

RIVER OWNERSHIP:  
INALIENABLE TAONGA AND IMPARTIBLE TUPUNA AWA

Marama Muru-Lanning

ABSTRACT

*This article examines Maori relationships with the State, the ownership of rivers and issues of identity. My research site is the Waikato River which is located in the North Island of New Zealand and comprises a number of Te Arawa and Tainui tribes. Te Arawa and Tainui are two large territorially-based descent groups. While Te Arawa communities are located at the beginning of the Waikato River in the Taupo and Reporoa areas, Tainui communities pepper the length of the river from Whakamaru to Port Waikato.<sup>1</sup>*

INTRODUCTION

This work is about Maori understandings of ownership, however, as I hope to illustrate, in many contexts what is more important for Maori than ‘owning’ in the conventional sense, are issues of authority, status and prestige. Indeed, the concepts of ‘ownership’ and ‘Waikato River’ are two metaphors which rally people because they are deeply embedded in local understandings of leadership and authority.<sup>2</sup> Let me illustrate these points with a brief ethnographic vignette.

At a meeting at Hopuhopu<sup>3</sup> which was attended by over sixty Waikato elders, Waikato iwi’s principal negotiator for Treaty of Waitangi claims, Robert Mahuta, declared: ‘We don’t need a bloody court document to tell us we own the river, we know we do’ (Personal Communication June 2000). The comment was well received by the elders attending the meeting. The purpose of the gathering was to inform the elders of the tribe’s claim for legal ownership of the Waikato River. While discussions of the Waikato River took precedence, Robert Mahuta also spoke about the tribe’s claims on the Maramarua Forest and Manukau Harbour and his strategy for advancing the Tainui Endowed College.<sup>4</sup> I note the gathering took place at a time when Robert Mahuta’s health

was seriously deteriorated and his leadership was being challenged in the public arena using courts and media<sup>5</sup> by some discontented Waikato tribal members (Diamond 2003: 113–143). Throughout the presentation the elders listened intently and showed their support of Robert Mahuta by nodding their heads and giving encouraging remarks such as ‘yes Robert’ and ‘that’s right Bubs.’<sup>6</sup> The elders seemed to have interpreted Robert Mahuta’s remarks as confirmation of Waikato Maori’s right to ‘own’ the Waikato River. However, whether the tribe’s claim for ownership would exclude or extinguish the rights of other tribes and stakeholders along the river and what the term ‘own’ may have precisely meant for the elders, was not discussed at the gathering.

In virtually every society there are concepts that we recognise as similar to the western concept of ownership. What various cultures consider subject to ownership, however, and how owning something becomes manifest, is often very different (Hann 1998: 23; Wagoner 1998; Strathern 1999, Strang 2008). There is in fact no Maori lexeme for the English verb ‘to own’. The only way to express the verb is by saying it in other ways. A number of Maori words are used to express the notions of own, owner and ownership. In the Ngata *English-Maori Dictionary* the word ‘own’ is equated with the Maori words *whai* (also written as whiwhi) and *mana*. The word ‘owner’ translates in Maori to *rangatira*. Similarly, the word ‘ownership’ is usually translated in Maori as *rangatiratanga* (Ngata 1993: 356). But these words are also bound up in Maori conceptions of power, authority and status, and do not necessarily involve the idea of a sovereign individual with exclusive rights of possession but rather a chief who is empowered to speak on behalf of the tribe. The following sentences from Ngata demonstrate how the words are used in Maori language (1993: 356):<sup>7</sup>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. <i>Kaore a ia i <u>whai</u> rawa, whenua, ano hoki.</i>                                     | He owned neither property nor land.                              |
| 2. <i>Kei a wai te <u>mana</u> o te whenua.</i>  | Who owns the land?   |
| 3. <i>E mohio ana ahau ki te <u>rangatira</u> o tetahi karaati, mana koe te awhina.</i>        | I know the owner of the garage, he will help you.                |
| 4. <i>He maha nga whakatipuranga i tautohetohetia ai te <u>rangatiratanga</u> o te whenua.</i> | Ownership of the land has been disputed for several generations. |

Geographer Evelyn Stokes, who produced two studies that assisted in advancing Waikato’s land claim, described the approach of Robert Mahuta and the Tainui Maori Trust Board in relation to the Waikato River claim. In her view,

Waikato Maori were not seeking exclusive ownership or a full and final settlement for the Waikato River, but rather, their primary objective was to contribute to the management of the river, taking into account Maori values (Stokes 1994: 49). Whether this view is what Robert Mahuta and other members of the Tainui Maori Trust Board had in mind when they lodged the tribe's claim for the Waikato River is open to question. In accord with Stokes' explanation, Norman Hill, the Environment Manager of Waahi Whanui Trust,<sup>8</sup> said at a 'Water Programme of Action' meeting in Hamilton:

We desire clean water, and we are interested in talking about co-management rather than ownership. Sir Robert Mahuta's view prevails that we know we own the river but we are interested in co-management. (Ministry for Environment February 2005)

Robert Mahuta's position has been interpreted in many ways by tribal members and other people with interests in the Waikato River. Yet in contemporary western society the ownership of property is the primary way that status is recognised. Robert Mahuta's address in June 2000 appears to have used the English word 'own' and the 'Waikato River' as mobilising metaphors not only to gather and unify the elders but also to demonstrate the significance of Kingitanga leadership among Waikato *iwi*. I use the term mobilising metaphors in the sense implied by Shore and Wright (1997). As they put it:

[W]hen key words succeed, not only in competitions within the political field (Bourdieu 1991), but also in attracting mass popular support, we term them 'mobilizing metaphors' (Wright 1993). Mobilizing metaphors become the centre of a cluster of keywords whose meaning extend and shift while previous associations with other words are dropped. Their mobilizing effect lies in their capacity to connect with, and appropriate the positive meanings and legitimacy derived from other key symbols... (Shore and Wright 1997: 20).

Similarly, Tilley writes that a metaphor may:

Not only serve as a binding element in providing an interpretive account of the world, it can also be conceived as a quality which links together individuals and groups. The fact that metaphors are culturally relative implies that members of the same culture may share many distinct metaphorical understandings in common (Tilley 1999: 9).

The use of ‘Waikato River’ as shorthand for Waikato *iwi* and the Kingitanga is a good illustration of how mobilising language works.

This paper provides an overview of how cultural groups with interests in the Waikato River now comprehend and practice ownership. It begins by juxtaposing two understandings of ownership occurring in New Zealand; these are English common law and Maori *tikanga* (customs and practices). Common law defines ownership as the state of having exclusive ‘rights’ in property and the ‘possession’ of property with the right to transfer possession to others (Hann 1998: 38). According to Hann, common law emphasises the essentially relational, social character of property ownership between individuals (1998: 8). *Tikanga* on the other hand emphasises the relationships and shared rights of groups of people to property (Norman 1996: 209). The term *tikanga* has a range of meanings which include authority, control, custom, ethic, formality, lore, manner, method, plan, protocol, rule and style (Williams 1985: 416). In general, *tikanga* is taken to mean ‘the Maori way of doing things’ and derives from the Maori word *tika* which emphasises ‘directness’, ‘straightness’, ‘rightness’ and ‘fairness’ (Williams 1985: 416). The following explanation by Durie demonstrates how *tikanga* operates in Maori society:

Tikanga are used as ‘guides to moral behaviour’ and within an environmental context refer to the preferred way of protecting natural resources, exercising guardianship, determining responsibilities and obligations, and protecting the interests of future generations. Few tribes have committed tikanga to writing or reduced them to a simple set of rules. Instead the most appropriate tikanga for a group at a given time, and in response to a particular situation, is more likely to be determined by processes of consensus, reached over time and based both on tribal precedent and the exigencies of the moment (1998: 23).

Anthropologist Joan Metge makes sense of the two positions of ownership by suggesting that *tikanga* is perhaps more concerned with creating fairness than common law (Personal Communication July 2009).

With a substantial literature for common law ownership in circulation (see Hann 1998; MacFarlane 1978, 1987; Verdery and Humphrey 2004; Waldron 1988) this paper’s examination of the subject will focus primarily on the role of primogeniture in transmitting rights and property to people. While primogeniture is no longer a prominent feature in the common law of New Zealand, it was adopted by the Kingitanga in the nineteenth century and still holds sway with that institution.

With a much smaller number of studies on *tikanga* in distribution (see Durie 1998; Tomas and Quince 1999; Mead 2003), I see the opportunity to make a contribution to the understanding of Maori ownership. This work examines an important structuring principle of *tikanga*. This is *tuakana-teina*, which organises Maori society. One aim of this paper is to demonstrate that the structuring principle gives form to the 'fluid' nature of Maori ownership. *Tuakana-teina* distinguishes the paired relationships of 'senior' and 'junior' between people and things. Williams defines *tuakana*, as 'an older brother of a male, an older sister of a female and a cousin of the same sex in an older branch of the family' (1985: 445), and *teina* 'as a younger brother of a male, a younger sister of a female and a cousin of the same sex in a younger branch of the family' (1985: 410). This ordering of people is largely responsible for structuring the reciprocal relationships between kin members of descent groups, tribal groups, and Maori and their environment (Salmond 1991: 348). The overall purpose of this discussion is to demonstrate that *tuakana-teina* defines in Maori cultural terms those things which 'can be' controlled and owned and those things which are 'too senior' or 'too great in status' to be controlled or owned.

For Maori, those things that are thought to have great status are things with *mana*. *Mana* is a concept of great significance to Maori people and is understood to reside in all manner of things including human beings, animals and inanimate objects. Individuals build up a store of *mana* from sources such as their descent from a key ancestor and personal achievements. Often described as 'spiritual power' and 'special essence', a person's *mana* is their power to perform in a given situation. For Metge, *mana* is often represented as a 'cloak' or 'mantle', especially the *mana* which has been handed down from ancestors (1995 [1986]: 63). Another important point that Metge makes is:

Mana is held not only by individuals but also by certain corporate groups, principally the descent-groups *iwi*, *hapuu* and *whaanau*... Whether an individual has mana in his own right or not, he always has some as a member of a named descent-group (1995 [1986]: 65).

#### ENGLISH COMMON LAW UNDERSTANDINGS OF OWNERSHIP

Common law is the system of law used in England and in countries colonised by England. According to Blackstone (1978), the term 'common law' originated after the Norman Conquest and was originally based on the principle that rulings made by the King Courts in England were made in accord with the common customs of the realm, as opposed to decisions made by local courts which were judged by provincial laws and customs. For this reason

common law is understood to be the 'law of precedent' which is distinguished from statutory law. Early philosophers such as Harrington, Hobbes and Locke explain the development of common law and private property as central to the establishment of modern capitalism (see Macfarlane 1978: 58, 1998: 105). Common law privileges property rights being invested in individuals, though as Goody acknowledges, in contemporary Western societies not all rights are individualised with some rights being attached to family, community and the state (1998: 201).

In the late eighteenth century and throughout the nineteenth century, private property practices of common law were exported out of England so that lands and valuable resources could be appropriated from native peoples. Common law maintained the view that land owners had a duty to develop and improve their lands (Hann 1998: 38). Macfarlane elucidates this:

European attitudes to land are based on philosophies of conquering and taming nature, and more specifically in Lockean conceptions of land use and individual rights. John Locke posited that land could become one's own only through labour: it is labour that gives value to land. His *Of Civil Government* provided the justification for appropriating land occupied by indigenous groups and others who did not 'use' land (1998: 127).

Primogeniture affirmed transmissions of owning property from oldest son to oldest son. When Macfarlane examined the role of primogeniture in establishing capitalism in England he wrote:

From at least the beginning of the sixteenth century the major share of the landholding went to one child. Maine has pointed out that this 'Feudal Law' of land practically disinherited all the children in favour of one. In essence, primogeniture and a peasant joint ownership unit are diametrically opposed. The family is not attached to the land, and one favoured individual is chosen at the whim of the parent, or by the custom of the manor (1978: 87).

When New Zealand was colonised, primogeniture was an influential feature of common law. While primogeniture was not practiced by Maori before the arrival of British settlers this study shows that members of the Kingitanga have adopted the concept. The principle of male primogeniture is used in the selection process for the leadership of the Kingitanga and also to determine the transmission of Kingitanga property from one leader to the next. While

symbolically primogeniture equates the *kahui ariki* to the British monarchy, practically it has to do with keeping the limited resources of the Kingitanga intact. The *kahui ariki* is Waikato *iwi*'s paramount family, which includes all the descendants of the first Maori King, Potatau Te Wherowhero. The common Maori view as expressed by Winiata is that the legitimisation of power and prestige for Kingitanga leaders comes directly from understandings of *mana* and *tapu*. He equated these two Maori leadership qualities to Weber's notion of charisma (1967:30). For Winiata, *mana* and *tapu* are qualities inherent in senior lineages and are the concepts which drive Kingitanga member's practice of primogeniture (1967:28). While the *tapu* of chiefs enables them to carry out certain ritualistic functions, their *mana* gives validity and power to their action. However, Winiata's explanation does not deal with the Kingitanga's preference for creating male leaders. The current leader of the Kingitanga is King Tuheitia. He is the oldest son of the sixth Kingitanga leader, Te Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikaahu. Though King Tuheitia has an older sister who was considered for the role as leader of the movement, external tribal chiefs and some influential Waikato members decided that a male successor would be more suitable. I must note his predecessor, Te Arikinui Dame Te Atairangikaahu, did not have any biological brothers.

Since much Waikato land was confiscated in the 1860s, I cannot ascertain whether Waikato Maori families who support the Kingitanga practice primogeniture in the transmissions of family property. Most of the families do however recognise the oldest living male as the head of their family. Overall, the structuring principle of primogeniture in relation to ownership is at odds with *tikanga* conceptions of ownership where rights to tribal lands and resources are safeguarded by *rangatira* and held collectively by *hapu* and *whanau* groups. While primogeniture advances the most senior male in a family and effectively excludes younger males and all female siblings from inheriting property, the principle of *tuakana-teina* does not alienate family members from property nor does it privilege males over females. Complementary gender roles and relationships are an important feature of *tuakana-teina* and I examine them later in the paper.

#### TIKANGA UNDERSTANDINGS OF OWNERSHIP

Before the arrival of Europeans, Maori society had its own concept of land and resource ownership (Firth 1929:338–9). Often land and resources belonged to more than one tribal group. Each tribe's rights and uses could be quite different. For instance, one tribe may have had the rights to harvest birds in an area at a particular time of the year, while another tribe may have had the

fishing rights for the area and a third tribe may have had the rights to grow crops (Firth 1929: 43; Ballara 1998:194–195, 197). According to Mead, this system of tribal co-operation in cultivation and the sharing and redistribution of resources inhibited any trend towards individualism and the individual ownership of land (2003: 282). Contests over land and resources were a regular occurrence between tribal groups (Jones and Biggs 1995: 138). While exclusive rights to lands and resources were extremely rare, tribes constantly disputed and negotiated their rights with one another (Ballara 1998: 200). Disputes between tribes had just as much to do with ‘acting out of a responsibility and an obligation to care’, as they did with protecting their economic and political interests. Indeed, recurrent disputing and negotiating meant that tribal boundaries and rights to resources were flexible. Claims were typically linked to inherited *mana* over land as well as a tribe’s occupation and use of it. Ballara describes how ancestral claiming was practiced:

[T]he land which a Maori has best claim to is that which [he] has had handed down to him from his ancestors to himself. Yet descent from an owning ancestor alone was insufficient; it had to be from an ancestor whose descendants had continued to occupy it. Descendants who lived elsewhere eventually lost their rights—their claims grew cold (1998: 200).

In the past, contests for lands and resources between tribal groups were driven by *rangatira* and worked out through *whaikorero* (public oratory) and the Maori cultural practices of *tono* (betrothals of marriage), *taonga* (exchanges of significant gifts), and warfare. Those *rangatira* that were skilled negotiators often increased the territory and resources of their tribes. The exercise of power and authority by *rangatira* in relation to the use, management and disposal of tribal lands and resources is referred to as *rangatiratanga*. When Robert Mahuta spoke about *rangatiratanga* he said the concept was enmeshed with *whakapapa* but that it had to be accompanied by performance. He added: ‘a *rangatira* is, to a large extent, quite humble in the way that he carries and deports himself within the tribe. You cannot afford to be arrogant otherwise you’re dead, and you’ve always got to have the good of the tribe at heart, in whatever you do’ (Diamond 2003: 140–41). However, Metge claims that:

Rangatiratanga is not simply the power and authority of the *rangatira*, it is also the power and authority of the *iwi*, for the two go together, the *rangatira* being the tribe’s chief representative and the trustee of tribal *taonga* (1991: 19).



Before the arrival of British colonists in New Zealand the exclusive ownership of property was not a feature that increased an *iwi* or *hapu* group's status in Maori society. What was important was the group's ability to negotiate with others and be influential in the sharing and distribution of lands and resources. While common law ownership is still influenced by Henry Maine's (1866) definition of people obtaining a 'bundle of rights', Maori informant discussions of ownership in this study revolve around their fulfilling obligations to kin members and being responsible for local resources.

For tribes of the Waikato River, many disputes over ownership have just as much to do with 'acting out of a responsibility to care', as they do with protecting a financial and political 'interest' in the Waikato River. One way Maori can act responsibly in relation to important local resource is through litigation. For Waikato Maori, one benefit of litigation is that it provides an opportunity to put Maori concerns 'on the public record' and is proof to future generations of their attempt to deal with significant issues. Members of Waikato *iwi* understand that when the Waikato River is altered its *mauri* (life force) is weakened, and this has an adverse effect on local Maori wellbeing. The importance of this view was illustrated in a dispute between the Waikato *iwi* authority and the thermal electricity generator, Genesis Power, which uses Waikato River waters at its power station in Huntly.

In 1999, Genesis Power applied for resource consent to further expand its use of the Waikato River in order to increase electricity production. In the resource consent application the company stated that it would be increasing the temperature of the river's waters in the vicinity of the Huntly power station from 25 degrees to 27 degrees Celsius. In response to their application, a number of interest groups associated with the river explained that this temperature increase would change the Waikato River's ecosystem dramatically, risking many of the river's plant and fish species and damaging the *mauri* of the river. Consequently, Waikato's *iwi* authority, who regard members of Waikato *iwi* to be *kaitiaki*<sup>9</sup> (guardians) with a responsibility to the river and other tribes of the river, took up a legal challenge through the Environment Court to stop Genesis Power's proposed development plans. After engaging the services of a law firm and presenting their case, the *iwi* authority successfully obtained an injunction to suspend Genesis Power's planned developments (Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust 1999–2000: 13). To some extent the choice as whether to litigate a dispute also depends upon on what other options may be available. Waikato *iwi* have a history of using other means to demonstrate their position, as well as resorting to the courts. The available options depend upon a number of matters such as the relevant legislation, financial resources and available expertise.

## THE RELEVANCE OF INALIENABILITY AND IMPARTIBILITY

Important questions spring to mind in this examination regarding ownership of rivers and whether the ownership of water is perceived to be different from ownership of land. When Maori tribal representatives signed the Treaty of Waitangi, the British colonial government assumed from common law that they had acquired exclusive control of the country's fresh water which flowed in the waterways and lakes. Gibbs explains:

The common law recognised rights of landowners to take and use water flowing over or under their land, which had not yet found its way to a waterway or lake, subject to certain restrictions. It also recognised limited rights of riparian landowners to take and use water flowing in waterways and lakes. Such water is not susceptible of ownership by anyone until it has been validly taken under these common law rights. (2007:14).

However, Maori argue that they have existing customary rights to water and that their rights have not been extinguished by either common law or statute. Wheen and Ruru contend that:

Maori have argued that the prejudicial loss of their rights to own and control bodies of water was caused by the common law. The Crown has generally argued that rights to possess the rivers were lost on the sale of land by consent, either because they were expressly included in the sales, or because the presumptions of English common law applied (2004:104).

Gibbs suggests that just because common law does not recognise 'ownership' in flowing water, it does not prevent Maori from claiming customary title, which may be similar to ownership (2007:15).

## TAONGA AND TUPUNA CLAIMS

Lands and resources which are regarded by Maori tribes as '*taonga*' are at the heart of many Treaty claims. This is because Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi guarantees Maori 'possession' of their *taonga* (Kawharu 2000:365). The Waitangi Tribunal's definition of *taonga* is a 'valued possession, or anything highly prized, and 'may include any material or non-material thing having cultural or spiritual significance for a given tribal group' (Wheen and Ruru 2004:100). Not surprisingly, there is a large body of literature on the concept of *taonga*,

some of which claims that *taonga* act as symbols of important relationships (see Tapsell 1997, 2000, 2006; Henare 2005). When Weiner wrote about *taonga*, she compared the concept to the kula system of exchange in Melanesia and exchanges of fine mats in Samoa (1992: 46). Weiner proposed that *taonga* are important things that cannot be alienated from earlier possessors. Her stance is similar to that of Thomas, who wrote about ‘objects which are entangled with human relationships of ‘reciprocal indebtedness’ (1994: 14). Weiner describes *taonga* not only as valuable Maori heirlooms which carry the identity of people and their pasts, but also as things that are imbued with the power and prestige of the people who possessed them. Therefore to gain another person’s *taonga* is to acquire their rank, name, and history (Weiner 1992: 64). She makes the point that:

Some things, like most commodities, are easy to give. But there are other possessions that are imbued with the intrinsic and ineffable identities of their owners which are not easy to give away. Ideally, these inalienable possessions are kept by their owners from one generation to the next within the closed context of family, descent group, or dynasty. The loss of such an inalienable possession diminishes the self and by extension, the group to which the person belongs (Weiner 1992: 6).

Weiner’s idea may be applied to Michael King’s description of the Waikato people and river where he proposes that Waikato Maori derive their identity from their enduring relationship with the Waikato River, he writes:

More than any others in New Zealand, the tribes of the Waikato Valley are a river people. Five centuries of continuous occupation of its banks have embedded the river deep into the group and individual consciousness (1984: 49).

The river being embedded in Waikato Maori identity is one of the reasons why Waikato Maori vigorously assert that they cannot be alienated from the Waikato River.

For Durie, the way *taonga* are valued varies according to particular methods of *tikanga* practised by different tribal groups (1998: 23). In view of this idea, it is possible to see why Maori argue that water (and bodies of water), which are perceived as *taonga*, cannot be parted from them (Gibbs 2007: 15). Yet, not all Maori use the Treaty of Waitangi’s representation of *taonga* to secure their rights in local lands and resources. Kawharu makes the point that:

[A]ccording to some oral traditions, lands, forests, fisheries, *marae* or sacred sites (*waahi tapu*) were not necessarily termed *taonga* (cf. *Waitangi Tribunal in PCE 1996: 54*). To do so would have made commonplace their status and said nothing about the particular qualities of each. Environmental resources were considered on their own merits and potential within a holistic scheme that is the universe. Thus land was referred to as *whenua* rather than *taonga*, sacred waters as *wai tapu* rather than *taonga* and so on (2000: 365).

It has already been noted that some Maori tribes perceive rivers to be *tupuna* like Kamira Haggie of Turangawaewae Marae, who in an interview for Te Papa Museum, said, 'the [Waikato] river is like a tupuna, an ancestor' (Personal Communication March 1997). However, in asserting that the Waikato River is a *tupuna* it does not mean that Waikato Maori do not also think that the river is a *taonga*. Waikato *iwi* represent their interest in the Waikato River by claiming that the river is their *Tupuna Awa*. The concept of *Tupuna Awa* shares many of the same understandings as the concept of *taonga*, that being that Waikato people cannot be alienated from their ancestor and the ancestor cannot be alienated from them.

On 29 July 1998 at the Environment Court hearing *Mahuta v Waikato Regional Council* (A91/98), the Court accepted evidence from Waikato tribal representatives that the 'Waikato-Tainui people have a special relationship with the Waikato River which is of fundamental importance to their social and cultural wellbeing'. Mrs Iti Rangihinemutu Rawiri of Te Awamarahi Marae expressed in her submission to the court: 'when people abuse the river it is the same as people abusing our mother or grandmother'. She continued, 'people must respect our river ancestor which must be put back to good health'. Also making a submission that day was Mr Te Motu-iti-o-rongomai Te Hoe Katipa of Turangawaewae Marae who stated that he recognised the Waikato River to be an ancestor with sacred functions. For the elder, 'the Waikato River was not only a canoe pathway to the tribe's ancestral burial ground at Taupiri Mountain but a 'guardian' which forewarned local Maori of potential threats and danger'.

However, when Joseph Te Rito of the Ngati Kahungunu and Rongomaiwahine tribes (located in the Mahia Peninsula region of the East Coast) was asked whether he recognised his local rivers to be *Tupuna Awa*, he replied:

To be quite honest, I haven't actively regarded it in that way and I'm not sure about the oldies. I haven't heard them on the marae saying things like 'Ko au te awa, ko te awa ko au' like I've heard Whanganui

people say. However, we are quite colonised now and if they [the elders of his tribes] refer to mountains as tipuna<sup>10</sup> then I'm sure they could refer to the awa as a tipuna—before we became too pakehified (Personal Communication May 2007).

Joseph Te Rito's comments suggest that when there is less dependency on rivers being part of a group's identity, they are perhaps not perceived as *tupuna*. I note rivers in the Mahia Peninsula area are not comparable to the Waikato River's size and abundance of resources.

In *Mahuta v Waikato Regional Council* the Environment Court accepted evidence that: 'the Waikato-Tainui people have a special relationship with the Waikato River which is of fundamental importance to their social and cultural wellbeing', and that, 'for Waikato-Tainui, the Waikato River means the whole river, including the banks, beds, waters, streams and tributaries, vegetation and fisheries, flood plains and metaphysical being' (A91/98, 29 July 1998). Of relevance to the representations of the river as a *Tupuna Awa* and river ancestor is Strathern's view which proposes that the partibility and impartibility of resources rests either with the object of the property claim or with the subjects making the claim (1999: 154). For many Maori, the idea of dividing the Waikato River into pieces is untenable because the river is a *tupuna* with great *mana*. It is a senior ancestor which cannot be controlled by people. Therefore, instead of dividing the river into pieces which would essentially alienate some tribes from the river, it is the rights to the river that must be shared out among tribes. When Strathern critiqued Sillitoe's (1998) work which examined the inalienability of possessions owned by New Guinea Highland men and women, she wrote:

That the rights at issue are those of disposal, and that this is a right that only one person at a time may hold, though the item in question (the rights to it) may pass serially between persons. One cannot own valuables exclusively (as 'private property'), but may enjoy custody of them for a while. He [Sillitoe] thus disputes the relevance of inalienability as a concept; people may cease to have rights in particular items while continuing to have rights in relation to the recipient by virtue of the transfer of those items (Strathern 1999: 153).

Healy (2009) also argued this view in a work which critiqued the concept of '*tuku whenua*'. *Tuku whenua* is defined as: 'granting a right to use land that does not alienate the land', and the 'Maori customary means of allocating land' (Healy 2009: 111). When the first British settlers arrived in New Zealand, *ran-*

*gatira* from various Northern *hapu* allocated lands to settlers so that they could make a life for themselves (Healy 2009: 113). Invariably the *rangatira* viewed the settlers as part of their local communities and recognised the rights of settlers to use and occupy land. However, the recognition of use and occupation rights did not mean that they intended to alienate their *hapu* from tribal lands that they allocated the settlers. Healy contributes to the understanding of *tuku whenua* by questioning whether *hapu* leaders, ‘readily grasped the European notion of sale’, and whether they would have ‘entered into transactions with the new settlers on the understanding that land alienations were intended’ (2009: 111).

To show how ownership operates in Maori society it is necessary to comprehend how Maori society is organised. The fundamental Maori principle of *tuakana-teina* not only organises relationships between people in Maori society but also organises the relationships between people and property.

#### TUAKANA-TEINA: A STRUCTURING PRINCIPLE OF MAORI OWNERSHIP

The *tuakana-teina* pairing is a social organisational structure used by Polynesian peoples of the Pacific. This section investigates how *tuakana-teina* frames Maori conceptions of ownership, possession, and belonging. My examination revolves around the role that *tuakana-teina* plays in identifying who has the capacity to own or be in charge of something and also how rights in resources which are sometimes understood and referred to as responsibilities and obligations are worked out between tribes.

Recognising that a person’s status is subtly embedded in language, is essential to the analysis of *tuakana-teina*. According to Biggs (1969), Maori language—like other Polynesian languages—is structured to differentiate the paired relationships of people and things. Valuable to this discussion is Biggs’s explanation of the Maori language possessive particles ‘o’ and ‘a’ which represent characteristics of being *tuakana* or senior and being *teina* or junior:

A and o always come at the beginning of a phrase. Both indicate possession, and both are translated by ‘of’, but their difference of form expresses a meaning distinction which is very important in Maori, a distinction which can be best expressed in the terms ‘dominance’ and ‘subordination’. Possession of anything towards which the possessor is dominant, active or superior, is expressed by a; possession of things in respect to which the possessor is subordinate, passive or inferior, is expressed by o (Biggs 1969: 43).

According to Biggs (1969), another characteristic which is helpful in assessing whether something belongs to the ‘o’ and ‘a’ categories is a general rule that non-portable things such as land, tools, rivers, canoes, and houses are distinguished by ‘o’, and portable things such as books, food, and domestic pets are distinguished by ‘a’. To paraphrase Biggs (1969), a person is active towards a book or in a dominant position with a book, in the sense that a book can be picked up and carried. However, Biggs (1969) points out that there are some exceptions to this rule with items of clothing which are portable being classified as ‘o’. This is because clothing protects people from the elements. Another exception is the status of domestic animals. While animals such as dogs, sheep, and cows are generally distinguished by ‘a’, horses are distinguished with ‘o’. This is because horses are considered to be a mode of transport. Maori differentiate water from food by classifying water as ‘o’ and food as ‘a’. The two lists below are of things that are marked by ‘o’ category possessive particles and ‘a’ category possessive particles:

#### ‘o’ Category Possessive Particles

*awa* (river), *whenua* (land), *Atua* (God), *ra* (sun), *taniwha* (water denizen), *ariki* (paramount chief), *rangatira* (chief), *kaumatua* (elder), *whare* (house).

#### ‘a’ Category Possessive Particles

*turu* (chair), *tepu* (table), *pepa* (paper), *mokopuna* (grandchildren), *tamariki* (children), *aporo* (apple), *huka* (sugar), *hei hei* (chicken).

Rivers in Maori language are classified with the possessive particle ‘o’, meaning that they are senior or unable to be controlled by human beings. The following sentences illustrate how Maori possession is expressed:

*Ko Waikato toku awa*

The Waikato is my river (I belong to the Waikato River)

*Ko Waikato toku tupuna*

The Waikato is my ancestor (I belong to the Waikato [River] ancestor)

The ‘o’ in the Maori word *toku* signifies that the *awa* and the *tupuna* have seniority or dominance over human beings. The Maori sentences above are translated into English to ‘the Waikato is my river’ and ‘the Waikato is my ancestor’; Maori speakers, however, suggest that more precise translations for the sentences are ‘I belong to the Waikato River’ and ‘I belong to the Waikato

ancestor'. Here *toku* translates in English to 'I' or 'my', where a person is junior or subordinate to the thing that is possessed. Thus, embedded cultural understandings represented in Maori language suggest that rivers and ancestors cannot be owned or controlled by human beings.

Carlson Wirihana, from Maungatautari Marae, is the Captain of *Rangatahi waka* (canoe). *Rangatahi* is part of Waikato *iwi*'s ceremonial canoe fleet. An appreciation of the 'o' possessive rule helps to elucidate his discussion of the Waikato River:

Now we have never maintained that we own the river. As far as we are concerned the river owns us (Fieldwork Interview March 2006).

As a means of contrast, the sentences below demonstrate how the possessive particle 'a' indicates that some things are junior to human beings and that they can be owned and controlled by people. The 'a' in the Maori word *taku*, meaning 'I' or 'my', signifies that the *pukapuka* (book) is junior or in a subordinate position to the human being:

*Ko tenei taku pukapuka*  
This is my book (This book belongs to me)

In a more recent article on Maori possessives, Bauer (1997) argues that 'o' is not well suited to the label 'subordinate', which suggests that the possessor is subordinate to the possessee. For Bauer:

The o relationship is one where the possessor does not dominate or control the possessee, but is not necessarily controlled by the possessee, either. If the distinction is thus characterised as between dominant and non-dominant (from the possessor's point of view) it reflects much better the fact that the a and the o categories are not equal in the system (1997:391).

Bauer also made the point that 'o' is used for relations between equals such as husbands and wives, and brothers and sisters, where neither dominates—or is dominated by—the other.

Though Biggs' (1969) and Bauer's (1997) explanations differ, they were fully aware that possession and relationships between things in Maori society are subtly conveyed through grammar.



THE ETHNOGRAPHIC EVIDENCE OF TUAKANA-TEINA

I will now examine how understandings of 'a' and 'o' underpin the principle of *tuakana* and *teina*. 'A' is comparable to the junior status of *teina*, and 'o' is comparable to the senior status of *tuakana*. Hukiterangi Muru of Turanga-waewae Marae provides an interesting analogy for the possessive particles and *tuakana* and *teina*:

The 'a' and *teina* can be compared to the terrestrial realm which includes all the things that people use. The 'o' and *tuakana* can be compared to a celestial realm which includes things that are spiritual, chiefly and sacred (Fieldwork Interview May 2009).

In social situations there is an expectation that people know their place and behave appropriately in relation to others. People who are regarded as *teina* are expected to show respectful behaviour and uphold their *tuakana*. Correspondingly, *tuakana* are obliged to participate in the lives of *teina* and give advice and encouragement. The following examples illustrate the complexity of *tuakana-teina* relationships. A woman in her mid-sixties from Turanga-waewae Marae provided some insight into *tuakana-teina* relationships, when she described a discussion with her cousin who had two older sisters and two younger sisters (names have been changed to protect the identity of the informants):

I can't believe Mere sometimes, she got up in the meeting and referred to Rangī and Lovey as her *teinas*. You don't call your sixty year old sisters *teinas* when you're in a room full of *rangatahi* (youth). She's not even a *tuakana*, she's a *teina* to Pare and Mata. It's bad manners to say people are your *teina*. You don't do that it's belittling. She was speaking in English she could have said Rangī and Lovey were her sisters, we know they're her younger sisters (Fieldwork Interview May 2006).

Hukiterangi Muru provided this explanation of *tuakana-teina*: 'At birth the oldest child receives the *mana* and the *tapu*. Sometimes a younger sibling can achieve or take the *mana* from the *tuakana* but they can never take the *tapu*. The *tapu* always remains with the eldest' (Fieldwork Interview June 2007).

In this interview the informant is using the word *mana* to mean, 'the standing and authority of the first born child', and the word *tapu* to mean, 'sacredness of the first born child'. When questioned whether a person's gender could in-

fluence this understanding, he explained that this was a bit of a grey area, but that he knew of women from his *marae* who were recognised as the *tuakana* and the head of their families with the *mana* and the *tapu*, even though they had younger brothers. He clarified his comment by saying: ‘It really depends on the person, the family and the situation it’s the way Maori society operates. These things are not set in stone’ (Fieldwork Interview June 2007).

Possessive particles do not indicate the gender of the river. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Tainui scholars Maharaia Winiata and Robert Mahuta wrote works which assigned the Waikato River female characteristics. Winiata (1967: 64) wrote: ‘the Waikato River was the mother of the tribes’, and Mahuta (1975: 6) claimed: ‘the Waikato is much more than just a river. To the tribes who derive their name from it, it is an ancestor “the mother of the tribes”’.

When Moko Tini, a young woman from Turangawaewae Marae, was asked if the Waikato River was gendered, she responded: ‘I understand the river as a female because that’s the way my father always spoke about it, you know like the river was our protector feeding us, yeh definitely a woman’ (Personal Communication October 2006).

Yet discussions with elders from Turangawaewae Marae, reveal that not all Waikato River Maori share ideas of female gendering for the river. The female elder Ngahinaturae Te Uira commented: ‘I don’t think about the awa having a gender, I haven’t heard anyone say it’s a female or a male. The awa is our *tupuna*, our ancestor, that’s how I understand it’ (Fieldwork Interview October 2006).

*Tuakana-teina* relationships also exist between tribal groups. An influential tribe of the upper reaches of the Waikato River is Ngati Tuwharetoa. This tribe has commercial assets in the Taupo region. Since the signing of the Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims Settlement Act in 1995, Waikato *iwi* have also become business competitors in the Waikato region. Because of the tribes’ assets, some Maori recognise Ngati Tuwharetoa and Waikato as *tuakana* tribes. Another reason that these tribes are considered *tuakana* to some of the other tribes along the Waikato River, is because both have paramount chiefs who are recognised as important Maori leaders by the State. The principle of *tuakana-teina* is useful for interpreting the following comment by a Waikato tribal member:

Well the ariki [of the Kingitanga] were the owners of the river as far as the people were concerned, and there could only be one ariki at a time. The *mana* sort of went down to the next one you know

because this mana comes from all the chiefs of Aotearoa. The mana of the mountains and the rivers, they [the chiefs] gave the mana. Maybe some didn't give very willingly but it was they [the chiefs] that decided to give the King certain powers (Fieldwork Interview January 2004).

Here the word *mana* means 'authority' and 'rights', and the word 'chief' means *rangatira*. In Maori society *ariki* are recognised as the most senior members of a tribe. Like *rangatira*, *ariki* have the responsibilities of safeguarding their tribe's rights in particular resources and bringing people together so that decisions can be made. Consequently, the type of ownership that the informant is describing is not a property right where an *ariki* benefits individually. The responsibility of Waikato as a 'senior iwi', was expressed by Ngahinaturae Te Uira when she talked about Waikato iwi's Treaty of Waitangi claim for the whole length of the Waikato River: 'We need to get the tupuna back first and then we can talk with the other tribes about what to do. Waikato [iwi] has an obligation to lead' (Fieldwork Interview October 2005).

This discussion illustrates that Maori social identities are primarily determined by their genealogical relationships with one another rather than property they own and control.

## CONCLUSION

Before the arrival of British settlers, Maori had a different concept of ownership bound up in the concept of *mana* and the authority and status of their *rangatira*. Rights to lands and resources were never fixed but constantly disputed. However, in recent times when Maori use the courts and claims process to fix tribal boundaries and rights, it must be asked whether Maori are abandoning their traditional understandings of ownership which encompass the concepts of *mana*, *rangatira* and *rangatiratanga*. This article has argued that the possessive particles of 'o' and 'a', and the fundamental principle of *tuakana-teina* underpin the way that Maori think about owning, possession and belonging. They have also traditionally underpinned the reciprocal obligations that exist between individuals and groups within Maori society.

While there are some Waikato River Maori who would like to legally own the Waikato River, including its bed and water, others feel that co-management rights and recognised *kaitiaki* status serve local Maori purposes well enough. Additionally, some Waikato River Maori are adamant that the Waikato River cannot be owned because it is a *tupuna* or ancestor, while other Maori believe

that the ownership and management of the Waikato River is best vested with the State. While it is difficult to reconcile these contradictory views, acknowledging that a range of opinions exists goes a long way in helping to understand some of the problems associated with Maori conceptions of ownership. The key point is that Maori claim ‘rights’ (which may also be interpreted as responsibilities and obligations) to exercise authority over the river and in the twenty-first century they are forced to make sense of English common law and their own *tikanga* understandings of ownership. Whatever the different conceptions of ownership—be it possessive individualism, collective ownership, shared rights in property, or variable ownership—another way of interpreting this debate, is that it is more to do with claims to status and power. Claims to ownership are important not least because they also provide a vehicle for legitimising status within and between competing groups.

## NOTES

- 1 See Stafford (1987) and Jones and Biggs (1995) for more on this.
- 2 See Tilley for evidence of this (1999:9).
- 3 Hopuhopu land was returned to Waikato Maori in the Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims Settlement Act 1995. Robert Mahuta and the Tainui Maori Trust Board established the tribe’s parliament building called Te Kauhanganui and the Tainui Endowed College on the land.
- 4 The Tainui Endowed College was intended to be a postgraduate research centre.
- 5 See, for example, Bidois, V. ‘Mahuta deal axed as tribe seeks cash sale’ *New Zealand Herald* (14 August, 2000); Yandall, P. ‘Tribal council accused of blunders’ *New Zealand Herald* (31 July 2000); Taylor, K. ‘Tainui braces for \$24m claim after court loss’ *New Zealand Herald* (23 December 2000); ‘Tainui seeks strategy to satisfy bank’ *New Zealand Herald* (3 March 2001).
- 6 Waikato tribal members referred to Robert Mahuta using one of three names. Generally speaking the elders of the tribe called him Robert, the people he worked with called him Bob, and his family and close friends called him Bubs or Bubba.
- 7 These sentences obtained from the *Ngata English-Maori Dictionary* have been modified to suit the Waikato dialect of Maori language.

- 8 Waahi Whaanui Trust provides services and programmes for individuals and families in Huntly and the surrounding districts. Programmes include social, education, employment, training and health services.
- 9 Kawharu defines kaitiakitanga not only as guardianship but resource management too (2000: 349).
- 10 *Tipuna* is the East Coast Maori version of the word *tupuna*.

#### REFERENCES

- Ballara, A., 1998 *Iwi: The Dynamics of Maori Tribal Organisation from c. 1769 to c. 1945*, Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Bauer, W., 1997 *The Reed Reference Grammar of Maori*, Auckland: Reed Books.
- Bidois, V., 2000 Mahuta deal axed as tribe seeks cash sale. *New Zealand Herald*, 14 August.
- Biggs, B., 1990 [1969] *Let's Learn Maori: A Guide to the Study of the Maori Language*, Auckland: Uniprint.
- Blackstone, W., 1978 *The Commentaries on the Laws of England*, New York: Garland Publishers.
- Diamond, P., 2003 *A Fire in Your Belly: Maori Leaders Speak*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.
- Durie, M. H., 1998 *Te Mana Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Maori Self Determination*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Firth, R., 1929 *The Economics of the New Zealand Maori*, London: Government Printer.
- Gibbs, M., 2007 'Maori Claims to Ownership of Freshwater', *Resource Management Journal* August 2007: 13–18.
- Goody, J., 1998 'Dowry and the Rights of Women to Property', in C.M. Hann (ed) *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 201–213.

- Haggie, K., 1997 *Turangawaewae Regatta video recorded interview with Kamira Haggie [Showing at Te Papa Museum-Wellington]* (Personal Communication March 1997).
- Hann, C.M., 1998 *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hann, C.M., 1998 'Introduction: The Embeddedness of Property as a Social Institution', in C.M. Hann (ed) *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press: 1–47.
- Healy, S., 2009 'Tuku Whenua as Customary Land Allocation: Contemporary Fabrication or Historical Fact', *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 118 (2): 111–134.
- Henare, A., 2005 *Museums, Anthropology and Imperial Exchange*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, P., and Biggs, B., 1995 *Nga Iwi o Tainui: The Traditional History of the Tainui People*, Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Kawharu, M., 2000 'Kaitiakitanga: A Maori Anthropological Perspective of the Maori Socio-Environmental Ethic of Resource Management', *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 110 (4): 349–70.
- King, M., 1984 [1977] *Te Puea: A Life*, Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Macfarlane, A., 1998 'The Mystery of Property: Inheritance and Industrialization in England and Japan', in C.M. Hann (ed) *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 104–123.
- Macfarlane, A., 1978 *The Origins of English Individualism: The Family, Property and Social Transition*, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Maine, H., 1866 *Ancient Law: Its Connection with the Early History of Society and its Relation to Modern Ideas*, London: J Murray.
- Mead, S., 2003 *Tikanga Maori: Living by Maori Values*, Wellington: Huia Publishers.

- Metge, J., 1995 *The Whaanau in Modern Society*, Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Metge, J., 1991 Evidence of Alice Joan Metge in Respect of Wharo Te Oneroa a Tohe. Report on 35 Years Research. Submitted to the Waitangi Tribunal.
- Metge, J., 2009 *Discussion of tikanga* [Meeting] (Personal Communication, July 2009).
- Ministry for Environment, 2005. *Water Meeting for Action*. [Online], Available at: <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/issues/water/prog-action/meetings/hamilton/hui.html> [Accessed 2 December 2009].
- Ngata, H.M., 1993 *English-Maori Dictionary*, Wellington: Learning Media Limited.
- Norman, W., 1996 'The Muriwhenua Claim', in Hugh Kawharu (ed) *Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*, New York: Oxford University Press, pp 180–210.
- Salmond, A., 1991 [1988] 'Tipuna Ancestors: Aspects of Maori Cognitive Descent' in A. Pawley (ed) *Man and a Half: Essays in Pacific Anthropology and Ethnobiology in Honour of Ralph Bulmer*, Auckland: Polynesian Society, pp 343–56.
- Shore, C., and Wright S., 1997 'Policy: A New Field of Anthropology', in Cris Shore and Susan Wright (eds) *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*, New York: Routledge, pp 2–39.
- Sillitoe, P., 1998 'The Development of Indigenous Knowledge: A New. Applied Anthropology', *Current Anthropology* 39 (2): 223–252.
- Stafford, D., 1967 *Te Arawa: A History of the Arawa People*, Wellington: Auckland: Reed.
- Stokes, E., 1994 *Rotokawa Geothermal Area: Some Historical Perspectives*, Hamilton: Department of Geography University of Waikato.
- Stokes, E., 1997 Ko Waikato Te Awa: the Waikato River, in E. Stokes and M. Begg (eds) *Te Hononga ki te Whenua: Belonging to the Land People and Places in the Waikato Region* Stokes, Hamilton: Waikato Branch NZGS Society, pp 36–51.

- Strang, V., 2008 'Fluid Forms: Owning Water in Australia.' December 2008 [Conference Paper for Ownership and Appropriation Conference 8<sup>th</sup>–12<sup>th</sup> December 2008] Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Strathern, M., 1999 *Property, Substance and Effect: Anthropological Essays on Persons and Things*, London and New Brunswick: The Athlone Press.
- Tapsell, P., 2006 *Ko Tawa Maori Treasures of New Zealand*, Auckland: David Bateman Ltd.
- Tapsell, P., 2000 *Pukaki: A Comet Returns*, Auckland: Reed Books.
- Tapsell, P., 1997 'The Flight of Pareraututu: An Investigation of Taonga from a Tribal Perspective', *Journal of Polynesian Society* 106 (4): 323–374.
- Taylor, K., 2000 Tainui braces for \$24m claim after court loss. *New Zealand Herald*, 23 December.
- Taylor, K., 2001 Tainui seeks strategy to satisfy bank. *New Zealand Herald*, 3 March.
- Te Rito, J., 2007 *Discussion on local understandings of rivers* [Informal discussion] (Personal Communication, May 2007).
- Thomas, N., 1994 *Entangled Objects: Exchange, Material Culture, and Colonialism in the Pacific*, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Tilley, C., 1999 *Metaphor and Material Culture*, Oxford, Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Tomas, N., and Quince K., 1999 'Maori Disputes and their Resolution', in P. Spiller (ed) *Dispute Resolution in New Zealand*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 205–234.
- Verdery, K., and Humphrey C., 2004 *Property in Question: Value Transformation in the Global Economy*. Oxford and New York: Berg Publishers.
- Wagoner, P., 1998 'An Unsettled Frontier, Blood and US Federal Policy', in C.M. Hann (ed) *Property Relations: Renewing the Anthropological Tradition*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 105–125.



- Waldron, J., 1988 *The Right to Private Property*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust, 1999–2000 *Te Hookioi: The Newsletter of Waikato Tainui*. December 1999-January 2000 ed. [Leaflet] Hopuhopu: Waikato Raupatu Lands Trust.
- Waikato-Tainui Raupatu Claims Settlement Act 1995 (NZ).
- Weiner, A., 1992 *Inalienable Possessions: The Paradox of Keeping-While-Giving*, Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press.
- Wheen, N., and Ruru J., 2004 'The Environmental Reports', in J., Hayward and N., Wheen (eds) *The Waitangi Tribunal*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books, pp 97–112.
- Williams, H., 1985 [1844] *The Dictionary of the Maori Language*, Wellington: Government Printing Office.
- Winiata, M., 1967 *The Changing Role of the Maori Leader in Maori Society*, Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul.
- Yandell, P., 2000 Tribal council accused of blunders. *New Zealand Herald*, 31 July.