peoples as makers and safe-keepers of knowledges, recording and appreciating knowledges and identities, advancing and sustaining of indigenous identities’. A further claim is that ‘indigenous knowledges are created in community. Research questions should focus on community needs, e.g. most iwi involved in treaty claims’ (Email communication, 28 August 2009).

The discourse itself is informative. The word ‘Māori’ is noticeable by its absence while the term ‘indigenous’ is impossible to overlook. What is of particular ethnographic interest here is the degree of compliance to, and absence of criticism of, the ‘Indigenous Knowledges,

from the north of New Zealand preparing to ‘challenge the Crown’s sovereignty in Waitangi Tribunal hearings’. That the ‘Crown had assumed sovereignty didn’t make it right’, said a spokesman for the iwi, while a Member of Parliament for the Māori Party described it with enthusiasm as ‘taking a claim which challenges the constitutional basis of this country’ (Tahana, 2009, A4). A third example is from an advertisement for a 4th December 2009 seminar or hui at Unitec sponsored by Nga Pae o Te Maramatanga (the Māori Research Centre for Excellence). ‘A one day hui that will present an overview of the situation of Māori and local government relationships within the Auckland region. The hui will focus on identifying strategic responses for advancing Tino Rangātiatanga within the current environment of rolling back the gains of Iwi, including the release of a declaration of Māori rights and local government. This declaration will become a benchmark for measuring the future development of policies, institutional processes and relationships not just within the Auckland region but potentially the nation.’ (Nga Pae o Te Maramatanga Knowledge Event email, 2 December 2009).

Peoples and National Identity research initiative’, given that its development is occurring in a university. The development of the Initiative is an ideal subject for the ethnographic research. As a University of Auckland academic, I receive emails about the Initiative. As a participant observer undertaking ethnographic research, this is the type of data I would wish to use.

The approach that has been normalised as the new hegemony is most clearly presented in the writings of Mason Durie, one of the most influential Māori academics.²³ For example, Durie (2003: 13) refers to the ‘Māori worldviews, [that] like those of many indigenous people, are based on values and experiences that have evolved over centuries. They form the basis for a knowledge system that is distinctly different from other systems such as science and the Judaeo-Christian philosophies’. There is no doubt that a strategy which promotes the belief in a difference so fundamental that it exists at an epistemological level is highly effective in the wider goal of Māori sovereignty (*tino rangatiratanga*) politics.

The attraction for academics of the ‘beguiling binary’ ‘built around the notions of collective categories eternally in conflict’ (Cannadine, 2008: 34) is demonstrated by Alison Jones’ ‘working the colonizer-indigene hyphen’ (2008: 473). This is an argument for the maintenance of a permanent tension in an ahistorical present between two groups regard as separate on the basis of different ethnic heritages and, ironically, different historical colonial experiences. According to Jones, ‘in indigene-colonizer research and teaching work, the hyphen is to be protected and asserted and is a positive site of productive methodological work’ (2008: 475). Such research, based upon an ahistorical understanding of social reality, becomes what the New Zealand historian, W. H. Oliver calls ‘presentism’. With reference to Māori research in particular, Oliver (2001), criticises the ‘instrumental presentism’, the using of ‘facts for present purposes’ (2001: 21) of the historical research and writing used ‘to write New Zealand history “from a Māori point of view”’ (2001: 10).

The inclusion of ‘kaupapa Māori knowledge’ into Ministry of Education policy gained traction through the first years of the century and *kaupapa Māori* education is now a comprehensive system of institutions, policies and practices. The Ministry of Education’s

²³ Durie’s unquestioned influence over more than a decade has recently been challenged with several strong critiques of his research methods. See Roy Nash (2006) and Graham Butterworth (2006).

2004 Annual Report on Māori Education states: ‘One of the key themes articulated in the Ministry of Education’s Māori Education Strategy is the need to support the growth and quality of kaupapa matauranga Māori. This key theme acknowledges the importance of whanau, hapū and iwi²⁴ in determining and driving kaupapa matauranga Māori. The Report also acknowledges the importance of Māori providing education to Māori (“by Māori for Māori”) and that knowledge is unique to each iwi, hapū and whanau’ (Ministry of Education, 2005: 21).

The University of Auckland has played a significant role in ‘creating an indigenous infrastructure aimed at Māori educational participation within a kaupapa Māori context’ (Robust, 2007: 1). Robust’s account of the parallels and linkages between the University of Auckland and the First Nations House of Learning at the University of British Columbia shows how ‘indigenous peoples from other counties’ are brought ‘together with the key objective of sharing ideas, peer reviewing, and benchmarking through staff and students exchanges. The focus is on further examining the processes of identifying and providing cultural space for indigenous peoples in tertiary institutions’ (2007, pp. 4-5). Robust notes Graham Smith’s positions as First Visiting Indigenous Scholar in 1998 and ‘First Distinguished Chair of Indigenous Education’ in 2004. Smith’s ‘Kaupapa Māori Intervention Model’ is used to show how events at the two universities demonstrate ‘conscientization’ and ‘transformative action’ (Robust, 2007: 6-7).

9. Tradition in Cultural Production

‘Kinship’ is an important marker in neotribal discourse because it provides the link between the present and the indigenous origins. The kinship terms, *whanau*, *hapū* and *iwi* are to be found throughout Māori education policy documents. Tribal kinship discourse contributes significantly, not only to the Māori/non-Māori binary, but to the notion of an ‘authentic’ Māori as someone with kinship ties to a tribe. The University of Auckland’s requirement that ethics applicants who are researching a ‘topic of particular interest to Māori’ or are using

²⁴ *Iwi* – tribe; *hapū* – sub-tribe; *whanau* – extended family; *matauranga* – knowledge.

Māori participants must state their tribal affiliation (or lack of) demonstrates the use of kinship as a way to categorise academics in relation to treaty ideology (Application Form, 2009: 12). It also shows the process by which Māori who do not know their tribal heritage are excluded from being ‘authentic’ Māori.

Like all ideologies, the traditionalism that indigenous politics appeals to ‘must be understood as the expression of a specific historical context and a specific constellation of political interests and economic opportunities’ (Schroder, 2003: 449). Schroder calls tradition

a resource in locality production’, an ‘important strategy in the tribal struggle for the reproduction of locality through representation. What is represented both to the local society itself and to the outside world is a claim to history that is different from national history and serves as the basis for further claims in the fields of economy and politics (2003: 451).

In the New Zealand case, tradition is the major resource in the production of indigenous knowledge.

That strategy requires an approach to history that is ahistorical. W. H. Oliver (2001) identified treaty ahistoricism in his analysis of Waitangi Tribunal reports to show the ‘intellectual suppleness’ which ‘characterised Tribunal hermeneutics and history, under the guidance’ of its second (and long-serving) chair, Chief Justice (now Sir) Edward Durie (2001: 9). Oliver regards the reports (which provide the material for contemporary treaty interpretation) as exemplifying ‘an instrumental but – because never explicitly avowed – elusive way of writing and using history’ (p. 9), an approach that Oliver calls ‘presentism’.

Creating a discourse of continuity with tradition is an essential strategy in gaining political recognition and the economic benefits that flow from this recognition. This is despite ‘the specifically modern nature of the new rapport between culturalist nationalisms’ (such as *tino rangatiratanga*) ‘and culture and traditions’ Babadzan (2000: 133). Success depends upon being recognised as legitimate inheritors of the past. Ivor Schroder (2003: 436) refers to similar strategies in American Indian traditionalist discourse’, which he describes as having ‘very little to do with historical experiences but rather with a strategy of political

legitimization’. Frances Widdowson and Albert Howard (2008) provide a similar critique of Canadian indigenous ideology as does Peter Sutton (2009) of the politicisation of culture in Australia.

That uncritical acceptance of all the features of biculturalism, meant that New Zealand universities, particularly the social sciences, accepted an approach that the philosopher, Mario Bunge, describes as the ‘antiscientific movement of the sociology of knowledge (which) emerged in the 1960s’ (Bunge, 1999: 234). The approach is characterised by cultural relativism, racial primordialism, and a cultural idealism in which ‘the everyday reality of social reproduction (is) replaced by the reproduction of symbolic representations’ (Schroder, 2003: 436).

The cultural essentialism and ethnic primordialism that permeates all kaupapa Māori writing ‘employs what Seyla Benhabib has called a “poor man’s sociology” – a misconceived, because far too holistic, notion of culture’ (Lukes, 2003: 34). It ignores the fact that

cultures are always open systems, sites of contestation and heterogeneity, of hybridisation and cross-fertilization, whose boundaries are inevitably indeterminate. The important thing to see is that cultures are never coherent, never closed to the outside, never merely local, and never uncontested from within and without (Lukes, 2003: 34).

The danger of moral nihilism and the descent into irrationalism posed by intellectual relativism (Friedman, 1994; Lukes, 2003) appears to be neither acknowledged nor addressed by kaupapa Māori writers. Mario Bunge (1999) recognises this intellectual closure in the concluding comments to his discussion of relativism in the social sciences by saying ‘Consequently, relativism is false. But this objection does not bother the consistent relativists, for they have no use for the concept of objective truth’ (Bunge, 1999: 55).

Sheilagh Walker’s master’s thesis (1996) in which she ‘names Tino Rangatiratanga as my methodology and Kaupapa Māori as the relevant epistemology’ (1996: 3) demonstrates what

Lukes calls the ‘denigration of systematic thought’. Citing Berlin, Lukes identifies ‘the “inarticulate, the mystical, the demonic, the dark reaches and mysterious depths”, the ‘view of the world as ‘an unordered succession of episodes, each carrying its value in itself, intelligible only by direct experience’ as relativism’s collapse into irrationalism (Lukes, 2003: 89). Walker refers to the way her ‘gut instincts scream out!’ as she encounters the requirements of a thesis.

Why this entrenchment in the notion of thesis as argument, as assertion, as proposition to be maintained? This Western Euro-centric notion of a thesis postulates knowledge as brute argument, dictates thought processes as oppositional elements in some theoretical battle’ (Walker, 1996: 4).

Christopher Lasch (1995) identifies this rejection of ‘Western culture as a whole, Western rationalism as such, the very notion of a common tradition or a set of common standards, that is said to be necessarily and unavoidably racist’ as the ‘New Tribalism’ (Lasch, 1995: 134). He describes how it

finds favour not only among the postmodern academics but in the media, in the world of commercial entertainment, and in the cultural boutiques and salons frequented by yuppies, appear(ing) on the scene at the very moment when tribalism has ceased to have any substantive content (Lasch, 1995: 134).

The shift in New Zealand anthropology to post-modernism (Webster, 1998), particularly influenced by Anne Salmond’s meanings-based anthropology (1982, 1991), is also a contributor to the way indigenous ideology became hegemonic with such rapidity and with so little criticism. With reference to Salmond (1985), anthropologists such as Roberts and Mills (1998: 49) contributed to making indigenous knowledge respectable in academic discourse. They declared that their aim was

to present an understanding of Māori epistemology from the perspective of scientists engaged in teaching indigenous worldviews (namely, that of the peoples of the Pacific) alongside that of Western science (1998: 67).

Roberts and Mills explain the fundamental difference drawn in *kaupapa Māori* writing between Māori knowledge and Western knowledge as the lack of a distinction between subject and object. Although the passage quoted below is rather long, it is important because many of the ideas promoted by advocates of indigenous knowledge may be traced directly to this and similar ideas.

‘Knowledge is a sacred power that belongs to a group rather than to a particular individual who may hold it for a time, and can only be passed on to chosen members of the group. As a sacred power knowledge can be ‘talked into’ physical objects as in the blessing of a building or a ceremonial ornament. Likewise, stories are told of how ancestors, in claiming territory, named landmarks, rocks, trees, waterfalls, and so on, and thereby locked together tribal understanding with the entities themselves so that a place and its knowledge could not be separated. In this way, the tribe’s heritage and the local environment come to share in a single *whakapapa*, and the world is not separated into a hierarchy of ontological categories corresponding to things of physical, biological and cultural origin. The cosmic generative power, the common dynamic process in which all things unfold (*tipu*), already contained the form of every possible being. Consequently, all things in the phenomenal world alike unfold their nature (*tipu*), live (*ora*), and have form (*ahua*) and so come to possess a body (*Tinana*), an immaterial self (*wairua*), and an abiding place of divine power (*mauri*), and characteristic vitality (*hau*) (Roberts and Wills 1998: 61).

Even more remarkably, the two authors argue that a group’s ethnic genetic heritage, its genealogy or *whakapapa*

provides a grand, unifying framework for understanding the origin and appearance of regularity in the entire universe, one that in the process unites the biological with the social and cultural (1998: 61).

Here is the justification for the idea taken up a few years later by Māori academics that

Māori epistemology is based on a view of the world in which the unifying ontological principle is *whakapapa* (manifesting *mauri* and *wairua*) rather than matter (driven by mechanism). Manifestations of *mauri* and *wairua* arise as a result of influences and “laws” whose meaning cannot be expressed in terms of pure mechanism or

contingency. It is tempting to make a comparison with the Western concept of teleology, but any “purpose” apparent in the unraveling of Māori *whakapapa* is driven by knowledge of the past, rather than being directed towards some future goal. For this reason it is sometimes said that Māori are a people who walk backwards into the future, meaning that it is the deeds of the ancestors (real and mythical) that control and guide the present generation and help determine the fate of future generations’ (1998: 61).

10. Researching Māori Academic Agents

Research into the nature, extent and effects of neotribal intellectuals’ agency in firstly, producing the material for the traditionalist indigenous ideology which justified retribalisation, and then secondly, in controlling that cultural production process and the product ‘indigenous knowledge’ is a difficult ethnographic task. Jessop (1990) and McAdam, Tarrow and Tilly (2001) have noted that such investigation requires the identification of the actors, their identities, actions, institutional positions, and the network structures. My purpose in this section is to begin this task by identifying the agents and finding points of entry for ethnographic research into their activities. This could pose ethical problems for the research unless efforts are taken to ensure that the research is not personalised. It requires care in ensuring that agents are referred to in their public positions only. For that reason I identify kinship networks amongst the Māori academic elite below (see section 11) because the kinship ties are the structuring principle in neotribal ideology.

In doing the research it is impossible to avoid inquiring into individuals’ and groups’ motives. This means that any ethnography of the production and management of cultural knowledge must necessarily be informed by a political economy perspective in order to link the actors’ motives to the political and economic interests of the class the actors represent. Major political and economic motives lie behind the cultural production and control of indigenous ideology because knowledge is a major economic resource in contemporary global capitalism. The task of ethnography is to investigate how those deeply embedded motives materialise into intentions and actions by specific agents as well as into the effects of those actions on others.

The role of indigenous and ethnic academics in reallocating political and economic power to elite groups is not confined to New Zealand. David Turton (1997) and Jonathan Friedman (1994), among others, identify the 'Western-educated third world scholars who today, after years of engagement in modernity, argue for a re-establishment of other forms of knowledge production and rules of discourse' (Friedman, 1994: 122). These indigenous academics create, through self-consciously 'traditional' discourses, the ethnic divisions that are then used to justify the neotraditionalist knowledge itself (Turton 1997). In addition, they connect with left-wing political studies to imply a link to progressive left-wing politics as well as to justify the use of academic activity for political goals. Steven Webster (1998: 188) in his account of the development of the Department of Māori Studies at the University of Auckland notes that: 'All Māori Studies graduate students (were) expected to become familiar with the works of Paulo Freire, Antonio Gramsci, Michel Foucault and a few others'.

The positions of Māori academics in universities and government institutions demonstrates how these individuals and their networks fit Shore's description of an elite as those who 'occupy the most influential positions or roles in the important spheres of social life. They are typically incumbents: the leaders, rulers and decision makers in any sector of society, or custodians of the machinery of policy making'. Elites are thus 'makers and shakers'; groups whose 'cultural capital' positions them above their fellow citizens and whose decisions crucially shape what happens in the wider society. Equally important, they are the groups that dominate what Elias (1978) called the 'means of orientation': peoples whose ideas and interests are hegemonic' (Shore, 2002: 9). Given the cultural production of Treaty and indigenous ideology and its current hegemonic status there is no doubt that Māori intellectuals can be described as such an elite.

The hegemony of indigenous ideology in educational policy has been achieved by 'mobilizing metaphors and linguistic devices that cloak policy with the symbols and trappings of political legitimacy' making 'normative claims that present a particular way of defining a problem and its solution, as if these were the only ways possible, while enforcing closure or silence on other ways of thinking or talking' (Shore and Wright, 1997: 3). Edward Durie (1991: 168) demonstrates this when he describes the Waitangi Tribunal as having 'exclusive authority to determine the meaning and effect of the treaty for the purposes of Māori Claims against the Crown'.

The issue of closure and silence is a theme for ethnographic studies into understanding how and with what effect that closure has occurred²⁵. I have a number of my own experiences and am aware that I am not alone, but I do not have documented material about the experiences of other academics that ethnographic research would provide. My most recent experience was the response to an opinion piece about the treaty that I wrote for the University of Auckland's alumni magazine, *Ingenio*, in 2007. In that article I referred to the research undertaken with Roger Openshaw to say that 'Matauranga Māori and kaupapa Māori have the status of science in our universities yet, unlike science, are protected from academic scrutiny' (Rata, 2007: 38). I also added that the current culturalist environment restrains individual academics from risk-taking because the university has taken on a political position in relation to the Treaty. My opinion piece did indeed turn out to be a risk. A senior colleague (a professor) wrote to the editor objecting to my criticism of the role of the Treaty in university life. Copies of the letter were sent to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Maori) given his responsibility for the university's acknowledgement of the Treaty.

After codifying neotribal ideology into indigenous knowledge, the Māori academic elite has been well-positioned to insert that knowledge into policy and practice. For example, the elite has roles on the numerous committees and consultancy groups that represent Māori interests to the government, along with influential positions on research funding bodies and academic journal editorial boards. The positions held by influential Māori academics leads to an additional difficulty with research into human agency. It becomes necessary to identify individuals in order to show the positions and the networks that link these positions. The 'very idea of 'elites' suggests qualities of 'agency', exclusivity', 'power', and an apparent separation from 'mass society' – concepts that in different ways, oblige us to consider related themes of stratification, hierarchy, brokers and causal agents behind events' (Shore, 2002: 4).

This idea of knowledge brokerage leads into the following section on agency. The focus of my proposed research is indigenous knowledge production agency. By conceptualising these

²⁵ A number of examples of that closure are provided in an article I wrote with Roger Openshaw, entitled 'The Weight of Inquiry: Conflicting Cultures in New Zealand's Tertiary Institutions, and published in the *Journal of International Studies in Sociology of Education* (2007).

agents in terms of their brokerage function, I am attributing intentions to their actions in producing indigenous knowledge. For example, I have explained the development of an ideology that essentialises indigeneity as intended to create a fundamental distinction between two social groups (ibid: 21). A second example – I understand the development of models and procedures that institutionalise this difference in terms of the brokerage requirements. It is here, in researching the relationship between intentions, actions and consequences that the research methodology needs to be developed. How are intentions, actions and consequences to be researched? How is the relationship between the factors made available for analysis? Intentions may be found in statements, documents and publications. These publications are one form of an academic's actions and the most easily available for collection and analysis. However, academics also 'act' in teaching and as contributors to university committees where decisions are made, networks created and overt or subtle influence exerted or experienced. More informal 'actions' occur in collegial interactions.

The ethnographic observations and analysis required to undertake the Research Project will be difficult given the power relations involved and my own position in these. However, Shore (1992: 18) points out that 'the study of elite cultures challenges anthropology to rethink not only its methods and its ethics, but also its wider remit as a discipline concerned with all of humanity, including ourselves'. According to Tremewan (2005a: 42) this 'is not an easy task if only because it is not instinctive and makes emotional distance problematic'. The comments of both these writers are relevant to my Research Project given that it will include ethnographies of colleagues in my own university as well as from other New Zealand universities. In a country the size of New Zealand with its small academic community, individuals are almost always known to one another personally. In addition, given the critical nature of my research, both prior and current, it is unlikely that the Māori academics I investigate will consent to being involved in the ethnographic study. This will mean that I will need to use the writings and public statements of those of the neotribal elite who play significant roles in the university.

For my Research Project I identify three Māori academics in particular as leading agents in codifying and institutionalising indigenous ideology. This is not to say that others, such as Sir Edward Durie, did not play a key role, but it is to restrict the inquiry to examples of those who

emerged within, or who contribute to, the sociology of education and who have had considerable influence over the university through the development of the Ministry of Education Māori Tertiary Framework (Ministry of Education, 2003). Steven Webster, in his 1998 *Patrons of Māori Culture* (pp. 155 – 188), provides a comprehensive account of the individuals and networks in other disciplines as well as the establishment of and appointments to university positions in Māori subjects throughout New Zealand during the 1970s and 1980s. Webster argues that ‘these institutional developments’ are ‘materially more significant than the important academic personalities and theories which currently dominate them’ (1998: 157).

However, I would suggest that the inter-dependence of the academics and their structural positions makes both agents and institutions equally significant. Indeed, agents played a crucial role in institutionalising culturalist ideology into the state. (Sir Hepi Te Heuheu and Sir Geoffrey Palmer and their role in brokering treaty ‘principles’ may be the seminal and most far-reaching but it is one of many examples). While the structural positions must exist for power to be exercised, it is people who exercise the power. This is Spinoza’s notion of process as structure in motion that is, ‘all motion is inherent in matter’ (Israel 2001:234). Although structure and agency are conceptualised separately, they act interdependently as one force. The structural positions authorize the exercise of power, but it is people who *exercise* power, and in doing so, solidify the process into structure. The Māori academics are the ‘movers’, and in ‘moving’ power, become the elite.

From their positions of academic and administrative seniority at several New Zealand universities, their directorships of tribal tertiary institutions (whare wananga), and their writings on *kaupapa Māori* and *matauranga Māori*, Professors Linda Smith (e.g. 1996, 1999), Graham Smith (e.g. 1987, 1990, 1997, 2003), and Mason Durie (e.g. 1998, 2001a, 2003) are key brokers in the networks of influence that affect almost all areas of education. Currently, Professor Linda Smith is Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) at Waikato University. Professor Mason Durie is Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) at Massey Universities while Professor Graham Smith was previously the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) at the University of Auckland and is

now the Chief Executive Officer at the Whare Wananga of Awanuiārangi²⁶. The ‘Durie Principles’, named after Mason Durie in acknowledgement of the contribution made by his ideas and leadership, inform all Māori education policy for both the compulsory and tertiary education sectors. A founder of the highly influential *Hui Taumata Matauranga* (National Māori Education Forum held annually from 2001), Durie is a key actor in the development of the political goals behind the establishment of separate Māori education institutions as well as policies with respect to Māori in mainstream education. He regards academic work and the development of Māori educational policy as advancing the ‘Māori call for tino rangatiratanga’ (Durie, 2001: 1). Research into the motives, actions, and networks of Maori academics, who are in many cases senior office-holders, would require detailed investigation of their social and political functions. In the next section I identify the areas where these functions are enacted.

11. Research Areas

The purpose of this section is to identify five areas for the Research Project investigation and to discuss possible research methods. These are: 1. Building agency infrastructure, 2. Building networks, 3. Academic ‘succession’, 4. Controlling research, 5. Acquiring institutional and government recognition. The examples of each area contain references to social actors by name. These areas are where ‘the specific social and political functions’ (Babadzan, 2000: 133) occur that are required for neotribal politicisation within the university.

Building Agency Infrastructure

The neotribal agency infrastructure is the reconfiguration of kinship positions. The infrastructure draws on traditionalist discourse to justify kinship-based hierarchical status positions within academia. Māori society is presented in revivalist terms as a hierarchical society in which certain groups have traditionally been advantaged above others. According to

²⁶ Whare wananga are government funded centres of higher learning with a focus on Māori language and knowledge. For example, Te Wananga o Raukawa offers courses in Māori language, Iwi and Hapū studies. The first contemporary wananga, Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiārangi, was established by statute in 1996. Wananga courses range from certificate level through to doctoral studies.

Steven Webster (1998) the idea of tribal division of status and prestige continues to linger on in contemporary society. It is reflected in higher education, better jobs, and higher incomes for a small group of people that is not infrequently of claimed aristocratic descent. This is most clearly illustrated by E. T. Durie's reference (2003: ix) in the Foreword to Professor Sidney Mead's book, 'Tikanga Māori'. The distinctly unscholarly reference to Mead's 'respected family lines' juxtaposes 'scholarly' and 'family lines' seemingly without difficulty, despite the inherent conflict between birth-ascribed authority and the authority conferred by scholarship.

However, the 'respected family lines' do become an object for scholarly inquiry when those 'lines' play a role as networks in neotribal academic agency. Kinship structures are central to the indigenous authority claimed by these agents. For this reason, my study of neotribal agents must consider the contribution of kinship to creating and maintaining networks of power and influence. The three agents I investigate: Linda Smith, Graham Smith and Mason Durie are all connected by kinship (close familial as well as more extensive tribal) links to one another and to other central players in treaty ideology creation and brokerage, such as Sidney Mead, Aroha Mead,²⁷ Edward Durie, and Arohia Durie. This proximity serves strategic purposes but also justifies the message of traditionalism. Kinship may be then portrayed, not as the nepotism of a classed elite, but as the structuring principle of a revived traditional socio-political entity. It is used to justify an authority over knowledge that cannot be challenged because it comes from the academic's kin-status, not his or her status as an independent scholar.

Networks

Mason Durie plays a leading role in creating and maintaining the network for neotribal academic agents. Seminars, conferences and consultation meetings bring together Māori academics to strengthen bonds and extend influence. One example is the 2005 Seventh Young

²⁷ Aroha Mead, the daughter of Māori professor, Sidney Mead, and sister to Linda Smith has recently been appointed as associate dean (research) for Toi huarewa at Victoria University of Wellington. Her task is to 'progress the university's Māori research initiatives and provide Māori research leadership. Mead has been involved in indigenous cultural and intellectual property and environment issues for over 30 years at tribal, national, Pacific, regional and international levels. She is chair of the Commission on Environmental, Economic and social Policy and Co-Chair of the Theme on Culture, Conservation, International Union for Conservation of Nature. She is currently a senior lecturer in Māori business at Victoria, and senior visiting research fellow at the Centre for Environmental Law, Macquarie University in Sydney, Australia' (*Education Review*, 9 October, 2009: 6)

Māori Leaders' Conference which considered the 'inter-generational transfer of Māori leadership skills and the development of individual skills for hapū, iwi and national development strategies for the next two decades' (Seventh Young Māori Leaders' Conference, Wellington, 2005). Another important networking vehicle is the Centre for Māori Excellence Policy Seminars, held by the National Institute of Research Excellence in Māori Development and Advancement, Nga Pae o te Maramatanga (co-chaired by Professor Linda Smith) which are designed to 'create a space for dialogue between policy analysts and Māori researchers. The theme selected for each Research and Policy seminar will highlight issues that traverse the different ministries, departments and agencies and that significantly impact on Māori cultural, social and economic development and wellbeing' (Nga Pae o te Maramatanga, Research and Policy series 1, 2005, 1). Both conferences are held in Wellington in order to build government officials into the networks. For example, the 'research and policy seminar series includes a Ministry respondent' 'who will also write and present a paper on the seminar topic' (2005: 2).

Academic Succession

The second generation of *kaupapa Māori* education writers who now occupy senior academic positions can be seen to have influence over post-graduate students who now enact an explicit strategy to develop *kaupapa Māori* at postgraduate level. They are also helping to place these graduates in key government positions. According to one of the key architects of the kaupapa Māori project, Graham Smith (with reference to Linda Smith):

In 1988, Linda and I were appointed jointly (.5 each) to a position in Māori education, in the Education Department at the University of Auckland. Much of my academic writing has been to create academic space and credibility for Kaupapa Māori institutions and beyond this for the 'intervention' potential embedded in the Kaupapa Māori approach and which may have a broader application with respect to transforming Māori educational crises more widely. One of our major achievements while working at the University has been to apply Kaupapa Māori strategies to our work. The results of this are very satisfying. In 1988 . . . the Education department only had one Māori post-graduate student and few at the under-graduate level. (In 1996) we have

the largest post-graduate programme of Māori students in New Zealand; sixty-four Masters students, nine PhD students and four Ed.D. students.

The Kaupapa Māori intervention has begun to be applied more widely. It has become embedded in Academic research literature. It has become part of the official government language. It underpins various government programmes in health, justice, social welfare and iwi development. It has informed, and permeates an increasing range of education and schooling activities: research, pedagogy, administration, publishing.

(G. H. Smith, 1997: 22).

Kaupapa Māori masters and doctoral theses supervised and examined by the senior Māori academics provide material to show the influence of those academics on post-graduate writings. All show that the purpose of *kaupapa Māori* is to politicise and decolonise in the interests of tribal sovereignty (*tino rangatiratanga*). For example, Cherryl Waerea-I-Te-Rangi Smith (1994) writes: ‘This thesis argues that iwi development is a discourse of power that is currently being contested by Māori and state interest groups’ (1994: iii).

From Sheilagh Walker (1996: 121): ‘As an expression of Kaupapa Māori, this thesis is an expression of my Tino Rangatiratanga.’

Leonie Pihama (1993: 57) states:

‘As a countering force Kaupapa Māori theorising rejects dominant group constructions of Māori as “other” and emphasises the status of Māori people as Tangata Whenua,²⁸ thereby encompassing the ongoing struggles of Iwi to reclaim the land that is rightfully theirs, and in doing so including Māori aspirations for control of Māori land that will

²⁸ Tangata whenua – indigenous ‘people of the land’

reinforce Māori spiritual links to Papatuanuku²⁹ and provide a basis for future economic development’.

According to Verna Tuteao (1998: 61), with acknowledgement to the influence of Graham Smith:

Kaupapa Māori rejects hegemonic inferences, and strives towards emancipatory ends, involving the destruction of those hegemonies which have disempowered Māori from controlling and defining our knowledge within the context of unequal relations in New Zealand.

She describes how

Smith proposes “a new theory of change” that emerged from resistance initiatives, emanating from kura kaupapa Māori communities based on Māori values and epistemologies (ibid:61)

Iris Turoa manages simultaneously to include and reject ‘Western’ knowledge.

This is a Māori interpretation of identity (since 1840). This is based upon the combined epistemologies of critical theory and particular Māori constructs and concepts. It is a bicultural interpretation interwoven with both Māori and Pakeha knowledge. . . .within this methodology both traditional and contemporary conceptualisations exist. This conceptualisation is buffeted within and against the collective versus individualism binary. As a ‘decolonising’ conceptualisation, both knowledge for this concept of identity is the knowledge that is grounded in the reclaiming and practicing (sic) of matauranga Māori and knowledge grounded in the ideologies of capitalism and colonisation’ (Turoa, 2000: 178).

Tania Ka’ai³⁰ (1995: 19) claims that

²⁹ Papatuanuku – ‘Earth Mother’

³⁰ Tania Ka’ai completed her PhD in 1995. The following year she was appointed to the position of professor at the University of Otago where she claimed ‘international recognition in indigenous epistemologies’ (Ka’ai, 2005). In 2007 she took up a professorship at the Auckland University of Technology. Her career path is an example of

‘Kaupapa Māori theory employs the notion of resistance to analyse oppositional behaviour as arising from moral and political indignation and not as deviance or learned helplessness. This resistance is committed to social and self-emancipation, to raising the radical consciousness and to demonstrating a commitment to action’ (1995: 33).

Now at Te Whare Wananga o Awanuiārangi, Graham Smith continues the strategy of producing post-graduate dissertations in ‘Māori dimensions and areas of knowledge’. ‘The institution expects to graduate its first two doctoral candidates (in 2010). It currently has about 21 PhD candidates, with a further 21 in the throes of enrolling’ (Gerritson, 2009: 10). These candidates will be added to the number occupying the new positions opening up in government institutions and universities and be members of the indigenous knowledge network.

Controlling research

Kaupapa Māori research models have been developed to ensure that Māori research is ‘with Māori, by Māori and for Māori’ (Jahnke and Taiapa, 1999: 45). It is assumed that the interests of the researcher are those of the researched and the purpose of the research is to serve this interest. If non-Māori are involved in the research, its purpose and methods are controlled by Māori. With reference to the ideas of Arohia Durie (1992), Jahnke and Taiapa (1999, pp. 49–50) argue:

There is a need to abide by a Māori system of ethics and accountability’. ‘Research about Māori requires clear goals and objectives, and reliable information based upon actual Māori experiences. This does require that Māori themselves should be involved in the design, delivery, management and monitoring of the research process.’ (ibid: 49–50).

Kaupapa Māori methodology is used in research commissioned by the Ministry of Education and other government agencies. A research study (Wilkie, 2001) conducted under the auspices

the structural mobility created with the establishment of positions that need to be filled so that universities meet their duty to acknowledge the Treaty of Waitangi.

of the New Zealand Council for Educational Research (a government funded agency) into special education is a good example of the uncritical commitment to kaupapa Māori research methodology advocated in Linda Smith's *Decolonizing Methodologies* (1999).

The term kaupapa Māori means Māori philosophy or agenda. When used in research it is both a world-view and a methodology which is underpinned by cultural safety, and Māori ethics, beliefs and knowledge, e.g. tikanga and matauranga Māori. Irwin (1994) and Smith (1999) argue that Māori should carry out research into Māori, for Māori and with Māori. In kaupapa Māori methodology, it is not only the fact that is important but also the emotional background (Wilkie, 2001: 10).

Like the post-graduate students, the writers refer to the explicit political nature of kaupapa Māori research as based on and justified by treaty partnership.

The research followed a kaupapa Māori research process using analysis based on the Treaty of Waitangi, and the principles derived from the Treaty developed by the fourth Labour government for use by governments and agencies. These principles were designed to analyse the relationship between the Crown and the Tangata whenua, and to ensure that the Treaty is being upheld (Wilkie, 2001: 10).

A Ministry of Education commissioned report (Tuuta, Bradnam, Hynds, Higgins with Broughton, 2004) into the Kauhua professional development project uses Graham Smith's 'Kaupapa Māori Transformative Model' (2004: 11) and Bishop and Glynn's 'Model for evaluating power relationships' (2004: 13). Both models are believed to 'depathologise' the Māori experience by

'validating and normalising the storying of the research group, particularly Māori voices in a Kaupapa Māori context' (2004: 9). Smith's 'model for Māori intervention rejects the Western lineal notions of conscientisation, resistance and transformative action and the belief that they 'stand' individually. His model is cyclic and built on the belief that all components are important, all occur simultaneously and they all stand in equal relation to each other' (2004: 10).

The Kauhua writers describe the efforts they made

to adhere to the principles of Kaupapa Māori research' (2004: 20) (as they evaluate an educational project described) as 'an innovative approach to teacher professional development that prioritises Māori student achievement. Kaupapa Māori as theory, resistance and transformative potential, provides a compelling theoretical framework for Te Kauhua' (2004: 15).

The School of Education at the University of Waikato has developed 'guidelines for researchers, supervisors and ethics committee members to ensure that research projects conducted . . . adhere to the ethic and protocols of Māori research methods and philosophies' (Powick, 2002: 2). The document includes Graham Smith's four models 'by which culturally appropriate research can be undertaken by Pakeha researchers (Powick, 2002: 8).

The Ethics Example

It could be argued that the single most important mechanism controlling research involving Māori is the university ethics process which approves who researches what and how. The University of Auckland's August 2009 human participants ethics regulations (Applicants' Manual, 2009, pp. 20 – 21 and Application Form, 2009: 12) provides a clear example of the exact mechanisms for controlling the what, who and how.

The university document 'Guiding Principles for Research' draws the attention of applicants to the University of Auckland Charter (Section 2.3.3) 'which acknowledges the Treaty of Waitangi', (University of Auckland Guiding Principles for Research, November 2006: 2). This establishes the requirements that research outcomes will 'directly or indirectly benefit Māori' (Applicants' Manual, 2009: 20). Research is

to empower and build capacity' (which) 'may be by means of: Developing a partnership between whanau, hapū, or iwi and the university researchers and Involving Māori in the organisation, management, and conduct of the project (Applicants' Manual, 2009: 20).

The applicant must: 'Explain how the intended research process is consistent with the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi'.

Compliance with the Treaty is monitored by the required consultation process and the need for authorisation from the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) or his nominee.

The ultimate aim of the consultation process is to obtain prior informed consent'. 'In all cases, consultation with the wider group is strongly recommended.' (Applicants' Manual, 2009: 20).

The Manual gives detailed instruction about the appropriate Māori groups with whom to consult. Names of local *tangata whenua* (indigenous people) are available from the Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori) along with advice on how to consult and people who can help in the consultation process. The Manual's reference to the impact of research on the Māori community, with many 'over-burdened' with consultation requests, shows how deeply entrenched the practice is.

The researcher must identify the group(s) with whom consultation has taken place, describe the consultation process, and attach evidence of the support of the group(s). This is closely monitored and the applicant needs to:

'Describe any on-going involvement the group(s) consulted has/have in the project. Describe how information will be disseminated to participants and the group consulted at the end of the project' (Application Form 2009: 12).

Control over the research prior to its beginning, throughout the process the Applicants' Manual encourages 'participants' active involvement in the project at every stage' (2009: 20) and at completion, means that the researched, rather than the researcher, will determine what are beneficial outcomes and what are not.

In this way, valid ethical concerns about the treatment of people being researched are confused with the purpose and nature of scholarship. The findings to come out of the research are already

determined by the purpose. What if the researcher produces unexpected, controversial and critical findings? What if the findings do not support the politics of the researched? The very purpose of research is to acquire deeper understanding of physical and social phenomena. That understanding can never be established prior to the research, only hypothesised.

Ethics committee approval (and the prior agreement from the Māori community) is required for research that may be considered ‘a topic of particular interest to Māori’ (Applicants’ Manual, 2009: 10). This would appear to include information such as the writings, statements and actions of public figures, information that is in the public domain and not traditionally the concern of university ethics committees. The phrase ‘or the research involves a topic of particular interest to Māori’ (Application Form, 2009: 10) is in brackets, suggesting almost an add-on, a qualification. Along with the equally matter-of-fact statement about a researcher’s race (which I address below), that phrase is the most significant in the document. Its consequences are far-reaching in that it ensures that all Māori research is in accordance with Treaty ideology. Indeed, it appears to overstep the Ethics Committee’s remit because it covers topics and methods that do not have ethical implications. They concern intellectual matters whose research is protected by Section 161 of the Tertiary Education Act that guarantees academic freedom.

The monitoring process for Māori research ethics applications is comprehensive and provides a good example of the extent of the management approach that characterises the neoliberal university as well as the hegemonic status of indigenous ideology. Applications which involve Māori research must be ‘signed off by the faculty nominee of the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori)’ (Applicants’ Manual, 2009: 10). That requirement is a form of treaty audit.

The University of Auckland’s new ethics requirements are interesting examples of monitoring and auditing processes. At a deeper level of analysis, they show the operation of a compliance management culture. ‘Ethics’ now appears to mean management of a political position rather than principled action to ensure sound scholarship. The concept is turned on its head. What is political is now considered ‘ethics’ and what is the domain of ethics is politicised. There are several real ethical issues (as distinct from political ones) in the University of Auckland’s own ethics requirements.

The most serious is the use of the racial categorisation in scholarship. Researchers must declare their racial heritage, referred to in the Applicants' Manual as 'background' (ibid, 2009: 10). Despite this innocuous term, 'background' cannot mean anything other than genetic heritage (i.e. race). While a person can become a New Zealander, one cannot become a Māori. That is determined by one's biological descent. No amount of fudging about 'cultural identification' and 'affiliation' can disguise that fact. For example, in order to be on the Māori electoral roll, one must be a 'Māori', which is defined as 'the descendant of a Māori'. Another example is the requirement of Māori educational scholarships for evidence of genealogical descent as well as cultural identification. The evidence is a genealogical chart (*whakapapa*) authorised by a family *kaumatua* (elder).

An important point of entry for my Research Project is to understand the way indigenous ideology has become so hegemonic that racial categorisation can be included in the heart of the university's research processes – the ethics process. This could be done by tracing how the two most troubling phrases became inserted into the Applicants' Manual. They appear in the same sentence: 'If the research involves participants who are recruited because they are Māori (or *the research involves a topic of particular interest to Māori*) the Māori researcher should list his or her *tribal affiliations* (pepeha)' (my italics). What processes were followed? Which agents were involved? Were the requirements challenged at any point? What role did the Ethics Committee play in drafting the Manual and were Māori office holders involved?

Institutional and Government Recognition

Like the university, government research funding agencies also recognise and require a Māori knowledge approach. According to the Ministry of Research, Science and Technology (MoRST), the government agency responsible for major research funding:

Māori Development relates to research concerning Māori as tangata whenua and considers, particularly, research by Māori, for Māori and possibly employing Māori methodologies (MoRST: 2).

Controls on Māori research extend from approving those who undertake the research to validating the outcome. New Zealand uses a Performance-Based Research Fund (PBRF) system (similar to the British Research Assessment Exercise [RAE]) to audit research.

Indigenous research has its own category. An article written by the PBRF Education Review Panel draws attention to the ‘high quality of Māori research in education’.

Many Māori education academics were among those receiving the highest quality rating (12% of all A and B grades were in Māori Education). In accordance with TEC guidelines, the review panel members considered the impact of Māori research on iwi, hapū and whanau in forming a judgement on the quality of the research. Perhaps the most obvious feature of the success of Māori academics in education lies in developing alternative and critical epistemological models and research methodologies’ (Alcorn, Bishop, Caardno, Crooks, Fairburn-Dunlop, Hattie, Jones, Kane, O’Brien and Stevenson, 2004: 281).

This shows that it is the very political character of the research and the success of the cultural production of Māori knowledge that receives recognition in the discipline. The authors may be either unaware or have chosen to ignore the ideological nature of ethnic knowledge because nothing in the article suggests that the authors have considered the extent to which intellectual relativism is a problem for scholarship.

12. Researching Agents’ Intentions

A not inconsiderable difficulty in researching elite agents’ motives is in obtaining consent to take part in ethnographic research. However, another way to investigate motives, is to deduce them from publicly stated intentions in relation to stated goals. This may also assist in dealing with the problem of ‘emotional distance’ identified by Tremewan. (See page 32.) The method of document and other publication analysis may also protect against the danger of the research appearing to be personalised although it is not the participant-observer ethnography that I would prefer to use in the Research Project.

I have already discussed the influence of the three agents I have selected to investigate on the development of kaupapa Māori and indigenous knowledge, including creating networks and

the research infrastructure. In this section I provide a brief account of their influence on Māori tertiary education policy. My purpose is to justify the proposed research into their agency.

The Māori Tertiary Education Framework (2003a)³¹ was written by the members of the Ministry of Education Māori Tertiary Reference Group, established in 2001. The Reference Group was chaired by Professor Linda Smith and included Professor Graham Smith (at the time Pro Vice-Chancellor (Māori), University of Auckland) and Arohia Durie (Massey University). The document acknowledges Professor Mason Durie's 'landmark work on Māori educational advancement' (ibid: 7) (which) have 'been widely discussed and supported by the Māori education community'³², and have significantly shaped this framework' (ibid:16). Durie proposed that Māori will be able:

'to live as Māori' in a 'Māori world' (of) 'Māori iwi, hapū and communities' and be understood according to Māori knowledge, 'matauranga Māori' – the 'Durie principles' (ibid: 16).

While the Framework is not prescriptive, it has nevertheless exerted considerable influence over Māori tertiary education policy. It has remained the Māori tertiary education policy document on the Ministry of Education's website since its publication in 2003.

While not endorsed by the government as policy the framework stands alongside the TES (Tertiary Education Strategy), detailing the strategic direction and key priorities and objectives for the national tertiary system. The framework is an important document to help inform the development of policy and assist education agencies in their thinking around Māori issues.

As well as contributing at the strategic policy level the framework is a tool for operational policy and TEOs (Tertiary Education Organisations). It will lay a special role in developing Charters and Profiles. It will assist the process of engagement between Māori and the tertiary sector, including government and TEOs. (ibid: 12)

³¹ The page numbers I use refer to the document downloaded from the Ministry of Education website on 4 December 2009.

³² 'Relevant Māori communities include Māori students and staff and local and regional whanau, hapū and iwi' (ibid: 24)

The Framework is considerably detailed. There are specific ‘priorities’, ‘goals’ and ‘action points’ for the development of a tribal-based tertiary education system which provide considerable detail about the policies and practices to be adopted. For example:

The tertiary system should reflect genuine shared authority for Māori communities both within individual TEOs and the wider system. Shared authority within the tertiary sector could include partnerships between Māori communities, iwi groups and providers. The system could also benefit through general arrangements such as partnerships between iwi and the Ministry’ (ibid: 23).

The concept of a tribal non-tribal division is justified in terms of a treaty partnership. According to Professor Linda Smith, it is ‘intended to be a treaty-based model established on partnership’ (ibid: 6). This idea appears throughout the document, for example, a reference to developing policies and plans between government agencies and Māori ‘should reflect the partnership relationship guaranteed by the Treaty of Waitangi’ (ibid: 23). It recommends that ‘all tertiary staff participate in a Treaty of Waitangi education programme wananga and have basic knowledge of tikanga Māori’ (ibid: 32). This is to ensure that tertiary institutions are:

inclusive of Māori communities and students and . . . reflect the ways of learning preferred by Māori students. Māori should be able to see themselves and their culture reflected in these institutions. This includes being able to identify the role of local whanau, hapū and iwi within the institution, from input into management and governance structures, through to specific aspects of the curriculum (ibid: 32).

The Framework recommends the cultural production of indigenous knowledge. Priority seven, ‘Māori-centred knowledge-creation’ includes the goals that:

Māori guardianship of knowledge is recognised and embraced by the system and TEOs’ (and) ‘TEOs and government agencies support the development of Māori intellectual independence and Māori knowledge according to tikanga Māori (ibid: 39).

There are a number of implications for university research that flow from this priority. For example:

Establishing a Māori research workforce development strategy across the tertiary sector supported by Māori’ and ‘Rewarding TEOs and funding agencies for developing effective knowledge protection and knowledge creation strategies with Māori communities’ (ibid: 40). ‘Developing TEO strategies that encourage and enhance kaupapa Māori³³ research activity, supervision and accountability for inclusion within provider charters’ (ibid: 41).

In addition, a division is recommended between Māori and non-Māori academic advancement procedures. For example, the Action Point’ for ‘Priority Two: Māori Leadership’ recommends:

Reviewing existing promotion and salary procedures within TEOs to ensure appropriateness for Māori. Involvement in traditional forums is required to maintain links and responsibilities with Māori whanau, hapū and iwi. This relates to maintaining respect, recognition and ownership issues associated with Māori knowledge and research. Consideration for academic promotion usually requires presentation of current academic work at conferences or for publication. This may not always be appropriate for Māori’ (ibid: 25).

The Framework is a new type of brokerage strategy. Previously brokerage has involved the placement of Māori into state institutions in order to represent tribal interests. Now brokerage is about control over the process of interaction between Māori and non-Māori. Strategies for monitoring the brokerage mechanism are highly developed. This ensures that the brokerage sites are maintained as the sites of power and privilege for the brokers, the representatives of the Treaty partnership.

³³ The use of a number of terms, ‘Māori knowledge’, ‘kaupapa Māori’, and ‘matauranga Māori’ suggest that there is not yet agreement on a single umbrella term. From my understanding this is because there are ‘in-house’ disagreements amongst Māori academics involved in the wananga movement especially, with some preferring ‘kaupapa Māori’, while others, such as the Whare Wananga of Aotearoa, insisting on the term ‘indigenous methodologies’.

The strategies to implement these forms of brokerage include the development of:

Processes and indicators' will be developed 'for measuring and monitoring effective outcomes for Māori from TEO (Tertiary Education Organisation) profiles and develop responses for both successful and unsuccessful outcomes (ibid: 22).

An 'Action Point' for Priority One 'Whanau, hapū and iwi advancement' (ibid: 21) includes 'Conducting internal and external cultural audits to assess the levels to which TEOs are meeting framework objectives' (ibid: 22).

The writers are explicit about the revolutionary nature of the proposal – a discourse suggestive of Graham Smith's influence in the drafting of the ideas.

Key initiatives from the framework will be realised over the course of a generation and it will take political and institutional courage to exercise the leadership required for fundamental change. An educational revolution is required and we hope that this is the decade for Māori in tertiary education (Ministry of Education, ibid: 6).

The intention of the writers of the document is to privatise Māori tertiary institutions into neotribal control. For example, the Framework's five guiding principles include:

Principle two – 'tino rangatiratanga' – means supporting aspirations for Māori self determination, enabling provision by Māori and enshrining Māori ownership in and authority over tertiary education'. 'The third principle – toi to mana – means empowering Māori to influence the tertiary system at all levels' (ibid: 17).

The language in the Framework is interesting for what it excludes as much as for what it says. This points to another possible area for research; the analysis of the ideology's linguistic devices. There are a number of interesting examples. One is the exclusion of the word 'New

Zealand'. It appears only once in the document – on the page written by the Ministry in response to the Framework (ibid: 42). A second example concerns the Treaty/ indigenous discourse that I referred to in section 13. The Framework was published in 2003. This is the likely reason for the preference for 'Treaty' and 'Māori' rather than 'indigenous'.

13. Criticism of Indigenous Ideology

I have described the successful strategies of academic agents who have brokered indigenous ideology into New Zealand's universities in order to justify researching these agents. However, there is another group involved in indigenous ideology who should also be included in the Research Project. These are academics who, despite the current hegemony, do criticise cultural politics. These include Roger Openshaw, 2006, 2007 (with Rata), 2008 (with Rata), 2009; Erich Kolig, 2006; John Clark, 2006; Graham Butterworth, 2006 and Simon Chapple, 2000. This section provides a sketch of the ideas of a further three: Dannette Marie, Brian Haig, and Chris Tremewan.

The criticisms build on the research of two eminent academics: Roy Nash (1937-2006) and Peter Munz (1921-2007). As early as 1983, Nash (1983) discussed how the dominance of cultural theory to explain differential educational attainments was a feature of the political interests of the emerging Māori elite. Referring to 'what is now very much the party line', Nash explains 'the silent exclusion of class from the discourse' (1983: 82) in the interests of 'the programme of ethnic compensation on which the entire political strategy is based' (1983: 82). With this insight, Nash accurately anticipated the Māori elite's strategy of compensation which became the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process from 1985 (Rata, 2003). Nash suggested that future research is required into 'the nature of the elite group (of Māori), its relationship with the working class Māori community, its level of integration with the state apparatus, and the connection between its educational and other social policies' (1983: 84). However, given the restrictions on who can undertake research into Māori, Nash's suggestion has had only limited uptake.

Peter Munz (1994, 1999, 2000) was strongly critical of the ‘two worlds’ approach in the writings of Anne Salmond, Mason Durie and Linda Smith. Munz calls Mason Durie ‘mistaken’ in believing that Māori knowledge and scholarship are equally valid systems of knowledge. Because this is a fundamental idea behind the inclusion of Māori knowledge in the university, Munz’s argument is worth re-stating. He argues that Māori matauranga and scholarship is ‘incorrectly presumed to be culturally and parochically “western” or “European” (2000: 14). He maintains that they

serve two entirely different and incompatible purposes’. ‘Māori matauranga is a belief system designed to bond people into a community. . . Scholarship and science . . . are based on the application of unrestricted criticism and scrutiny to all beliefs, especially to those alleged to be taboo, as well as to its own theories’ (Munz, 2000: 14).

He charges both Salmond and Smith with propagating the ‘delusion’ that:

all societies, literate as well as illiterate, are of the same standing and by the cultivation of their myths, that there is no valid distinction between societies whose members have emancipated themselves from cultural compulsions and societies whose members have not emancipated themselves, and that scholarly knowledge (which, among other things, teaches that there is a structural difference between the former and the latter) is only one more myth: the myth made up by European imperialists. There is nothing much to be said in favour of any of these delusion (Munz has also referred to others) no matter how ‘politically correct’ they are at the present time (2000: 16).

Munz was particularly critical of Linda Smith’s *Indigenous Methodologies* (1999) saying that the book:

is likely to obfuscate politico-social debates in New Zealand because it maintains that acquiring knowledge about indigenous peoples, as distinct from the stories these people themselves are telling, is a way of colonizing them and amounts to imperialism’ (1999: 4).

He also attacked another pillar of indigenous ideology, that Māori research is by Māori for Māori. Munz rejects Smith's premise that research should be confined 'to the discovery of what people are saying about themselves so that their self-image remains intact and shielded from the corrosive extension of knowledge' (1999: 5). He also takes issue with the notion of 'indigenous' saying that 'indigenoussness is not a sensible criterion of distinction between research methodologies. Indigenous people can pursue both kinds of research into their own belief system' (1999: 5).

Dannette Marie and Brian Haig

The most comprehensive critical analysis of *kaupapa Māori* research specifically has been undertaken by Dannette Marie and Brian Haig (2006, 2009). They

contend that a significant feature of the politicisation of science in New Zealand involves the requirement that research scientists uncritically accept the tenets of relativism that the ideology of biculturalism harbours and the Māori renaissance project actively promotes. These tenets of relativism can be observed in the notion that the epistemic worth of 'Māori knowledge' can only be comprehended and evaluated from within the Māori cultural framework (or world-view) (2009: 117).

The authors provide examples of the extent to which the indigenous knowledge approach pervades New Zealand science saying that:

areas now regarded as being of specific relevance to Māori are unbounded. Various New Zealand acts of legislation including the *Health Research Council Act 1990*, the *Crown Research Institutes Act 1992*, and the *Foundation for Research, Science and Technology Amendment Act 1993* all express relevant provisions for Māori research' (2009: 120). Of particular interest is their discussion of the Ministry of Research, Science, and Technology' document '*Vision Matauranga: Unlocking the potential of Māori knowledge, resources and people*' (Ministry of Research, Science and Technology, 2006) which refers to 'indigenous innovation and knowledge. The document states that although indigenous and scientific knowledge should be regarded

as distinct knowledge systems or epistemologies, a relation between the two is required in order that issues of mutual interest can be discussed in a culturally appropriate manner. Like the parallel systems of education and health in New Zealand, science must reflect the bicultural orthodoxy. This requires the unconditional acceptance of relativism and allows the science system to be used as an additional platform to further facilitate special Māori identity rights and claims' (2009, pp. 118-119).

Marie and Haig identify the auditing role of the 'rights-based approach' to research that kaupapa Māori represents. They argue that:

the functional significance of a 'rights-based approach' is not in its attainment of evidence, but in its auditing role that ensures that New Zealand research institutions, organisations, and scientists comply with KMR views about the causes of current disparities where Māori are either over- or under-represented (2009: 124).

They refer also to the significant 'moral pressure, which has led to individuals conforming to doctrines including kaupapa Māori research methodology that fundamentally reject orthodox science' (2009: 127). This 'moral pressure' is a useful point of entry into my proposed ethnographic research. It raises questions about how moral pressure is applied, who applies it, who is affected by it and with what consequences.

Christopher Tremewan

The 2005 publication in the New Zealand anthropological journal, *Sites, the New Series*, of Chris Tremewan's provocative 'Ideological Conformity: A Fundamental Challenge to the Social Sciences in New Zealand', with responses from Jeffrey Sissons and Tom Ryan followed by Tremewan's response, began a debate in New Zealand which never gained traction, probably as a result of the very factors Tremewan identified. This is that culturalist 'ideological conformity, (as) a dead hand that stifled rather than promoted critical debate'. He laid the blame at the door of New Zealand's social sciences for not only its 'failure to provide an adequate critique of social norms in this country' but for its complicity in a process of

racial categorisation that may well have destructive consequences for those it is meant to help and for the whole society' (2005: 2).

Like Marie and Haig, Tremewan refers to the moral pressure that keeps academics silent, and therefore complicit, in the institutionalisation of indigenous ideology into the university. He also hints at the fate awaiting those who are critical.

There is nothing as implacable as academics, NGO activists or government policy analysts policing their colleagues for political conformity under the guise of academic rigour. The New Zealand research community, from the biomedical sciences to the social sciences, is almost inured to ideological imperatives in funding applications and conference paper selections. Those critiquing the dominant culturalist paradigm, even obliquely, are likely to miss out on funding or be excluded from presentation roles at multi-sectoral policy conferences (2005: 13).

Instances of moral pressure and the fate of academics who are critical of the culturalist paradigm are worthy subjects for in-depth ethnographic investigation.

14. Conclusion

Policy and institutions are the regulatory network of power relations. Lachmann (2003: 6) has described the importance of acquiring control of a 'distinct organisational apparatus', as 'elites effect social change by acting for themselves'. Since the mid-1990s, the neotribal intellectual elite has been able to acquire considerable influence over both public policy and public institutions with respect to Māori and the relations between Māori and non-Māori. It has secured the university as the institution for the cultural production of indigenous knowledge and it secured education policy as the vehicle to authorise and control that knowledge production. By acquiring control of Māori education policy and institutions, the retribalising elite has acquired control of the mechanisms of cultural production and socialisation to produce the '*shared meanings*' that contribute to 'the formation of subjects and of subjective experience' (Friedman, 2000: 645).

The proposed task for the Research Project to which this Working Paper contributes, is to understand how 'indigeneity' has become *shared meaning* in the New Zealand university. I have outlined how this will require investigating the nature, extent, and effects of neotribal academic agency, in, firstly, producing the material which justifies indigenous ideology, and then secondly, in controlling that cultural production process and the product 'indigenous knowledge'.

In identifying indigenous knowledge as the distinct form of cultural mobilisation in the interests of the Māori retribalising elite I have responded to the wider purpose of the anthropology of policy. According to Cris Shore (2002: 3) its practitioners need to show how elites constitute themselves by identifying exactly how 'an elite group develops its own particularistic set of interests, norms and practices to differentiate itself from the masses'. He refers to the cultural resources' that are mobilised and the way the elite 'cultivate functions that are simultaneously "universalistic" and "particularistic"' (2002: 3).

The production of indigenous knowledge in New Zealand in two short decades and its insertion into the university provides a microcosm of that cultural production to show how New Zealand biculturalism has become an elite strategy of social change, enacted through control of ideology, policy and institutions. It is a process that exemplifies Lachmann's (2000 and 2003) theory that:

relations between elites are the source of societal change, given that 'a central dynamic in inter-elite relations is the construction of institutions by elites to preserve their advantaged position' (Larson and Zalanga, 2003: 77)

and, I would add, to legitimate their economic and political ambitions.

My proposed ethnographic research will continue my investigation into how the neotribal elite uses the university to develop and consolidate its advantaged position. An important part of the research will be to understand the effects on academic life. How is the work of an academic controlled by the need to comply with Treaty requirements and auditing practices? What is the effect of a politicised university culture on the ability of academics to operate as the 'critic and

conscience of society' (a legislated requirement in New Zealand)? What is the effect on the university as the place for independent intellectual inquiry, for inquiry that takes risks, including the risk of causing offence? David Cannadine (2008) describes the freedom, confidence, creative energy and imagination the academics need. Citing Halsey (2008: 312), he asks 'whether their creativity, in the past both celebrated and never fully understood, can be maintained into the future is a vital but unresolved question'. It is my intention to make a contribution to answering that important question by investigating cultural politics in the New Zealand university. Unfortunately in my choice of methodology I may be subject to those politics.

Bibliography

- Alcorn, N., Bishop, R., Cardno, C., Crooks, T., Fairburn-Dunlop, Hattie, J., Jones A., Kane, R., O'Brien, and J. Stevenson (2004) *Enhancing Education Research in New Zealand: Experiences and Recommendations from the PBRF Education Peer Review Panel*, *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 39(2): 275 - 89.
- Appiah, K. A. (2005) *The Ethics of Individuality, The Ethics of Identity*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Application Form (2009) University of Auckland Ethics Committee. University of Auckland.
- Applicants' Manual (2009) University of Auckland Ethics Committee. University of Auckland.
- Babadzan, A. (2000) "Anthropology, nationalism and the 'invention of tradition'", *Anthropological Forum*. 10, no. 2 (2000): 131 – 155.
- Berthold, T. Personal Communication.
- Bunge, M. (1998) *Social Sciences under Debate*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Butterworth, G. (2006) *Historical Revisionism in New Zealand: Always Winter and Never Christmas*. In. Rata, E. and Openshaw, R. (eds.) *Public Policy and Ethnicity: The Politics of Ethnic Boundary Making*, (pp. 185 – 200). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cannadine, D. (2008) *Making History Now and Then*, Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chapple, S. (2000). *Māori Socio-Economic Disparity*. *Political Science*, 52 (2): 101 – 15.
- Clark, J. (2006) *Dogmas of Ethnicity*. In. Rata, E. and Openshaw, R. (eds.) *Public Policy and Ethnicity: The Politics of Ethnic Boundary Making*, (pp. 170 – 184). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- DMAD, Data Management and Analysis Division (2006) *Education Statistics of New Zealand for 2005*, Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Durie E.T. (2003) Foreword. In. Mead S. *Tikanga Māori*. Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Durie, E. T. J. (1991) *The Treaty in Māori History*, In Renwick, W. (ed.) *Sovereignty and Indigenous Rights: The Treaty of Waitangi in International Contexts*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Durie M (2003) *Māori educational advancement at the interface between te ao Māori and te ao whanui*. Presentation to the Hui Taumata Matauranga Tuatoru, 9 March. Faculty of Education, University of Auckland. 830.901 Research methods in educational and community settings, Semester Two Course Booklet.
- Durie, M. (2001) *A Framework for Considering Māori Educational Advancement*, Ministry of Education, <http://www.minedu.govt.nz/> last update: 15 April 2005. Retrieved 11 July 2005.
- Durie, M. (1998) *Te Mana, Te Kawanatanga, The Politics of Māori Self-Determination*, 1998,
- Durie, M. (2001a) *Mauri Ora: The Dynamics of Māori Health*

- Durie, M. (2003) *Launching Māori Futures*
- Durie, M. (1998) 'The Treaty of Waitangi – Perspectives on Social Policy', in R. Capper, A. Brown and W. Ihimaera (Eds). *Kaupapa New Zealand, Vision Aotearoa*. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Education Review, 9 October, 2009,(p. 6)
- Education Act 1989. Retrieved 11th December 2009, from http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1989/0080/latest/DLM175959.html?search=ts_all%40act%40bill%40regulation_1989+Education+Act_rese&p=1&sr=1
- Faculty of Education (2004) *Course Booklet: Research Methods*. University of Auckland.
- Faculty of Education, University of Auckland email communication (2009).
- Faculty of Education, EDUC 140 *Course Booklet* (2009) University of Auckland.
- Fitzgerald, T. (1972). Māori acculturation: The evolution of choice in a post-colonial situation. *Delta*, 11, 38-48
- Friedman, J. (1994) *Cultural Identity and Global Process*. London: Sage.
- Friedman, J. (2000). Globalisation, Class and Culture in Global Systems. *Journal of World Systems Research*, I(3), Fall/Winter, 636-656.
- Gerritsen, J. (2009) *Wananga at the Crossroad*, Interview with Graham Smith, *Education Review*. 28 August: 10-11.
- Head, L. (2006) 'Land, Authority and the Forgetting of Being in Early Colonial Māori History'. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Canterbury.
- Irwin, K. (1994). Māori research methods and practices. *Sites*, 28(Autumn), 25-43.
- Israel, J. (2001) *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jahnke H & Taiapa, J (1999) Māori Research. In: Davidson C, & Tolich M. (ed.) *Social Science Research in New Zealand, Many Paths to Understanding*. (pp 39–50). Auckland: Longman.
- Jessop, B. (1990) *State Theory*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Jones, A., McCulloch, G., Marshall, J. Smith G.H. & L. T. Smith (eds.) (1990) *Myths and Realities: Schooling in New Zealand*. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press.
- Jones, A., & Jenkins, K. (2008). Rethinking collaboration: Working the indigene-colonizer. In N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln & L. T. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of critical and indigenous methodologies* (pp. 471-486). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Ka'ai-Oldman T (1995) 'Te tatari i te kaupapa'. Unpublished PhD in Māori education thesis, University of Waikato.
- Ka'ai, T. (2005) Staff profile. www.otago.ac.nz Retrieved 14 August 2005.
- Kawharu, I. (1989). *Waitangi: Māori and Pakeha perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. Auckland, New Zealand: Oxford University Press.
- King, M. (1985). *Being Pakeha*. Auckland, New Zealand: Hodder and Stoughton.

- Kolig, E. (2006) Freedom, Identity Construction and Cultural Closure: The Taniwha, the Hijab and the Wiener Schnitzel as Boundary Markers. In Rata, E. & Openshaw, R. (eds.) *Public Policy and Ethnicity: The Politics of Ethnic Boundary Making*, (pp. 25 – 39). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuper, A. (1999) *Culture, the Anthropologists' Account*. Cambridge Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Lasch C 1995. *The Revolt of the Elites*. New York, W. W. Norton & Company.
- Larson E, Zalanga S 2003. Indigenous capitalists: the development of indigenous investment companies in relations to class, ethnicity, and the state in Malaysia and Fiji. In: Davis D E (ed.) *Political Power and Social Theory*. (pp. 73 – 102). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Lachmann, R. (2000) *Capitalists in Spite of Themselves: Elite Conflict and Economic Transformations in Early Modern Europe*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lachmann, R. (2003) Elite self-interest and economic decline in early modern Europe. *American Sociological Review*, 68: 346 – 372.
- Li, T. (2010 in press) 'Indigeneity, capitalism, and the management of dispossession', *Current Anthropology*.
- Lukes, S. (2003) *Liberals and Cannibals, the Implications of Diversity*, London: Verso.
- Marie, D. & Haig, B (2006) Kaupapa Māori Research Methodology: A Critique and An Alternative, *New Zealand Science Review*, 63(1): 17 – 21.
- Marie, D. and Haig, B (2009) The Māori Renaissance and the Politicisation of Science in New Zealand, In Openshaw, R. & Rata, E. (eds.) *The Politics of Conformity in New Zealand*, (pp. 115 – 134). Auckland: Pearson.
- Masters, C. (2009) Historian's Case for Tuhoe Independence, *New Zealand Herald*, 28 November: B7.
- McCulloch, G. (1989) *History, Ideology and Policy in New Zealand Education*, Presented to the NZARE Conference, Massey University, Palmerston North, December.
- McAdam, D. Tarrow, S. & C. Tilly (2001) *Dynamics of Contention*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, Mss.
- Mead, S. (2003) *Tikanga Māori*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Ministry of Education (2003a) *Ministry of Education Māori Tertiary Education Framework. A Report by the Māori Tertiary Reference Group*. November. <http://www.minedu.govt.nz> [accessed 1 August 2005].
- Ministry of Education (2003) *Ministry of Education Statement of Intent 2003 – 2008: Iwi Education Partnerships*. <http://www.minedu.govt.nz> [accessed 1 August 2005].
- Ministry of Education (2003). *Ministry of Education Māori and tertiary education framework. A report by the Māori tertiary reference group*. Ministry of Education, Wellington, November.
- Ministry of Education (2005) *Ministry of Education 2005. Nga Haeata Matauranga. Annual Report on Māori Education*. Wellington, April.
- MoRST (2004) *Ministry of Research, Science and Technology 2004. Māori Development & Advancement*.

- <http://www.morst.govt.nz/?CHANNEL=OUTPUT=CLASS=FUNDING7PAGE=Output+class+funding>. [accessed 13 May 2004].
- MoRST (2006). Ministry of Research, Science and Technology 2006. Vision Mātauranga: Unlocking the potential of Māori people, knowledge and resources. Wellington: Author
- Munz: (1994) The Two Worlds of Anne Salmond in Postmodern Fancy-Dress, *The New Zealand Journal of History*, 28(1): 60-75.
- Munz: (1999) Open and Closed Research, *New Zealand Books*, December, 4 – 6.
- Munz: (2000) Te Papa and the Problem of Historical Truth, *History Now*, 6(1), November, 13 – 1.
- Nanda, M. (2003) *Prophets Facing Backwards: Postmodern Critiques of Science and Hindu Nationalism in India*. New Brunswick: Rutgers.
- Nash, R. (2006) Challenging Ethnic Explanations for Educational Failure, In: Rata, E. & Openshaw, R. (eds.) *Public Policy and Ethnicity: The Politics of Ethnic Boundary Making*, (pp. 156 – 169). Houndsmill: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Nash, R. (1983) *Schools Can't Make Jobs'*, Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press Ltd.
- Newfield, C. (2008). *Unmaking the Public University – The Forty Year Assault on the Middle Class*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Ngā Pae o te Maramatanga, Research and Policy series 1, 2005. Wellington.
- Ngā Haeata Mātauranga - Annual report on Māori education (2004). Retrieved 11th December 2009, from http://www.educationcounts.govt.nz/publications/series/5851/nga_haeata_matauranga_-_annual_report_on_maori_education_2004
- Oliver, W.H. (2001) The Future Behind Us. In: Sharp A, & McHugh P. (ed.) *Histories, Power and Loss*. (pp. 9–30). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Openshaw, R. (2006) Putting Ethnicity into Policy: A New Zealand Case Study. In Rata, E. & Openshaw, R. (eds.) *Public Policy and Ethnicity, The Politics of Ethnic Boundary-Making*. (pp. 113 – 127). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Openshaw, R. & Rata, E. (2008) Flax rope or iron fetter: How cultural essentialism threatens intellectual freedom in the New Zealand tertiary education sector. *New Zealand Journal of Tertiary Education Policy*, 3(1).
- Openshaw, R. & Rata, E. (2007). 'The Weight of Inquiry: Conflicting Cultures in New Zealand's Tertiary Institutions, *Journal of International Studies in Sociology of Education*, 17(4), 407-425.
- Openshaw, R. (2009) *Reforming New Zealand Secondary Education: The Picot Report and the Road to Radical Reform*, NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- O'Regan, T. (1994). *Readying the canoe upon the beach*. In Capper, R., Brown, A., and Ihimaera, W., *Kaupapa New Zealand, Vision Aotearoa*. Wellington: Bridget William Books.
- Palmer, G. (2006) *The treaty of Waitangi – Where to From Here?* Presentation to the Te Papa Treaty of Waitangi Debate Series, 2 February.

- Pena, S. (2005). Reasons for banish the concept of race from Brazilian medicine. *História, Ciência e Saúde – Manguinhos*, 12, 321-346.
- Pihama L. (1993) *Tungia te ururua, kia tupu whakaritorito te tupu o te harakeke: A critical analysis of parents as first teachers*. Unpublished Master of Education thesis, University of Auckland.
- Powick K. 2002. *Māori research ethics*. Wilf Malcolm Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, University of Waikato.
- Poulantzas, N. (1976) *The Crisis of the Dictatorships*, London: NLB.
- Rata, E. (1996) 'The Emergence of Tribal-Capitalism', Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Auckland.
- Rata, E. (2002) 'The Transformation of Indigeneity', *Review, A Journal of the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems and Civilisations*, State University of New York. XXV (2), 173–195,
- Rata, E. (2000). *A Political Economy of Neotribal Capitalism*. Lanham, Md and Oxford: Lexington Books.
- Rata, E. (2003) *An Overview of Neotribal Capitalism*. *Ethnologies Comparees*. <http://alor.univ-montp3.fr/cerce/r6/n6.htm>
- Rata, E. (2003b) *Late Capitalism and Ethnic Revivalism, 'A New Middle Age'?* *Anthropological Theory*, 3 (1), 46–64.
- Rata, E. (2003a) *Leadership Ideology in Neotribal Capitalism, Political Power and Social Theory*. 16, 45 – 73
- Rata, E. (2004) *Marching through the institutions, the neotribal elite and the treaty of Waitangi*. *Sites* 1(2): 56-81.
- Rata, E. & Openshaw, R. (eds.) (2006) *Public Policy and Ethnicity, The Politics of Ethnic Boundary-Making*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rata, E. (2007) *Cultural Relativism, Ingenio*, University of Auckland Alumni Magazine, Autumn: 38.
- Rata, E. & Zubarán, C. (2009) *When Criticism is Silent*, *New Zealand Mental Health*, In. Openshaw, R. & Rata, E. (eds.) *The Politics of Conformity in New Zealand*, (pp. 85-109). Auckland: Pearson Publications.
- Rata, E. (2011 in press) *Discursive Strategies of the Maori Tribal Elite, Critique of Anthropology*, 31:4.
- Roberts R. M. & P. R. Wills. (1998). *Understanding Māori Epistemology: A Scientific Perspective*. In Wautischer, H. (ed.). *Tribal Epistemologies*, (pp. 43-79). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Robust, T. (2007) *Developing Indigenous Infrastructure in the University: Another Era or Another Error?*, *MAI Review*, 1(7): 1 – 10.
- Salmond, A. (1991) *Two Worlds: First Meetings between Māori and Europeans 1642-1772*. Auckland: Viking.

- Salmond, Anne (1982) Theoretical Landscapes, On Cross-Cultural Conceptions of Knowledge. In D. Parkin (ed.) *Semantic Anthropology*. (pp. 65 – 87). London: Academic Press.
- Salmond, A. (1985). Māori epistemologies. In O. J (Ed.), *Reason and morality* (pp. 240-263). London: Tavistock Publications.
- Schroder I. W. (2003) The political economy of tribalism in North America: neotribal capitalism? *Anthropological Theory* 3(4): 435–455.
- Seventh Young Māori Leaders' Conference, Wellington, 2005
- Sharp, A. (2002) Blood, Custom and Consent: Three Kinds of Māori Groups and the Challenges they present to Governments, *University of Toronto Law Journal*, 9(xii): 9 – 37.
- Shore, C., & Wright, S. (1999). Audit culture and anthropology: Neo-liberalism in British higher education. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, 7(4 (December)), 59-63.
- Shore, C. & Wright, S. (1997) *Anthropology of Policy, Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*. London: Routledge.
- Shore, C. (2002) Introduction: Towards an Anthropology of Elites, In Shore, C and Nugent, S. (eds.) *Elite Cultures: Anthropological Perspectives*, (pp. 1 - 21). London: Routledge.
- Shore, C. (1992). Virgin births and sterile databases: Anthropology and the new reproductive technologies. *Current Anthropology*, 33(3 (June)), 295-314.
- Siegfried, A. (1914) (trans. E. V. Burns) *Democracy in New Zealand*. London: Bell Sons.
- Smith, C. (1994) 'Kimihia Te Maramatanga: Colonisation and Iwi Development', RUME Masters Theses Series, No. 4, University of Auckland.
- Smith, G. H. (1987). *Akonga Māori, Māori Pedagogy and Learning*, Vol 11 Nga Kete Wananga Series, Auckland: Auckland College of Education
- Smith, G. H. (1990) The Politics of Reforming Māori Education: The Transforming Potential of Kura Kaupapa Māori, In Lauder, H. and Wylie, C. (eds.) *Towards Successful Schooling*, (pp. 73 – 88). London: Falmer Press.
- Smith G.H. (2003) Kaupapa Māori theory: Transformative praxis and new formations of colonisation. *Cultural Sites, Cultural Theory, Cultural Policy*, The Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research Te Papa Museum. Wellington.
- Smith, G. H. (1997) *The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis*. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Smith, L. T. (1998) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*, Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Auckland.
- Smith, L. T. (1999) *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Statistics New Zealand. (2005) *Statistical standard for ethnicity 2005*. Wellington, New Zealand: Statistics New Zealand.
- Sutton: (2009) *The Politics of Suffering: Indigenous Australia and the End of the Liberal Consensus*, Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.

- Tahana, Y. (2009) Northland Iwi Happy to Defer Sovereignty Challenge, New Zealand Herald, 7 September, A4
- Tau, M., Ormsby, D., Manthei, M., & T. Potiki (2003) Te Tapuae o Rehua: Treaty-Based Guidelines and Protocols for Tertiary Education Institutions, Churchchurch: Te Tapuae o Rehua Ltd in association with University of Otago Press.
- TPK, Te Puni Kokiri (2001) He Tirohanga o Kawa ki te Tiriti o Waitangi, Wellington: Te Puni Kokiri.
- Turton, D. (ed.) (1997) War and Ethnicity, Global Connections and Local Violence (Center for Interdisciplinary Research on Social Stress, San Marino (RSM): University of Rochester Press.
- Tocker, K. (2002) He hua pai te kura kaupapa Māori. Unpublished MEd thesis, University of Auckland.
- Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975. Retrieved 11th December 2009, from http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/1975/0114/latest/DLM435368.html?search=ts_all%40act%40bill%40regulation_1975+Treaty+of+Waitangi+Act_resel&p=1&sr=1
- Tremewan C (2005) Ideological conformity: A fundamental challenge to the social sciences in New Zealand. Sites 2(1): 1-27.
- Tremewan, C. (2005a) It's Time to Answer the Important Questions – A Response to Sissons and Ryan, Sites, 2(1): 34 - 38.
- Tremewan, C. (2006). Repoliticising race: The Anglican church in New Zealand. In E. Rata & R. Openshaw (Eds.), Public policy and ethnicity: The politics of ethnic boundary making (pp. 95-112). London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Turoa, I. (2000) A Conundrum: Finding a Definitive Definition out of Multiple Ways of Knowing – The Real Māori'. Reinvigorating New Zealand Sociology: Practices, Projects, politics and Protests. Proceedings of Conference 2000, 17 – 19 November, Department of Sociology and Social Policy, the University of Waikato.
- Tuteao, V. M. (1998) Maako anoo e hanga tooku nei whare ko ngaa pou o roto, he maahoe, he patatee. Ko te taahuhu he hiinau. Unpublished MA thesis, University of Auckland.
- Tuuta, M. Bradnam, L. Hynds, A. & J. Higgins with R. Broughton (2004) Evaluation of the te kauhua Māori mainstream pilot project. Report to the Ministry of Education, Wellington.
- University of Auckland Guiding Principles for Research, November 2006
- University of Auckland Strategic Plan, Objective 10, 2006
- University of Auckland Human Participants Ethics Committee Applicants' Manual, 2009
- Waikato News (2007) University of Waikato, 9 March
- Waldron, J. (2002) Indigeneity? First Peoples and Last Occupancy. Quentin-Baxter Memorial Lecture, Victoria University of Wellington Law School, 5 December.
- Walker, S. (1996) Kia tau te rangimarie kaupapa Māori theory as a resistance against the construction of Māori as the other, Unpublished MA in Education thesis, University of Auckland.
- Webster, S. (1998) Patrons of Māori Culture. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.

Wilkie, M. with Berryman M, Himona T, Paul T (2001). *Matauranga Motuhake*, New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Wellington.

Widdowson, F. & Howard, A. (2008) *Disrobing the Aboriginal Industry: The deception Behind Indigenous Cultural Preservation*, Montreal: McGill-Queens University press.

Winiata, Whatarangi (1998) 'Reducing the Socio-economic Disparities in Housing, Employment, Health and Education', 8 December (http://twm.co.nz/MSoln_Win.html).

Yinger, J. (1985). Ethnicity. *American Review of Sociology*, II, 151-180.

Glossary³⁴

Hapū

A sub-tribal group, each hapū identifies as belonging to a larger tribe. Hapū are also kinship groups determined by shared descent from a common ancestor. A hapū will belong to a specific geographical location within the greater tribal area, most hapū will also have their own marae. Hapū is also the Māori word for pregnancy.

Hui Taumata Matauranga

These meetings have been hosted by Ngāti Tuwharetoa and its Paramount Chief, Tumu Te Heuheu for the purposes of discussing issues for Māori in relation to education. The initial hui was held in February 2001 with subsequent hui have also been held in 2002 and 2003.

Iwi

A nation or tribe, and in the context of this paper it refers to a tribal grouping. Tribal groupings are based on kinship ties, genealogy and shared histories back to a single ancestor from whom all people in a particular tribe descend. Each iwi has ties to specific geographical locations, each iwi also has its own customs, practices and dialectal differences which distinguish it from other iwi. Each iwi will also have a number of hapū or sub-tribes which affiliate to the larger group. Iwi is also the Māori word for bone.

³⁴ The glossary is taken from the Māori Tertiary Education Framework, 2003a, pp. 43-47.

Iwi Partnerships

Iwi Partnerships are formalised relationships between the Ministry of Education and iwi-based organisations. They are established to improve educational outcomes through shared understandings and working together.

Tertiary Education Organisation (TEO)

An organisation, either public, private, or community-based, offering tertiary education.

Tertiary Education System

The collective term for providers of education and training, industry training organisations, learners and other key stakeholders, associated government agencies, and the regulatory and funding framework.

Tikanga

Māori customs and protocols.

Tikanga-a-iwi

The customs and protocols of an iwi.

Wānanga

As defined in the Education Amendment Act 1990, Section s162 (b)IV, wānanga are characterised by teaching and research that maintains, advances, disseminates and assists the application of knowledge regarding ahua Māori according to tikanga Māori. The three recognised wānanga under the Education Act are Te Whare Wānanga o Awaniārangi, Te Wānanga o Aotearoa and Te Wānanga o Raukawa.

Whānau

Is the Māori word for family and birth. In the context of this paper it refers to family. To Māori the word family refers to the extended family including cousins and aunts and uncles. Membership of the whānau is determined predominantly through kinship ties although whānagai (adopted) children are also members of the whānau and then in turn the larger social groups of hapū and iwi. The kinship ties are determined by descent through a close common ancestor such as a grandparent or great-grandparent. A number of whānau belong to a hapū.

Through inter-marriage most Māori today are able to identify as belonging to a number of hapū and iwi.

The following words are translated by the writer

Kaupapa Māori

Māori principles

Matauranga Māori

Māori knowledge

Working Papers in the University Reform Series:

1. Setting Universities Free? The background to the self-ownership of Danish Universities, Jakob Williams Ørberg, July 2006.
2. Trust in Universities - Parliamentary debates on the 2003 university law, Jakob Williams Ørberg, October 2006.
3. Histories of RUC - Roskilde University Centre, Else Hansen, November 2006.
4. An Insight into the Ideas Surrounding the 2003 University Law - Development contracts and management reforms, Peter Brink Andersen, November 2006.
5. Who Speaks for the University? - Legislative frameworks for Danish university leadership 1970-2003, Jakob Williams Ørberg, May 2007
6. 'After Neoliberalism'? - The reform of New Zealand's university system, Cris Shore, June 2007
7. Women in Academia - Women's career paths in the social sciences, in the context of Lund University and Swedish higher education, Susan Wright, October 2007
8. Will market-based ventures substitute for government funding? - Theorising university financial management, Penny Ciancanelli, May 2008
9. Measurements and Distortions – A Review of the British System of Research Assessment, Susan Wright, May 2008
10. Becoming and Being: University reform, biography and the everyday practice of sociologists, Nicola Spurling, June 2009
11. Polishing the Family Silver. Discussions at Roskilde University Center in Advance of the 2003 University Law, Nathalia Brichet, August 2009
12. Forandringsprocesser i akademien. En empirisk undersøgelse af medarbejderperspektiver på en fusionsproces i anledning af universitetsfusionerne, Gertrud Lynge Esbensen, September 2009
13. Recent Higher Education Reforms in Vietnam: The Role of the World Bank, Que Ahn Dang, October 2009
14. The organization of the university, Hans Siggaard Jensen, April 2010
15. Collegialism, Democracy and University Governance – The Case of Denmark, Hans Siggaard Jensen, June 2010
16. Follow the Money, Rebecca Boden and Susan Wright, October 2010