

KIWI, KERERU, AND KAPU:  
THE CULTURE OF COMMUNITY CONSERVATION IN RURAL NEW ZEALAND  
-WITH A COMPARISON TO HAWAII

A Thesis by

Matthew S. Harms

Bachelor of Arts, Arizona State University, 2004

Submitted to the Department of Anthropology  
and the faculty of the Graduate School of  
Wichita State University  
as partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts

May 2008

© Copyright 2008 by Matthew S. Harms

All Rights Reserved

KIWI, KERERU, AND KAPU:  
THE CULTURE OF COMMUNITY CONSERVATION IN RURAL NEW ZEALAND  
-WITH A COMPARISON TO HAWAII

The following faculty have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content, and recommended that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts with a major in Anthropology

---

Dorothy Billings, Committee Chair

---

Robert Lawless, Committee Member

---

Karen Brown, Committee Member

## DEDICATION

To my wife and children, who have been there for me....  
and always will be

Kī mai ki ahau, He aha te mea nui, Māku e kī atu, He tangata, he tangata, he tangata!  
Ask me the question: What is it that is important? And I shall respond: It is humanity, humanity,  
humanity!

- Northland Maori poem

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are many people who have contributed to this research and thesis in myriad ways for whom I owe a debt of gratitude. I should like to thank my graduate advisor, committee chairman, professor and friend Dorothy Billings for her encouragement, advisement, and tutelage. Her willingness to divulge wisdom from her years of experience within anthropology has profoundly deepened and broadened my own experiences. I am most grateful for a thesis committee who with interest and patience, provided advisement and direction- Robert Lawless who with wit, provided clarity and advice; Karen Brown who provided support, expertise and a healthy dose of enthusiasm; and in particular, Jacqueline Snyder whose encouragement and devotion to learning, living and picking a good fight, led myself and many others to experience New Zealand culture.

There are many individuals who have directly aided this research, for whom I must acknowledge and thank out of respect and gratitude; Doug Farr, whom I consider a friend, kindly and deftly acted as informant and guide for me while in New Zealand society; the many individuals of the Maungatautari community and trust, who provided information and access most graciously to a neophyte such as myself; the many individuals whom I know and came to meet in Hawai`i, who aided my research with their time, talents and knowledge.

No less helpful, and more than deserving of praise, I owe many thanks to various family members; James and Kathy Claridge provided hospitality and aloha in allowing me to stay with them while in Hawai`i; Lorin and Shanie Harms provided assistance and guidance in untold ways, many years over; Shannon, Charles and Lori Harms collectively and with devotion and endurance cared for all that is most valuable for me while away doing research. Especially, I owe

a thank you beyond measure to my wife, Amanda Harms, and my children, whose sacrifice, patience, help, and undying support propel me forward in all my efforts. Not far from family, I owe many thanks to my family away from home- the many professors, staff members and fellow students who comprise the anthropology department of Wichita State University for having contributed in myriad ways that ultimately have enriched this work. I am also grateful for the staff of the Wichita State University Library, for efforts that have sustained and made possible many aspects of this research. A final thank you and expression of gratitude is deserving of those who have, for the love of learning, provided means to support anthropological research. I therefore thank and acknowledge Nancy and Dick Berner and the administrator of the C.W.M. Hart student research fund for their financial support of this research.

I am grateful as well for the input and advice rendered that has influenced my own thoughts on the subject. However, I remain solely responsible for the information contained herein and for any errors that may have, despite my best efforts, found their way into the text.

## ABSTRACT

The Māori and Pākehā (non-Māori New Zealander-European descent) bicultural society in a rural community around Mount Maungatautari, New Zealand, seems to have overcome some significant culturally-embedded differences as exhibited in collaboration on a large-scale and complex conservation project that is community-based and driven, with minimal government control and funding. The emergence of this and other such community-initiated projects in New Zealand invites an examination to determine the socio-cultural factors associated with the emergence of such projects. A comparison of Hawaii's state of community conservation is felt to highlight those key factors.

Through the comparison, Polynesian and Western cultural-historical factors emerge as part of a suite of socio-cultural factors contributing to the New Zealand community's cross-cultural communication and collaboration. Maori-Polynesian culture and values influence the present stage of collaboration with the elements of valuing differences, the maintenance of strong ties to land through tribal organization, tribal land recognition, ever-stronger culture and identity transmission, and a willingness to apply their own notion of *tapu* (sacred restriction or removal from the sphere of the profane) to suspend other cherished cultural traditions, allowing the regeneration of species in conjunction with community conservation. Pākehā culture in this project is derived from the re-visioning of New Zealand as a nation intended to be a bicultural society by both group's ancestors in the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi and contemporary Waitangi tribunals, the cultivation of a "kiwi" identity that expresses multiple-generational ties and affection to land, and an increasing valuation of local biota and indigenous *tikanga* (ways of doing things) through local and international cross-cultural and environmental discourse.



## PREFACE

Though there have been many background factors that undoubtedly influenced the production of this research, the primary and formative one remains a class conducted in New Zealand. Having previously lived in Hawai`i, my interests have long resided with Polynesian peoples and their culture. Before attending Wichita State University, I became aware that some faculty members maintain a focus on Oceania. I also identified the aforementioned class as one to attend, even before setting foot on university grounds. The class in question, led by Jacqueline Snyder, focused on New Zealand's culture and environment, convening in New Zealand. It facilitated a seminal taste of ethnographic field work and an exposure to various socio-cultural situations there, including emphasis on the environment and bicultural relations, and the interplay of the two in local conservation efforts.

My interest in Polynesia predated my own experience of living in Hawai`i. However, living there only developed this interest further. Life in Hawai`i affords many opportunities to encounter other ethnic-cultural groups and experiences. I enjoyed many aspects of the multi-cultural society while there as a missionary for two years, from learning to eat quite a number of different ethnic foods, to speaking a few phrases of various languages and adjusting my own actions and thoughts to better interact within their society. I also came to see some of the tensions that exist between various cultural groups within the society, despite some shared socio-cultural elements. These tensions ranged over a spectrum of issues, and I identified some especially charged debates centering on issues of land, native self-determination, indigenous rights and political influence, and control over land, sea and socio-cultural resources. Access to areas, sacred sites, or traditional areas of resources for cultural needs, is not always easy now for

those whose ancestors accessed with impunity. Some expressed resentment of Western culture and lifestyle for the effects they deemed deleterious to land, ocean, and indigenous culture. Differences between conceptions of land, sky, and earth- even life, percolated to the top of many discussions regarding Polynesian and Western cultures. These observations have remained with me, informing experiences in New Zealand and subsequent questioning.

While in Aotearoa/ New Zealand our group visited a few community conservation projects. Some projects were modest while others were astounding; yet in common, they all seemingly incorporated various socio-cultural groups in the decision making and work processes undertaken. Later, in the course of writing a paper for the class, questions about the human element of the project arose; questions for which I had only partial answers. These questions sparked new lines of questioning. Had culturally-based value and belief differences, connected to multicultural tension, surfaced in such projects? If so, what commonality or shared cultural links were and are in place to permit any degree of collaboration? Many of these projects can be deemed successful because the work has moved forward quite admirably. Progress was made because it appears hard decisions were made. Hard decisions it seems were made because either a few individuals were positioned to ultimately make decisions by disregarding competing cultural inputs, or various parties both valued and reached past divisive differences, ultimately collaborating based on elements of commonality and valuation of each other's cultural differences and input.

For the Maungatautari Ecological Island Trust (MEIT) and project, formed in 2002, it seems to be the latter. The trust board bylaws stipulate an equal share of Māori and Pākehā trustees on the board. Moreover the board receives input from an all-Māori cultural-advisory

sub-committee. The planning and actions taken there seem to include the community and all its cultural elements. Additionally, the project relatively quickly gathered funding, constructed plans, mustered volunteers and participants, involved all interested parties, and carried out the work. It seems the community did fashion an effective bicultural collaboration. Back in Kansas, it seemed quite achievable that an at-a-distance investigation into the cultural background of the community and project could reveal the socio-cultural factors at work.

Anthropological curiosity and other lines of reasoning have driven me to investigate the culture behind this style of conservation. Anthropologically, the project and community is interesting in itself, in the prospect that a bicultural community effectively surmounted cross-cultural challenges. On another level, the research into the situation seems important. In the interest of maintaining biodiversity worldwide, communities are uniquely positioned to take an ever-growing prominence in the conservation work to be done. A community in close proximity to a project site affords cheap labor costs with the help of vested individuals who in many cases are quite familiar with the local problems and challenges to be undertaken. Also if such communities possess indigenous peoples, and others who over time have gained familiarity with the area, the project has a built-in knowledge base. Yet, if community conservation projects are to succeed, then a community must first foster collaborative and inclusive discussion, decision-making, planning, and work that reaches shared cultural values, effectively navigating through cultural and value-based differences. What then is the culture of communities that have succeeded? What cultural factors are at play within these socio-cultural groups that enables such collaboration?

Put in another perspective, the answers to such questions take on additional relevancy. Amid the environmental concerns facing the global environment and thus the human career that depends on it, we cannot, nor should we expect, governments to handle all the challenges. Communities ultimately are in a unique position to take on local conservation problems and develop new original projects. When elemental factors and practices associated with successful community cross-cultural communication and projects can be discerned from inter-community comparatives, then perhaps more communities can be made aware of such factors and strategies and ultimately become better equipped to achieve their own conservation and cross-cultural communication goals.

The work on this research in truth began in New Zealand first and in Hawai'i thereafter; thus the thesis follows suit, discussing each in turn. Chapter one, an introduction, sets the stage by providing information about the project, the need for the research and the line of questioning that brought about this thesis. Chapters two and three respectively, discuss the informing theoretical/research traditions and the research methods utilized. Chapter four examines the Maungatautari community project from the perspective of the socio-cultural conditions surrounding the community-based project, its emergence, management, and connection to assisting entities. The fifth chapter discusses the ultimate and proximate factors within Maori Polynesian and New Zealand society and culture, and the events that have brought about the socio-cultural conditions and that enable contemporary conservation efforts. The New Zealand data is the sum of coursework-oriented study tour in New Zealand, subsequent communication with individuals and organizations there, and library research.

Chapter six examines the general and present state of community conservation in Hawai`i. The initial goal of this side of the research was to identify a community-initiated terrestrial project similar to Maungatautari and compare the socio-cultural factors behind them. However, efforts failed to locate such a project, finding instead that most community-initiated projects were marine focused and of a smaller scale. Thus, the discussion turns to the general state of conservation in Hawai`i and community involvement therein. Following this exposition, chapter seven discusses the ultimate and proximate socio-cultural factors within Hawaiian Polynesian culture, past to the present, that are seen to be influencing the present socio-cultural condition and thereby Hawai`i's state of conservation. The Hawaiian data is derived primarily from investigations through library research, brief field work in Hawai`i, and subsequent communication with individuals and organizations.

Following these data chapters, chapter eight analyzes the data primarily through a comparative analysis and in consultation with various relevant theoretical bodies of thought. The current state of community-led and sustained conservation in New Zealand and Hawai`i is evaluated to draw out and highlight both similarities and differences. Following this, the cultural-historical factors are likewise compared and contrasted to highlight the more relevant socio-cultural factors behind the present form of community conservation attendant to New Zealand and in relation to the community and district surrounding Maungatautari. The conclusion, chapter nine, summarizes the analyses, draws out conclusions and practical applications, and discusses opportunities for further research.

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

DLNR	Department of Land and Natural Resources, State of Hawai`i
DOC	Department of Conservation, New Zealand
MEIT	Maungatautari Ecological Island Trust
MHA	Molokai Hunters Association
NAAEE	North American Association for Environmental Education
NARS	Natural Area Reserve System, State of Hawai`i
OHA	Office of Hawaiian Affairs, State of Hawai`i
TNC	The Nature Conservancy

## CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Maungatautari- National Interest and Discourse	1
	The Questions Anthropology Asks	3
	Comparison- Why New Zealand and Hawai`i	4
II.	RELEVANT THEORY AND RESEARCH	7
	The Value in Comparison	7
	Biodiversity Loss and Indigent Community Involvement	7
	Cross-Cultural Communication	8
	Indigenous Knowledge Valued	9
	Cross-Cultural Bridging	10
	Anthropology in Conservation	11
III.	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	13
	Fieldwork	13
	Library Research	15
IV.	MOTION ON THE MOUNTAIN- MAUNGATAUTARI	16
	The Community Project and Problem	16
	Preservationism, Cultural Use and Cross-cultural Navigation	20
	Maungatautari- A Brief History	22
	Project Maungatautari- The Nascence	26
	Concerted Emergence	26
	Wider Community Engagement	27
	Identified Core Factors in New Zealand	28
V.	NEW ZEALAND’S PAST MADE PRESENT	31
	Māori Social Organization	32
	Māori Worldview, Cultural Values and Beliefs	34
	The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi and Biculturalism	36
	Waitangi Tribunal and a Kiwi Identity Re-envisioned	39
	Pākehā Identity and Cultural Values	41

## CONTENTS (continued)

Chapter		Page
VI.	A SAMPLE OF CONSERVATION IN HAWAI'I	43
	High-Level Conservation- Terrestrial Predominance	44
	Grass-Roots Conservation- Challenges in Marginalization and Progress	45
	Community Involvement: Its Expressions and Challenges	45
	Native Enumeration- Leadership, Land, and Links of Lineality	50
	Identified Core factors in Hawai'i	56
VII.	HAWAI'I'S PAST MADE PRESENT	58
	Hawaiian Kinship, Social Organization and Land	58
	Hawaiian Worldview, Cultural Values and Beliefs	61
	Culture Collision, Culture Loss	62
	Sovereignty to Statehood- Implications of Imperialism	63
VIII.	DISCUSSION	65
	Māori and Hawaiian Links to Land	65
	Cultural Beliefs and Values	68
	Entre into a Western World	71
	Ultimate and Proximate Factors	74
IX.	CONCLUSION	80
	A Culture of Biculturalism	80
	Practical Implications	83
	Future Research Opportunities	84
	REFERENCES	85



# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### **Maungatautari- National Interest and Discourse**

In a New Zealand Herald news release dated 15 August 2007, mention is made of a recent storm that passed over the Waikato area south of Auckland, on the north island of New Zealand. The article indicates that a few tree branches fell onto a fence located on a mountain called Maungatautari, allowing a rat to likely climb over the fence by means of a branch. The fence, being fitted with a monitoring system, was quickly repaired and efforts were initiated that resulted in the quick elimination of the intruder. Normally, such a story would not be considered newsworthy. What after all is newsworthy or interesting about an average storm, a few downed branches or a rat getting over a fence?

The event made the news in this instance for several reasons. The fence in question is designed to prevent access of non-indigenous mammalian pests, such as rats, stoats (weasels), cats, and possums, as part of a reserve established to save and increase native plants and animals within. Such mammalian pests have been eradicated from the mountain within the fence, creating an ecological island, through the course of several years' concerted efforts primarily on the part the local community and district. Native biodiversity has increased in the absence of these pests and yet remains acutely susceptible to further incursions. Historically, such pests have been a major component of New Zealand's native biotic losses and an instigator of cultural change (Craig et al. 2000:61; Young 2004:41,58). Thus, ardent efforts are made at preventing any possible intrusion of even one rat or any mammalian pest back into the reserve.

In another vein, the event was newsworthy for it highlighted both the precariousness of the reserve, the challenges facing the reserve's management, and the success exhibited by the project at many levels. Through the incident and attendant research, it came to be understood that predators stalk the fence opportunistically for access. Despite the technological prowess of the fence in normally preventing incursions, and having sections with an electronic system to indicate when downed limbs touch it, the fence cannot fix itself; management must proactively monitor the fence and react quickly and decisively to repair the enclosure and eliminate any pest who may have entered the reserve in the interim. Funding, resources, and planning must all be in place, and effectively managed to maintain the enclosure, promote biota restorative practices, and ensure the reserve's goals are being pursued and met. Lastly, and no less importantly, the ecological island itself seems to be the largest and most audacious reserve of its kind to be implemented on the main islands of New Zealand.

For these reasons the event takes on much larger implications for the whole of New Zealand. In a way, it addresses some of the underlying questions confronting those New Zealanders concerned generally with environmentalism, and specifically with biodiversity loss and conservation. What efforts can individuals make? Can a community effectively help in the cause or should they leave it to governments? Can ecological islands succeed in restoring species back to native habitats on the severely compromised main islands? What species can be expected to survive when returned to native habitats on the main islands? What conditions are necessary for such reintroductions? What are the challenges and risks associated with such projects? How are successful projects of this size and nature formed, implemented, maintained, and managed? When such projects involve Māori land and cultural resources, or Pākehā land and cultural resources or a mixture of both, how are such engagements to be negotiated or

navigated? In decision making venues, how is discussion between socio-cultural groups to be moderated and engaged? Who ultimately has authority over decisions? Who has a say or who does not? When culturally embedded differences surface, how are they approached and resolved to enable movement forward on such projects? The story, challenges, successes and future of Maungatautari speak to these questions, providing an example in its own life history and future.

### **The Questions Anthropology Asks**

Anthropologically, the project holds much information that can address many culturally-oriented questions. If the project is considered successful, then what socio-cultural factors or conditions were elemental to this success? Considering the project emanated from a community and district, how did it start and what is the relationship between the project and the community's residents? Being that the successful establishment and implementation of a large ecological reserve is a considerable undertaking even for established governments and international organizations, how did this rural community accomplish it? Moreover, when it is understood that the community and district, much like the rest of New Zealand, is culturally heterogeneous or bi- or multi-cultural, being comprised of indigenous Polynesians -the Māori, and Pākehā (non-Māori New Zealanders, usually of European descent), the question emerges: how have they been able to surmount the tensions and problems not only inherent in complex projects, but especially those associated with post-colonial, bi-cultural societies (Orlove and Brush 1996:338)?

What socio-cultural factors then are present in the culture of this community that sustains and aids Māori and Pākehā collaborative efforts in the project? From an anthropological standpoint, the research herein intends to ascertain and document those cultural characteristics at

work in this community/district that both engender and maintain a type of cross-cultural communication and collaboration that finds and builds from some common ground between the culturally heterogeneous groups of New Zealand's Māori and Pākehā citizenry. Indeed, what are the factors of commonality between them? What shared events, and or discourse informs, guides, and sustains decision-making processes among the cross-cultural groups connected to the project? How are differences negotiated productively to satisfy all parties involved and move forward pertinent action? In other words when planning, implementation or other action involving the project is conducted how are one group's culturally-based construals, beliefs, expectations and ideas negotiated with differing ones from another group? Being that individual and group beliefs, ideas, construals, and even expectations, are expressed through a cultural filter, the culture of various groups engaged in such efforts becomes of primary concern. Moreover, the kinship and socio-political structure of each cultural group, also affects the situation, and serves as a cultural vehicle and boundary marker. The success had in the case of Maungatautari and its community then is very much a factor of the ability of the community's socio-cultural groups to come together culturally and to both hold meaningful dialogue and enact mutually-laid plans. What then is the culture of this community's conservation effort?

### **Comparison- Why New Zealand and Hawai`i**

In contemplating an appropriate method of investigating the cultural of community conservation of the Maungatautari community, and under the constraints of limited fieldwork, a comparative and historical study seems appropriate. Many previous works of comparative examinations exist within anthropology, and within a new ecological/environmental anthropology advocated by Kottak (1999), intercommunity comparison is invaluable. This approach aims to highlight the key factors and elements related to the phenomenon in question.

The state of Hawai`i compellingly qualifies as a suitable location for comparison on the merits of a number of pertinent aspects.

Hawai`i in many respects parallels New Zealand. Like New Zealand, Hawai`i's Polynesian human colonization came from central eastern Polynesia, and both were near the last places to be reached in what has come to be known as Polynesia, though the Māori arrived at their new home about 600 years later (Fagan 2004:294-297; Irwin 1990:94; Kirch and Green 1992:167; Redman 1999:70). The Polynesian cultural form of both colonist groups would have been far more similar than dissimilar having come from a related or shared parental Polynesian population (Clark and Terrell 1978:296, 298; Irwin 1990:94). Mounting research evinces that both New Zealand and Hawai`i experienced subsequent immigrations or trade from central eastern Polynesia, likely providing some degree of cultural influx (Anderson 2002:384; Clark and Terrell 1978:298; Fornander 1969:6-7,168; Irwin 1990:93; Kirch and Green 1992:170; Young 2004:39). Fast forward a number of centuries, and we find that both were primarily thrust onto the Western world's stage by Captain James Cook nearly synchronically. Thereafter, history records that both nations had similar experiential trajectories, including Missionization, cultural-collision, Western civilization encroachment and immigration, land dispossession, agricultural industrialization, colonization, territorialization and indigent marginalization. Ultimately, both came to have bicultural or multicultural societies with the common element of indigent Polynesians. Succinctly, within Polynesia the two places where the most outside influence has come to bear are New Zealand and Hawaii (Keesing 1947:12)

In another vein, New Zealand and Hawai`i geographically share many similarities that currently influence cultural-environmental interactions. The geographic isolation each possesses

has profoundly affected biotic evolutionary relationships (Craig et al. 2000:62-63; Young 2004:33-35, Redman 1999:68-69). Rare and unique floral and faunal species evolved concomitantly, along with distinctive biotic-environmental relationships. The isolation also translated to a certain degree of difficulty for human colonization and for all subsequent immigration there (Redman 1999:68-69). Likewise, remoteness no doubt played a role in their relatively late discovery to the rest of the world and thereby subsequent contacts (Redman 1999:68-69). The islands themselves contain a wide array of biomes and ecotones that over time stimulated unique biological formations and wide diversity (Craig et al. 2000:62-63; Young 2004:33-35; Redman 1999:68-70). Thus, human colonizers of each island group likely benefitted from such richness and variety for a time and yet became reminded at some point of the tenuous nature of previous ecological strategies in their new home and locality and the need to adapt strategies from within their similar cultural quivers (Redman 1999:68-73). Hawai'i's similarity in geography and human history uniquely qualifies it as a more than sufficient candidate for comparison. The limited comparison of New Zealand to Hawai'i along these lines draws out the similarities and differences among their indigenous cultural forms and later colonized societies, highlighting the key cultural elements or factors generally behind New Zealand's culture of conservation and specifically those buttressing bi-cultural community projects like Maungatautari.

## CHAPTER II

### RELEVANT THEORY AND RESEARCH

#### **The Value in Comparison**

There are a number of research traditions and schools of thought pertinent to this research. First, within anthropology the practice of cultural comparison along any lines almost goes without saying. Unswervingly, and nearly ubiquitously, the anthropological canon is replete with direct cross-cultural comparisons, beginning early on with Herodotus' annals, or closer to present with Frazier's *Golden Bough*, and Mead's *Sex and Temperament in Three Primitive Societies*. Nearly any work at any time and nearly any work of ethnology, kinship, social organization, value systems, or identity, utilizes comparison at some level or another. It has been used not only due to its simplicity and role as a human tool for learning, but because comparison highlights key factors, be they similar or dissimilar. These factors then can be weighed for relevance and used to infer or draw conclusions. A cultural element or facet is observed, known, or perceived as existing, through at least a comparison to what we know or have already experienced. To know or recognize anything is to subject it to comparison. It is as elemental a learning strategy as mimicry. To recognize anything as similar or different based on what one considers familiar or recognizes as normal or conventional, is to compare and draw such a conclusion. Thus, in the sense that comparison is a research tradition or convention, the precedent is substantial.

#### **Biodiversity Loss and Indigent Community Involvement**

A very applicable vein of thought concerns New Zealand's loss of biodiversity and change in biotic systems. Craig et al. (2000:61) conclude that despite the designation of 30% of

New Zealand land as reserves, biodiversity is still decreasing. The reasons cited for this undeterred loss include poor management due to a dearth of government funding, a failure to attach economic value to native biodiversity, the continued presence of introduced pests, and the lack of community and Māori influence (Craig et al. 2000:61-62,65-66). They suggest among other remedies, an engagement with indigenous Māori, who are attributed to be accepting of a blend of “protected and productive components of the landscape” based on Māori values (Craig et al. 2000:61,66). They are not alone in this assertion. Orlove and Brush (1996:339) maintain that anthropology has demonstrated that indigenous culturally-driven resource acquisition and usage is usually, though not inevitably, compatible with conservation goals. Moreover, stronger perceptions of both the cultural value of diversity and the tangible and increasing threat of extinction in recent decades resonate with notions of biodiversity conservation (Orlove and Brush 1996:330-331). Within this framework, indigenous Māori culture and its values becomes a factor in the search for achievable and effective conservation. The project at Maungatautari provides informed commentary, if not a test of, their suggestions, particularly those of Maori influence and hence inclusion in community conservation projects, overall community involvement, and project funding.

### **Cross-Cultural Communication**

Key to any such inclusive dialogues concerning two or more distinct socio-cultural groups, is the ability to both recognize and value culturally-embedded differences, and locate similarities or a commonality that effectively produces collaboration (Metge and Kinloch1978:8; Metge 2001:1). Culture, in a simple and useful definition, can be labeled a “system of shared understandings” (Metge and Kinloch1978:8). Culturally-embedded construals and understandings do not easily travel across language and socio-cultural groups, fostering



misunderstanding, especially when understandings are assumed to be shared by members of both parties (Metge and Kinloch 1978:8). Metge's combined works including 1978's *Talking Past Each Other!?* which discussed problems of cross-cultural communication and her 2001 release *Korero Tahī: Talking Together*, were greatly informed and aided by key Māori authorities, and effectively distilled to a tentative Pākehā population the differences and similarities of their cultural group's values and ways of communicating and working together. Has such discourse been effective and played a role in cross-cultural communication the community level? Has it permeated into socio-cultural group's quiver of societal navigation tools, and more importantly has it transcended being an ideal and arrived at practice? The MEIT project here again can speak to these issues and questions in, if nothing else, a specific, localized context.

### **Indigenous Knowledge Valued**

The use of indigenous knowledge in ecosystem or conservation management projects and plans, in a post-colonial world, that is not so post-colonial, is very much debated. Berkes et al. (2001:1251-1252) relate that studies show many indigent groups have an empirically-based knowledge of the world around them, situated in a looped system of trial and error within cultural practice and passed-down knowledge. It is further asserted that such knowledge is of course culturally-embedded and tied to group's underlying world-view (Berkes et al. 2001:1252). Others are reluctant to accept, without reservation, native voices contesting adeptness at environmental management, seeing many such groups as being linked to international discourse. However, it is conceded that validity exists for some indigenous knowledge systems (Brosius 1999:278-279,281; Milton 1996:107,109-113; Orlove and Brush 1996:330,333-334,339,346; Sponsel 1995:183). Again, in relation to this discussion and body of thought, Maungatautari offers a highly relevant situation to examine. International discourse can

certainly be an informational source to all parties involved. Māori traditional knowledge could be valued and hence utilized as part of the reserve's management plans or not. Or, it could be that each party outwardly accepts and yet downplays or dismisses the other's knowledge base and suggestions. In any manifestation resulting from such navigation, cultural values underlie constituent group participation and consideration of the attendant parties. What cultural knowledge and values are at work within the Maungatautari community?

### **Cross-Cultural Bridging**

Attitudes, being a little more slippery or difficult to categorize and collect, nonetheless bespeak values and world-views embedded in culture. Attitudes humans have concerning the environment do change over time and are not homogenous throughout any given society or at any given time (Redman 1999:15). Moreover, such culturally-derived attitudes condition perceptions of the world (Redman 1999:34). However, comparing Western and non-Western beliefs and attitudes, each has key attitudes distinctive enough to draw a distinct separation between them (Redman 1999:15,16-34). Additionally, Redman (1999:24) prefers to re-label the dichotomy as large-scale versus small-scale societies, and in such a re-envisioning, the primary factor is the mutuality or embeddedness felt by small-scale societal members in contrast to the presumed separateness from nature felt among many large-scale societal members. Despite such divides, Milton (1996:106-107) would concur with Metge (2001) and others in asserting that conceptual bridges can be built across cultures, connecting cultural understandings and construals of the environment. The community constituents of Maungatautari may have successfully crossed this cultural divide. Yet again, within this community project and others like it in New Zealand, there may be something at work- some set of socio-cultural elements that have reached past attitudinal disparity.

## **Anthropology in Conservation**

On a final theoretical note, environmental and conservation issues can now more acceptably be addressed by anthropology. The emergent “new ecological anthropology” seeks to develop “culturally-informed and appropriate solutions” to environmental problems that are now more accurately seen as linked to politics, international discourse, and external agents (Kottak 1999:25). With local communities and ecosystems increasingly under these neocolonial pressures, anthropologists should not necessarily be neutral; these forces are not only culturally insensitive but also threaten native inhabitant’s culture and ways of life (Kottak 1999:25). Anthropology, specifically this new environmental anthropology in contrast to the old ecological anthropology characterized by Rappaport’s work, can leave the sidelines of observation and escape the tunnel-vision so prevalent among research focused on a single cultural group and concerted work to propose and evaluate policy not only within a local and regional context but also within national and international contexts (Kottak 1999:23-25).

Moreover, intercommunity and international comparison should be utilized, and especially so amidst the complex “linkages and structures that structure the modern world” (Kottak 1999:25). In such an approach, the local village or community is no longer the entire subject of study; the entire suite of influences upon the community must be weighed in any analysis (Kottak 1999:25; see also Sponsel 1995). Communities are no longer isolates from national or international environmental discourse, and are often confronted by intra-national discourse, national projects, and the agendas of governmental agencies. In approaching the problem at hand from this theoretical vein, factors that affect the culture of the community’s citizens can be identified and placed in proper relief. Lastly, under this rubric anthropology is

positioned to take a more active role in addressing both environmental and cultural problems, attendant to all humanity.

## CHAPTER III

### METHODS OF RESEARCH

The research herein is acknowledged to be foundational, rather than conclusive in nature and it is hoped that this research will be built upon and more exhaustively investigated within a doctoral research program. The primary thrust of the research is comparative and historical in nature, and accomplished through fieldwork and library research. However, the research has been informed, as aforementioned, by a two-year presence in Hawai'i between the summers of 1994 and 1996.

#### **Fieldwork**

A short period in New Zealand aided the research qualitatively by making it possible obtain on-the-ground knowledge directly from involved individuals. The study-tour or class in the summer of 2007 permitted a visit to Mount Maungatautari in Aotearoa/New Zealand and provided an opportunity to examine environmentalism in New Zealand and explore Maori-Pakeha cultural relationships on the whole. Specifically, time spent at Maungatautari enabled discussions with a MEIT trustee in regards to the project, its origins in the community, and the various challenges accompanying the project. Furthermore, avenues of information were established for continuing long-distance contact and research. Other reserves and projects were also visited, as part of the class, but generally did not provide opportunities for discussion with direct participants. A Māori *hapu* (subtribe) and *marae* (central hapu sacred space and meeting houses) was visited twice, also resulting in discussion time with various individuals who offered valuable insights.

The time spent in Hawai`i during the 1990s, permitted travel to various islands, observation of differing socio-cultural circles, and visits to state parks and a reserve. While I gained important general information during my time there, my function in Hawai`i was not to gather information about culture and multi-cultural communities in relation to land and resource use, nor in regards to the establishment, involvement and maintenance of an environmental or conservation project. Pre-fieldwork investigations for this project were made over the web and by phone in the fall of 2007. Arrangements were made to interview persons connected to conservation efforts in Hawai`i to learn about their role in these activities and to network through them and find others engaged in community conservation. A short-duration trip to Hawai`i was conducted in early January 2008, with a base of operations on the north shore.

Interviews conducted were always informal and lacking any form of questionnaire. Participants were advised of the research intent and offered both anonymity and a copy of the completed research upon completion. Notes and thoughts from interviews were with rare exception typed the same day and immediately thereafter for lengthy interviews. There were a few interviews which due to length and time of day, may have impinged upon an informant's meal time and possibly comfort. In these situations the author offered and paid for lunch, enabling interviews and conversations to continue in a relaxed and cordial atmosphere. In all cases, individuals were left to provide me with their own cultural identification. I did not make any assumptions as to cultural affiliation or identification. A final note here to include is that all names of individuals interviewed have been changed to preserve confidentiality.

## **Library Research**

Library research provided the scope and background needed to give the fieldwork perspective. Various books by anthropologists and historians comprise a core resource, comprised of ethnography, psychological anthropology, environmental and ecological anthropology along with texts documenting and addressing cultural change and colonial cultural-collisions. Anthropological journals and periodicals also provide a core source of information. Historical and political documents in the form of texts, journals, personal papers, newspaper articles, government documents and records in various forms, e.g. meeting minutes, correspondence or treaty documents etc., were consulted and utilized where relevant. Ecological and environmental texts, scholarly journals and periodicals were consulted in relation to both historical processes of land, resource, and biodiversity use, change, management and contemporary research and international discourse, where relevant. Internet sources, though problematic, have been used judiciously for documentation concerning events so recent as to afford no other source. However, those used are in the majority connected to reputable organizations and governmental agencies. Thus, a few websites feature prominently and importantly, such as those maintained by the Maungatautari Ecological Island Trust (MEIT), various conservation organizations and governmental agencies.

## CHAPTER IV

### MOTION ON THE MOUNTIAN- MAUNGATAUTARI

#### **The Community Project and Problem**

Located in the Waikato region of the north island of New Zealand, near the town of Cambridge, Mount Maungatautari rises over the area's river courses and pasture lands. Any approach to it provides an easy view to the contrast between the mountain's heavily forested slopes and the cleared pasture land that surrounds its base and spreads over the region. Fog often engulfs the vividly dark green slopes and hides the mountain's distinctiveness in a shroud of white, beckoning a closer investigation to see beyond its veil and the imposing wall-like tree line.

To experience Maungatautari is to experience grandeur. I hasten to add that though the mount is picturesque, it is not tall, nor high, nor grandiose in any of the facets that bring such a moniker. Its grandeur lies in its potential, in what dwells within its forest canopy presently, and in what lives in the homes around it. The forest is largely intact, in comparison to forest stands in general over the north island of New Zealand. Nevertheless, it has suffered a significant loss of native fauna much like the rest of New Zealand. The introduction of various mammalian species by humans has resulted in much extinction through predation, habitat destruction, and competition. Maungatautari has, by virtue of a number of factors, remained less affected by these incursions, retaining a more complete native flora array. However, until recently, it too was progressing on the path of ever more significant biodiversity loss.



This is when the community stepped in when a recently perfected pest-proof fence became available. Key individuals formed a community trust, called the Maungatautari Ecological Island Trust (MEIT) to plan and undertake the conservation of the mountain. Installation of the fence was fairly straightforward considering resident's pasture lands abutted the mountain nearly the full course around it, creating an easily accessed and distinct tree-line. The land that was fenced consisted of Māori land, private land, and public-owned scenic reserve land administered by the Waipa District Council (<http://www.maungatrust.org/aboutmaunga/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008). Phil, a Pākehā entrepreneur living near the mountain, and current MEIT board trustee, indicated that the fence was developed locally by an individual. Moreover, he stated that when residents learned of the fence, they began asking more than rhetorically, "why can't we fence the mountain."

In New Zealand there are no states or provinces, but rather regions and districts/cities. New Zealand Government is therefore less hierarchical than in the United States. Indeed, instead of numerous federal agencies that deal with the environment, and additional ones at the state level, and more at the county level, New Zealand has a single government agency responsible for most of the country's conservation efforts- the Department of Conservation (DOC) (Craig et al. 2000:61). Phil continues by saying that initially the idea was proposed to the DOC, whereby the community and the DOC would collectively initiate the project. However, the DOC he says, advised them that to get started they needed to raise a certain amount of funds ahead of time, before initial efforts could be started. Luckily, he says, they as a community decided to venture forward, choosing to start the project off very small, but thereby gain credibility and momentum, which was expected to thereafter bring in significant funding. He indicated that if they had not started in this fashion, it would have not progressed at all. He related that at present, the trust

had collected NZ\$14 million to sustain and drive the project. Bruce Clarkson, a biologist at the University of Waikato and an advisor to MEIT, reiterated this thought, indicating that the DOC comparatively has insufficient funding for the amount of requisite work entrusted to them, thus their work and funds must necessarily be concentrated on maintaining existing high biodiversity areas to prevent further extinction events (letter to author, October. 8, 2007). Returning to in this group discussion with Phil and my fellow classmates the topic changed slightly and mention was made that the area's Māori were connected to and part of the project. However, little else was said about the subject at this time. Phil did take our group out to the mountain on a hike into its interior, whereby we directly observed the efforts of the community in regards to the fence, the trails, the monitoring system, the aviary, and many of the projects that keep the mountain both protected and engaged in species rehabilitation, reintroduction and research.

Briefly, the reserve or ecological island was spread over the mountain by stages and surrounded the mountain's entire circumferential tree-line by September 2007. An enclosure was made starting at one end of the mountain by fencing the tree line around the end and proceeding along each mountainside's tree line. These sides were connected by a fence built across the mountain to connect them. Once enclosed, brodifacoum (anticoagulant) pellet air drops were initiated in conjunction with various traps, to rid the enclosure of non-indigenous mammals or pests. By stages this was repeated so that eventually the entire mountain was fenced. Two smaller and inner enclosures remain for sensitive native animal reintroductions. In sum, nearly 3400ha or 8401 acres have been enclosed with 47 km of fencing and cleared of mammalian pests (e.g. stoats (weasels), possums, cats, rats, rabbits, deer), creating the largest pest-free zone on mainland New Zealand. Introductions of native flightless birds, such as the

kiwi, have met with success. Indeed, the mountain has recently experienced its first kiwi birth in over 100 years.

However, success is maintained through near constant effort. Recall from the introduction, the concern caused by an opportunistic rat at the first availability of a downed branch and a way over the fence. The fence-line then is patrolled and monitored through community volunteers. Likewise, many of the traps employed were and are constructed by volunteers from the surrounding area. Trust members and community volunteers comprise the core labor pool needed to carry out many aspects of the project including the construction of a recently completed aviary, species monitoring, and native biota reintroductions, to name a few.

The MEIT trust itself was established in 2002. The organization is comprised of eighteen trustees, five of whom are local landowners, another five are *Tangata Whenua* (people of the land) referring to local Māori, three more come from the Waipa District Council, the Department of Conservation and Waikato Conservation board respectively, and a final five individuals who garner appointment due to expertise or having an interest in the project ([www.maungatrust.org/trustees/](http://www.maungatrust.org/trustees/), accessed as recently as April 4, 2008). The trust officially declares its aim to be the fencing of the mountain, the creation of a pest-free forest, and a collaborative management of the sanctuary and species re-introductions ([maungatrust.org/trustees/](http://maungatrust.org/trustees/), accessed April 4, 2008). Additionally, there is a Tangata Whenua Committee, which presently appears to have three (normally five) individuals who “guide the Trust on Māori protocol and the reintroduction of wildlife” ([www.maungatrust.org/tangata/](http://www.maungatrust.org/tangata/), accessed April 4, 2008). The area’s Māori proclaim Mount Maungatautari *taonga* (a sacred or prized possession), which will with their assistance “once again be the mountain that our

forefathers knew,” a mountain resonating with birdsong and the perfume of plants (maungatrust.org/tangata/, accessed April 4, 2008).

### **Preservationism, Cultural Use and Cross-cultural Navigation**

Consideration of such sentiments, highlights an admirable parallelism between the two groups and their goals. However, these two guiding goals illustrate what I infer to be, slightly different values and beliefs, which are of course culturally-derived and affixed. Nick for example, a key Pākehā informant, mentioned the native *kereru* (wood pigeon), relating that Māori had arrived at a sustainable use practice, taking only mature individuals from the population. Indeed, the Māori tradition of only hunting the *kereru* for food during its wintertime-fat season stands in stark contrast to later Pākehā laws that prohibited Māori from hunting *kereru* for food in favor of exclusive Pākehā sport-hunting; this becomes all the more telling in the knowledge that this occurred when Pākehā forest destruction and clearing efforts meant greater overall food scarcity for the Māori (Pool 1991:75,100; Young 2004:73,103). Moreover, the *kereru* bird, now an iconic bird of the conservationist movement, is the very bird Māori traditionally eat near death, considering them “essential preparation and sustenance for the long journey into the next world” (Young 2004:217). Who then, asks Young (2004:217) would refuse a dying relative their final request to eat *kereru*? The *kereru*, still considered endangered, metaphorically sits at the crossroads of traditional indigenous sustainable-use practices and preservationist ideals. The keeping of tradition is wrapped up in cultural identity, belief, and practice and seems to oppose a preservationism that strictly prohibits both hunting and practical use in addition to belief-directed use. The task for the MEIT is to reconcile these and other opposing views.

The examples above and following, are indicative of tensions presently underlying New Zealand society, due to historical and continuing cultural-collisions. Once, while eating with a group of Māori after being traditionally welcomed onto their *marae*, I spoke at length with a gentleman who volunteered that he was biologically half-Māori, half-Pākehā. Rōpata related that he had grown up essentially Pākehā. He was not allowed to speak Māori from an early age. Recently he had “come back to the marae” (i.e. he had only recently reconnected himself to his traditional Māori *hapu* (sub-tribe) or family). Thus, he was currently in the throes of relearning Māori language and culture, and finding the task rewarding but difficult. Importantly, he nonetheless asserted that he was Māori, and lamented the years of lost experience with what he considered his true cultural group and identity. His experience, he said, is an example of former wide destruction and suppression of indigenous culture and rights, indicating in my view, the very real presence of wounds within New Zealand society. However, it appears these “wounds,” while not necessarily healed, are being treated.

Hēni, a judge, councilwoman, and member of neighboring *marae*, sat at length with our group, discussing issues important to her, her *hapu*, and Māori in general. Much of the discussion centered on connections to, use of, and regard for land. She related among other examples, one of her own. Her family owned some nearby land, which had been in the family many generations. She wanted to build a home for herself on a small portion of it. In order to build or use land in New Zealand, a resource consent petition must be submitted, reviewed and approved. Her resource consent procedure was especially difficult for reasons not altogether clear to her. After much effort and difficulty, she was approved. In fact, I was able to go and see her home, the bay and view it enjoys and the nearby hapu-owned kiwi fields when she and I gathered up boxes of the fruit for us. In this time, we spoke of each other’s family, culture,

children, and hopes. She expressed her desires for her progeny to enjoy more cultural freedoms than she has.

Māori culture has protocols very much attuned to navigating intergroup tension by turning it into familiarity through subtle steps. When colleagues and I arrived at the *marae* we of course waited at its gate and entered to find our guest seats only after becoming acceptable to the guarding warrior through the *wero* (ritual challenge to determine friend or foe). Next, the *mihi* (welcome ceremony) allowed for Māori singing and then a formal exchange between each group's appointed speaker. The Māori greeter in his response speech to our group's introduction speech, and especially in response to the knowledge of where we were from, included careful and deliberate connections to us in his rejoinder. In gratitude, he thanked us for our elder relatives who had fought in World War II, protecting New Zealand and themselves from being invaded by the Japanese. After more singing, we then at last shook hands and performed the *hongi* (nose to nose, forehead to forehead greeting to become part of them), comingled and then ate lunch together. The entire ceremony was not inordinately long, though it was longer than western greetings and simple invitations to "come on in." Metge and Kinloch (1978:16-17) explain that this procedure, present in one form or another at most Māori meeting occasions, gradually reduce obscurity and distance to engender a closeness and familiarity between unfamiliar groups. Such procedures seem well positioned to foster relationships of mutual respect, and thereby effective cross-cultural engagements and communication.

### **Maungatautari- A Brief History**

The New Zealand Archipelago broke free from Gondwanaland, which eventually came to be Australia, eighty million years ago (Craig et al. 2000:62; Smith 2005:1). Polynesians seem to

have arrived at New Zealand's north island between A.D. 1000 and 1200 or about 800 years ago, finally colonizing the last major land mass on earth, excepting Antarctica (Craig et al. 2000:63; Fagan 2004:296; Smith 2005:1,7; Young 2004:35,38). John Scott's research indicates Ngati Kahupungapunga as the first recognized Māori group in the Maungatautari region, beginning a five century Māori occupation and relationship that came to sustain 5000 Māori before European arrival (<http://www.maungatrust.org/history/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008). Regarding Māori life on the mountain, Peter Tairi, Chairman of the Maungatautari Marae has stated:

“for hundreds of years Maungatautari has been a source of life for both Māori and Pākehā. Now it is time to give back to our mountain what we have taken away” (<http://www.maungatrust.org/protecting/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008).

However, before the turn of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, Ngati Kahupungapunga was conquered and displaced by the Tainui, coming inland from the west coast (John Scott, <http://www.maungatrust.org/history/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008). The Ngati Raukawa was the first of the Tainui tribes to make this district their home, and did so for centuries, yet over time three *hapu* (subtribes) were formed; Ngati Wairere, Ngati Haua, and Ngati Koroki came to hold the present *tangata whenua* (control of mana of the land), with the first two controlling the southern slopes and the lattermost controlling the majority of Māori land there (John Scott, <http://www.maungatrust.org/history/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008). Presently, the land in the reserve is an amalgamation of Māori land, private land, and public-owned scenic reserve land administered by the Waipa District Council (<http://www.maungatrust.org/aboutmaunga/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008).

In regards to certain characterizations of indigenous knowledge of the land and resources as “more ecologically minded” than Western practices and specifically in the case of the Māori and Pākehā, recent acknowledgement has been made on both sides, that each has committed folly in regards to use of the environment (Smith 2005:13-14; Young 2004:147). However, the admission by either group that they have not always used sustainable practices has not always been so forthcoming. Indeed, as recently as the 1980s, the Waitangi Tribunal stated in a rather romanticized view that “[it seems] clear that the Māori brought with him a magico-religious worldview of the environment that readily lent itself to the conservation of the earth’s natural resources” (Smith 2005:13). However, research has chimed in to temper this romanticized view. Palaeobiologists conclude that New Zealand’s avifauna was decimated by introduced mammalian predators, humans not excepted, and indeed in geologic time, ecosystems vanished in an instant following human colonization (Craig et al. 2000:61,63; Smith 2005:14; Young 2004:216-217). New Zealand rainforests from the time of human colonization have declined from 78 percent of the land area to 23 percent (Craig et al. 2000:63; Young 2004:216-217). However, the decline during Māori occupation was 78 percent to 53 percent, while during the much shorter European colonization period to present, the decline was from 53 percent to 23 percent (Young 2004:229).

Polynesians in New Zealand caused most extinctions far before European arrival, yet some overlook what conservation acumen these Polynesians developed with time and experience (Smith 2005:14-15; Young 2004:217). Aotearoa (New Zealand) would have been the most climatically diverse land the Polynesians came upon, being the coldest and the most dissimilar environment to which they were accustomed, “stretch[ing] [Māori] adaptability to the limit” (Smith:2005:17). European colonists continued and exacerbated the environmental changes



initiated by Māori Polynesians with the same methodologies, adding only better technology and a more numerous array of mammalian predators, resultantly producing more change post A.D. 1840 than all change previously induced (Craig et al. 2000:63; John Scott, <http://www.maungatrust.org/history/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008; Smith 2005:14-15). Smith (2005:17) saliently concludes from the situation, and from others, that humans in a new environment will adversely affect ecosystems ahead of any acquired intimate knowledge of the new environment that produces a sustainable-use equilibrium. The Māori after all, are humans first before environmentalists; they did indeed decimate the marine ecology in the very human pattern of resource exploitation for survival, prior to strategies of intensive agriculture (Smith 2005:14).

The rainforest now confined to the slopes of Maungatautari once extended far beyond, and into the valley regions, and contained numerous varieties of avifauna, of which most evolved without natural predators (John Scott, <http://www.maungatrust.org/history/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008). Māori presence in New Zealand did result in a 50 percent loss of indigenous animals (e.g. the moa) and a 40 percent loss of forest cover before European arrival (Smith 2005:14-15; Young 2004:43,229). The Maungatautari area was likewise affected with significant Māori habitation for an extended period of time (as aforementioned), and crucially, through a process of change, initiated by European expansion and escalated as Pākehā presence pushed into the region in the late 1800s; this culminated in a bush-to-pastureland transformation that has since been solidified through the post-WWI enthronement of dairy production as the primary national industry (John Scott, <http://www.maungatrust.org/history/>, accessed as recently as April 7, 2008). Thus, Maungatautari experienced in kind, what the whole of New Zealand has (Young 2004:38-56), namely human habitation, field-clearing by fire, crop cultivation, non-

indigenous pest introduction, and intensive agri-business, collectively degrading native habitats and biotic diversity.

## **Project Maungatautari- The Nascence**

### **Concerted Emergence**

The Maungatautari Ecological Island Trust and project seems to have emerged out of local ingenuity and collaboration on many fronts. David Wallace, a Karapiro (area near the mountain) farmer, who invented the fence that effectively repulsed nearly all mammalian pests and would come to be used on the mountain, led out on the endeavor, according to Phil, Nick and Linley O'Neil, immediately garnering wide community support ([http://www.maungatrust.org/research/#Information\\_for\\_researchers](http://www.maungatrust.org/research/#Information_for_researchers), accessed April 8, 2008; letter to author, August 12, 2007). Linley O'Neil also confirmed that the founding trustees, Wallie Clark, a *kaumatua* (elder) from the Maungatautari Marae; Bill Garland, a farmer at Maungatautari; John Hewitt, mayor of the Waipa District Council; Greg Martin, conservator with DOC; and Gordon Stephenson, Waotu farmer, were all there from the project's inception (<http://www.maungatrust.org/trustees/>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008; letter to author, August 12, 2007). Linley further indicated that the Waipa District Council (akin to a city council) funded the actual formation of the trust (letter to author, August 12, 2007). Additionally, the trust has three primary committees that support its efforts. They are the fundraising committee, the science and research committee, and the pest-eradication sub-committee (<http://www.maungatrust.org/committees/>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). Financially, the community and the fundraising committee have gathered over NZ\$14 million which has sustained all the progress thus far, in all requisite aspects (e.g. materials, planning and funding of the project) ([http://www.maungatrust.org/progress\\_so\\_far/](http://www.maungatrust.org/progress_so_far/)).

## **Wider Community Engagement**

The project is sustained primarily through volunteer efforts. Upwards of 200 volunteers participate in the many projects that require steady input, including pest monitoring, planting of native species, removal of foreign species, native species monitoring, building and or maintenance. Indeed, the trust's chief executive, Jim Mylchrest, indicated that "much of the progress this conservation project has made is due to the hard work and determination of our very talented volunteers" (<http://www.maungatrust.org/volunteers/>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). Additionally, the trust held a volunteer and member's day, which likely celebrated their efforts, showcased the fruition of work, built excitement through new projects, and certainly provided a sense of community and shared stewardship (<http://www.maungatrust.org/volunteers/>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008).

Further engendering community wide participation, the trust has sought for educative and research programs to be conducted in conjunction with the project. MEIT approached and engaged area schools, inviting students to participate in activities on the mountain, and is presently researching the possibility of an Information Centre to supply interpretational material and assist with educational tours ([http://www.maungatrust.org/education\\_intro/](http://www.maungatrust.org/education_intro/), accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). University level research has been and is being conducted at the reserve, further engaging the wider community. Trevor Connolly's master's research in biology is ascertaining the level of pest activity at the fence line and methods for correcting breaches effectively (<http://www.maungatrust.org/research/>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). Other research projects have been completed and it is likely more are in various stages of review for consideration or progress (<http://www.maungatrust.org/research/>, accessed as recently as April 8,

2008). Thus, MEIT has nearly from its birth encouraged and sought for engagement of the community, including the scientific one.

In sum, the project actively includes in its operation Pākehā, Māori traditionally connected to the mountain and its region, many local farmers at its flanks, many persons living in the region, key individuals in the area's local government, and other individuals living nearby and interested in researching, funding, volunteering, and/or advising the trust in its community-based effort. It has been very successful from its inception, and has continued so; it has gathered funding both locally, nationally and internationally, and continues to harness volunteer labor and expertise from various local sources. Not inclined to rest on its successes, the trust is planning new and more engaging fronts with which to engender further and wider support. Knowing that to reach its environmental goals, the trust asserts the need to reach another goal first, namely the establishment of a “sustainable enterprise that ensures the longevity of the project” (<http://www.maungatrust.org/goals/>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). Couched in this thought is the realization that the input goal of fostering effective communication and collaboration between all involved parties must be first for the trust to succeed in its output goals of biodiversity conservation. Due to the success the trust has exhibited in its conservation goals, it is reasonably inferred that the input goal has been accomplished to one degree or another.

### **Identified Core Factors in New Zealand**

From the culture-history and in particular the interviews and conversations herein collected, there are a few key factors that can be identified as relevant to the project's emergence, success and present form. Recall that Phil, in explaining the structure of the trust itself, highlighted the partnering relationship in the trust board's very structure and between the two

primary cultural groups in the community and area. Trustee numbers are to be half Māori and half Pākehā. Moreover the board is advised by a sub-committee on matters of Māori protocol in the work that is done. The area's *marae* constitute the location for many introductions and formal events in connection with the project. Collectively, these evince teamwork and a commitment on both parties part, to jointly accomplish the task at hand and endeavor to regard the other group's culturally derived values, customs/approach and goals in the process. Moreover, this collaboration is also built upon each group's willingness to leave their own intractable corner that is cultural dogma and meet to jointly travel along a mutually-plotted path. This path is made possible through commonality. The community and trust jointly express a connection to the mountain, being close to it physically and culturally. They found that they not only had a way to address the biodiversity problems there, but that they did have access and control over the land, such that they would be able to implement their plans. Hēni reiterated the long-held dilemma in New Zealand centered on control of land, despite advances that shed light on the infringement of Māori rights and that presently empower Māori far more than ever before. Moreover, for her, the issue of land use is not separable from cultural freedom. In relation to land, indeed those Māori involved in the project are asserting their cultural rights to the land, while not placing these rights above the larger community's rights. They jointly began by rejecting the DOC's initial guidance and recommendation, choosing instead to begin as they saw fit. The private funding that came in followed only after initial and successful forays, ultimately freeing the project from monetary restraints associated with meager government funding.

Nick related the very real divide between each group's culturally-embedded values and goals writ large. Juxtaposing the traditional Māori cultural use of Kereru, conservation discourse asserts that no use can be levied at present. Which group then should acquiesce? Or, at which

point do the parties meet, if they do? What culturally-derived value or belief informs this debate, the processes by which it is resolved, and the resolution itself? In the kereru-depleted far north the answer came in the form of a Māori group entrusted with the efforts to raise the numbers of these endangered birds. *Ngati Hine*, a Māori group with ancestral ties to the area, guards and manages a valley there in a predator program that includes their own abstention- a move in which they have chosen to forgo the customary right to hunt the bird, in order to attain the long-term goal to preserve the species (Young 2004:217-218). In a sense, they have engaged a *tapu/kapu* (sacred restraint) for an indeterminate time period in the hope that they may in the future lift it.

## CHAPTER V

### NEW ZEALAND'S PAST MADE PRESENT

When knowledge, as the substance of the mind expressed through language, is passed down over successive generations, the present remains conceptually built on previous thought and constructs, thereby causing the “past to imprison the present” (La Barre 1970:xv). The expression posits the idea that what we know is in fact a portion of what our ancestors knew, and moreover it is formed and construed within the limits of the language we also received from them. Thus, the present is a reification of the past- it is the past that is imposing itself on the present. This may be the case, but perhaps something was overlooked or not addressed in this observation. Is it not also possible for those in the present to appropriate the past, re-construe or re-envision it or even radically depart from it? Or is it the case that whatever is done with the past's construals, however it may be manipulated, altered, or rejected, such action itself remains confined with the past's construals transmitted and reified in the present's culturally-coded construals and perceptions through inheritance? Do we only ever think and act based on the limits of our own culture?

La Barre's recorded thoughts were published ahead of many periods of indigent cultural resurgence. Would it have been modified in any manner if he had observed such cultural resurgences? It is possible that the Māori cultural resurgence of the late 1980s and early 1990s is the melding of both a re-envisioning of the past and an acceptance of the past imprisoning the present? These are some of the compelling thoughts that arise, when New Zealand's cultural-historical factors are reviewed, considered and compared to modern cultural practices. The past has very much to do with the present situation in New Zealand, culturally and socially, in a

dialectical relationship. Not unimportantly, the present re-envision the past at times to suit its own needs or simply to focalize on presently important aspects of the past in the here and now. From such a stance, it is essential to ascertain New Zealand's socio-cultural milieu diachronically. Having related various conversations, situations and recent events concerning Maungatautari's community conservation, the present chapter will endeavor to briefly explore those historical events and associated cultural aspects that in accord with cues identified from the field data and experiences that are deemed most relevant and contributory to the Maungatautari community's bicultural conservation.

### **Māori Social Organization**

Discussion above identified that Māori were part of the project from the beginning as individual community members and in organized entities through two Māori sub-tribes and *marae* connected to the mountain and area. Thus, Māori kinship and social organization has contributed to the way the project started and has been conducted. From this vantage point, it becomes important to understand Māori societal and kinship organization. Irving Goldman (1957:376) labels the Maori a traditional society, being most like the prototype Polynesian system, with the key marker, social status, being derived from seniority of descent, and most often through males. Thus, Maori kinship and social organization is closely linked in the patriarchal descent group called the *hapu* or subtribe (Goldman 1957:379-380; Hiroa 1950:333,338; Sahlins 1958:154-155).

The *iwi* or tribe, consisting of a number of *hapu*, which were a number of *whanau* (minimal social unit- an extended patrilocal family of four generations), was led and linked by an *aho ariki*, a direct descendent of the founder of the tribe (Best 1952:95; Hiroa 1950:333; Sahlins



1958:155). Māori society has predominantly been composed of two to three social classes: the chief, the common folk and the slaves when present- though in reality it is hard to see the commoner or *ware* class- for no one admits membership to it and everyone seems to produce a connection to people of standing (Best 1952:95; Hiroa 1950:337; Goldman 1970:45-50; Sahlins 1958:156). The *rangatira* or chiefly class is comprised of chiefs and all those in good standing because of good birth (Best 1952:95). Rank and leadership were determined by primogeniture in senior families, with purity of descent being “jealously guarded” by carefully chosen marriage arrangements (Aginsky and Hiroa 1940:195; Hiroa 1950:337-338).

However, there were cases of inter-group marriages, and therein, the male spouse was given the choice to align their new “family” and himself with his father’s or his mother’s group based on the availability of land, with the connection that is not chosen eventually being dropped (Sahlins 1958:155). This means that an individual would choose to align themselves with the group that had more available land. In this manner, land itself becomes a component or factor in regards to family structure, sub-tribe organization, and social action. Importantly, the anthropologist Te Rangi Hiroa adds another key element to our base of data to consider. He explains that the *marae*, a term I found to be synonymous with not only the space in front of a Māori meeting house but of both of them together, is connected to a village and a *hapu* or sub-tribe (Hiroa 1950:374). It was a place of food, dance, song, lodging for guests, social gatherings, funerals and a place to gather, prepare for and fight in battle (Hiroa 1950:374,390,416). Thus, ancestry and status are linked to the *marae* and thereby the land and area it was on, with the *marae* being the locus of Maori *hapu* public life (Hiroa 1950:374; Patterson 1992:79).

## **Māori Worldview, Cultural Values and Beliefs**

That culturally-derived differences surfaced in approaches and expectations, is made very evident in the fieldwork presented above. Māori culturally-embedded perceptions, values and construals, inform and guide Māori individuals and organizations within the community. How they work and interact within the project and community is based upon these beliefs. As detected and discussed above, strict protectionism seeks to preclude all use, even culturally-derived usage. Thus, having a sense of Māori cultural beliefs as they relate to land, to biota, and cross-cultural communication and collaboration, is appropriate.

At the onset of this discussion, let it be said that cross-cultural understanding requires far more than a mere linking of word in one language to a word in another language, or what a dictionary or phrase book can provide, for a single text cannot, in the words of Sir Hugh Kawharu, “lift the veil from centuries of tradition” (in foreword to Barlow 1991:vii). These sentiments evince the intricacy and deep-layeredness within the realm of cultural meanings. The warning given declares that no single treatise, no matter the eloquence, can adroitly convey the perceptions, beliefs, values, and intricacies inherent to any culture and its people. The cursory coverage herein to follow is by far no exception. However, a base or operational understanding remains the goal.

The Māori world view is determined by *whakapapa* (genealogy that traces descent to the gods, not only for people, but everything that exists, be it inanimate or animate) which was then used to “interpret and interact with the landscape” (Patterson 1992:77; Smith 2005:9). The surrounding world with all its flowers, plants, animals, earth and sky are relatives or kin, connected in a web of kinship, and created by the *Atua* (gods) (Barlow 1991:11; Smith 2005:9).

Maori envisioned their gods in the tangible world around them, and all that exists in the world as expressions of their gods- hence the god *Tane* is seen in the forest and the god *Tangaroa* is seen in the sea (Barlow 1991:11; Patterson 1992:23,47). It follows then, that while nature sustains life, it is not to be misused; rather balance is sought for in relationships with the surrounding world that is at once both kin and deity, and imbued with *mauri* (lifeforce) (Patterson 1992:10,23; Young 2004:50). Responding to calls for a ‘no use policy,’ some Māori cogently characterize the preservationist ethic as reaction to Western culture’s near ubiquitous exploitation of resources (Patterson 1992:22). Māori view sustainable use as respectful and proper in maintaining a healthy state of *mauri* and balance (Patterson 1992:23-24). Also, Māori work ideals require both an understanding and a caring for of all that exists around us (Patterson 1992:46-47). Thus, traditionally, a proposed use for any material in the world is first questioned for appropriateness and if appropriateness is assured, *tapu* is removed and the material or creature is used (Patterson 1992:23-25,77). In this manner, Māori cosmogony and religious belief, as part of their worldview, inform usage patterns, distilling down to a cultural-resource pattern.

Concerning Māori or any other people’s values, the space herein is far short of the space needed to cover such an expansive topic. Nonetheless, for the purposes of the study, some of the culturally-embedded values need be covered, if succinctly. The statement above, relating the Māori belief of *mauri* that is in everything, “amounts to saying that everything should be treated with respect” (Patterson 1992:77-78). Thus, we gather an axiomatic value that dictates a respect for what western thought would call ‘the natural world.’ Another axiom or essential belief, discussed to a degree above, is *tapu* (*kapu* in Hawaiian). *Tapu*, a sacred and restricted status that can be placed on rivers, forest, animals, rocks, mountains et cetera, can be seen as a Māori

conservation ethic, linked to *mana* and *mauri* (Young 2004:49). The *tapu* of an object can be construed as a contract between humans and their deity or those with power to enact *tapu*, wherein the adherence of *tapu* by the individual is rewarded with “protection against malevolent forces” and the power to use the environment to meet their needs (Patterson 1992:83; Young 2004:49-50). The observer of any *tapu* follows these restrictions generally in the knowledge that their ability to survive will be strengthened by their very observance of it.

Returning to the belief in maintaining knowledge of one’s ancestry, the *marae* is the place at which fruition of life is most fully reached. With the value or axiom of maintaining pride in ones’ ancestry by acknowledging their deeds and their dictums of protocol and living, the *marae* links Māori to their ancestors, their ancestor’s lands, and remains the setting for such values and beliefs to be learned and expressed (Hiroa 1950:374; Patterson 1992:78-79,87-89). Indeed, as *marae* are located on a group’s land, the *marae*, in location and structure, is linked to ancestral remains. This established a strong tie to land, giving rise to the epithet “eating [your] ancestors,” for those who would sell land for food or material goods (Patterson 1992:89). It is from this stance that we see interlinks between the *marae*, the *hapu*, tribal identity, the ancestors, deference to ancestors, respect for land and all that it supports and connects, and learning and living both Māori ways and the *hapu*’s ways.

### **The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi and Biculturalism**

Modern New Zealand as a country is derived from a treaty made between Māori and the Crown, which changed its status from colony to a commonwealth nation of the British Empire, and in the process cemented a social configuration of biculturalism. The concerted exigencies that brought about this result are manifold though there are a few key strains to examine.

Starting at Western contact, the islands were discovered to the Western world by Abel Tasman in 1642, and most prominently by James Cook in 1769-1770 (Smith 2005:25). By 1800 Māori populations had reached a zenith, thereafter declining significantly with increasing food scarcity in conjunction with intensified, musket-equipped, tribal warfare from 1807 to 1840 (Best 1914:74; Smith 2005:34,36-37). During this period, British did involve themselves in the warfare, with some seeing a need for Britain to take over and extend its steadying hand (Buick 1972:1). However, by 1830, many leading chiefs of the northern areas determined that their tribal system was no longer managing an emergent Pākehā and Māori society (Buick 1972:10). Additionally, Maori population figures dropped significantly with a concomitant drop in strength of ties by any one group to a certain land area, due to the Māori musket wars and the redistributing of tribes because of it; this situation produced an environ wherein land was sold for paltry sums or exchanged for pakeha protection, resulting in the loss of significant portions of ancestral lands to incoming European settlers (Smith 2005:37-39). The loss of land and men made it clear to many chiefs that their strength to defend against any foreign power was far diminished (Buick 1972:10).

In 1831, rumor purported increasing French interest, resulting in British efforts to deter any advances, real or merely perceived as such, and assuage Māori concerns (Smith 2005:39-41). A working confederacy of tribes was created in 1835 and an open dialogue aimed at entreating the British Crown to tender protection and annex the lands was reiterated (Buick 1972:27-29; Smith 2005:41). Immigrant numbers began to increase after 1838 with the promise of accessible land created by the newly independent confederacy and the impending promise of a Crown and Māori treaty (Buick 1972:33; Smith 2005:44). The underpowered Confederation of Chiefs could not reign in the growing anarchy derived of Māori desire for muskets and the Pākehā thirst for

land, prompting an 1838 petition to the King to intervene (Buick 1972:35-38). Preliminaries to a treaty were accomplished in January 1840 and on February 5<sup>th</sup> the treaty was hotly debated by an assembly of Māori Chiefs, with Governor Hobson and various missionaries, and signed on the 6<sup>th</sup> by a majority of the Chiefs, excepting Te Wherowhero of Waikato, Te Awara chiefs, and Te Heuheu of Ngati Tuwharetoa (they collectively were marked by less exposure to European influence and maintained Māori religious ways, remaining non-Christian) (Buick 1972:114,122-124; Smith 2005:45-47).

There are many issues connected to the treaty, its signing, and the events of those days, that continue to be debated and examined (Buick 1972:122-130,133-138,146; Smith 2005:49). The key underlying and common aspect among them all, is the contestation of land, derived from differing culturally-derived meanings of land and language (Barlow 1991:135; Buick 1972:129-132,269; Smith 2005:54). The treaty itself is very succinct, and in three articles stated essentially that all Māori cede all rights and powers of sovereignty over their territories to the Crown, that they retain full and exclusive possession of their lands, forests and fisheries, though they can dispossess them at sale for fair prices, and that as British subjects, they garner the full rights and privilege this affords (see Barlow 1991:135 for the full text; Dominy 1990:11).

The treaty and the decline of Māori and their control over land has significantly etched its mark on New Zealand society. Māori population at the time of the treaty numbered between 200,000 and 250,000, falling to 42,000 by the end of the 1800s (Reedy 2000:157). Shrewd land deals, Māori themselves selling land, disease, and the Land wars between 1860 and 1872, resultantly decimated Māori numbers and with increasing foreigner immigration, resulted in a Pākehā majority and the dispossession of Māori lands by fifty percent from 1860 to 1891

(Barlow 1991:135; Pool 1991:75,91,100; Smith 2005:54-77). In the 1890s however, *iwi* (tribes) began to attain some measure of population equilibrium again (Pool 1991:101). Per the 1996 Census, 580,000 individuals or 17.3% of the entire New Zealand population indicated they were of Māori descent (Reedy 2000:157). Since the 1840 treaty, the nation has successively been comprised of, first an overwhelming Māori majority to a mere 2000 immigrants; second, a nearly extinguished people living in a foreign homeland; and third, a predominately Pākehā society, but with a significant amount of Māori who are increasing both in number and influence. For the majority of its modern existence, New Zealand society has been comprised of at least two cultures, but has predominately been fostering towards European culture and dismissive of Māori culture.

### **Waitangi Tribunal and Kiwi Identity Re-envisioned**

The process of land dispossession and Māori cultural decay continued, significantly unaltered, until 1967, at which time a routine statute created for land acquisition, came under Māori protest ushering in a new phase of New Zealand society (Smith 2005:228-229). In March of 1975, a long Māori protest march was levied to convince parliament of their grievances, culminating in the passage of the Treaty of Waitangi Act (Dominy 1990:12; Smith 2005:228-229). The act established a tribunal to advise the government concerning claims in relation to a practical application of the 1840 Treaty itself, along with the aim of determining the 1840 treaty's full import and the extent of its influence (Dominy 1990:12). The bicultural tribunal proved largely ineffectual until 1981 with the appointment of Justice Taihakurei Durie, formerly of the Maori land court, serving with the express intent to educate Pākehā concerning the full importance of the 1840 treaty and to redress injustices (Dominy 1990:12; Smith 2005:231-232).

In the first major decision handed out, Māori concerns over sewage effluent damaging fishing reefs were supported, effectively challenging the government's long-standing status quo, and galvanizing the in-situ environmental movement (Smith 2005:233). Between 1975 and 1985 Māori brought three significant cases before the tribunal, with each one resulting in findings of support for specific Māori concerns related to appropriate use, thereby providing the impetus for action to improve attendant environmental circumstances in New Zealand (Young 2004:192-193). Importantly, the three cases communicated particulars of Māori culture beyond the specifics of the case- the laws of *tapu* became known throughout the environmentalist community (Young 2004:195). In 1986, the tribunal, in its role of commenting on the purpose of the treaty, declared that the government should protect and perpetuate Maori language; the government listened and acted- they not only recognized Maori as an official language but began efforts to prevent its extinction (Smith 2005:233). Next, the Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act (1985) widened the power of the tribunal significantly by allowing it to investigate claims dating back to 1840, while augmenting the tribunal's number to seven individuals (Dominy 1990:12). This expansion opened the floodgate, as Crown and New Zealand governmental infidelity, in regards to infringement upon Māori cultural, societal, and resource rights, could be redressed by the committee, without restraint, retroactively back to 1840. In 1995 and again in 1997, redress for lost Māori lands and *mana* took the form of NZ\$170 Million, paid out to various *Iwi* and *Hapu* (Smith 2005:236). Furthermore, the Treaty of Waitangi State-owned Enterprises Act (1988) further empowered the tribunal with the authority to recommend the transfer of any land or state interest in land, to Māori peoples (Dominy 1990:12). These events reverberated through New Zealand, and brought Māori cultural terms and meanings concerning *tapu* and the



environment into general public knowledge, engendering discourse and local government action into matters of conservation and cleanup (Young 2004:195).

The moniker “kiwi” can be used to simply describe a resident of New Zealand. Seemingly, the term aspires to a transcendence of “Māori” and “Pākehā” terms and identities, perhaps turning on an acceptance of the notion of “nation” and the Treaty of Waitangi as the birth certificate of a harmonious bicultural society and country (Bell 1996:8-9). Difficulty may arise in the conscientious use of such a moniker, if honesty permits the full recitation of New Zealand’s divided and bloody history (Bell 1996:9). However, despite its history and indeed with its history, it might be possible for New Zealanders to construct a mutually-shared New Zealand identity, in a ‘culture of biculturalism.’ Patterson (1992:10-11) relates an envisioning of the Waitangi Treaty as the charter for a covenant relationship, guided by a willingness to understand the other partner, their opinions and their world-view, within a framework of sobriety and respect. In such a covenant partnership, each party, in an average, meets each other half-way, in a balanced relationship, marked by empathy, sympathy and identification (Patterson 1992:10). Such sentiments echo Dame Joan Metge’s own calls for a meeting of the minds and hearts. Such a relationship can be exhibited within communities and their conservation projects, building a re-envisioned ‘kiwi’ identity and culture that “find[s] common ground in terms of hopes and expectations for a new era” (Smith 2005:252).

### **Pākehā Identity and Cultural Values**

Pākehā national identity contains components ranging from the ownership of land, shared British heritage, projections of oneness through the Treaty of Waitangi, and perhaps for some, nationalizing figures or entities such as the New Zealand All-Blacks rugby team. Early settlers

came with little family, having left most of the extended familial relationships in Europe (Bell 1996:5). Land ownership came to play a big part of Pākehā identity in reaction to the loss of familiarity, being in an altogether new environment, and without family or kin to rely on or connect to (Bell 1996:5-6). The common thread of British ancestry has tied Pākehā together in language, in talk of 'home,' in customs and social rituals, in culinary tastes, and allegiance to the crown (Bell 1996:6). In terms of Pākehā identity in relation to the role the Treaty of Waitangi plays in the creation of a New Zealand identity, it can be argued that it helps or detracts. Bell (1996:9) exhibits contempt for notions of unity through the treaty, instead seeing only the social injustices, war and dispossession that occurred under its watch (Bell 1996:9-10). Conversely, Patterson (1992:10) asserts, that while the Treaty of Waitangi stresses the Māori cultural intent behind it, it challenges all to arrive at a balanced partnership that seeks for respect, temperance and understanding. Indeed it is a challenge, for Pākehā values stem from a very different worldview. Western constructs reside at the root of Pākehā culture and values, including Christian and Kantian ethics, Judeo-Christian attitudes in the bible, and a strict dichotomy between humans and the environment (Patterson 1992:10,22). This compendium of discourse in Pākehā culture and values views the world as a domain to be subdued and developed as man sees fit according to his desires (Patterson 1992:10,22). It is from this background that Pākehā beliefs construe the world as separate from humans. This separation does not preclude interest in preserving the environment, rather it provides different reasons and attached values for doing so in relation to Māori reasons and values.

## CHAPTER VI

### A SAMPLE OF CONSERVATION IN HAWAI'I

Through the course of a few years time living in Hawai'i, I gained a certain degree of familiarity was gained concerning the general state of affairs in the former Polynesian kingdom. Residence on four different isles brought encounters with various state parks, including Koke'e State Park on Kauai, and Kalaupapa National Historic Park on Moloka'i. Both were enjoyable for the enlightening conversations with individuals while there and the stunning scenery. Other experiences entail a visit to reserve lands and much driving around Hawaiian homestead lands. Though I left Hawai'i, the experiences I had there have never left me. For this reason, I have often returned to the subject of Polynesia in my pursuits since then. Various term papers over the years have often returned to Hawaiian subject material. I recall composing a soil reconstruction plan for the island of Kaho'olawe, the island used in post-contact times for small animal grazing before WWII and as a bombing target since the late 1940s to 1984. The deleterious effects of both practices left the island denuded and free of topsoil, leaving only deadpan and dead or sick reefs inundated by dirt runoff. In other venues I oft recall and consider the socio-cultural situation there in relation to land and economics. While there in Hawai'i from the summer of 1994 to the summer of 1996, I came across U.S. Military housing on large spacious plots and beachfront property in Ewa Beach west of Pearl harbor, while many of Hawai'i's indigenous residents lived in old, worn and small homes within cramped and confined housing areas such as those found in Ewa Beach, Nanakuli or O'ahu's west side. Many parents worked two jobs, having little time for much else than work. Life and the daily minutiae in what to some is paradise, is less than paradisiacal for many residents. It is nonetheless their home.

A primary industry of the state is tourism and those industries connected to the military. It seems these industries are powerful drivers of the state's economy and policy. In such a situation, questions concerning the meeting of native resident needs do arise. Comparing the present overall state of things for New Zealand and Hawai'i highlights how different they presently are, considering the key similarities of their deeper pasts. What similarities remain however? What are the key differences? In regards to the intended research, as mentioned above, no community-initiated large-scale terrestrial project was located in Hawai'i. This alone provides an indication of the state of conservation in Hawai'i. What then is the state of community conservation within Hawai'i?

### **High-Level Conservation**

Research into the state's present milieu of community conservation began with online searches into conservation agencies, groups and efforts there. The first two primary and prevalent efforts at conservation in Hawai'i that emerged was the Natural Area Reserve System (NARS) under Hawai'i State Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC). NARS has nineteen reserves spread over the five primary Hawaiian Islands (<http://www.dofaw.net/nars/index.php>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). The Nature Conservancy currently has twenty preserves, watershed partnerships, and protected areas, approaching nearly 200,000 acres, of which eleven are fully TNC owned and self-managed (<http://www.nature.org/wherewework/northamerica/states/hawaii/preserves/>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). Another conservation presence in Hawai'i was the Audubon Society, albeit briefly. Waimea Valley on the north shore of O`ahu, is a valley that likely had some limited Hawaiian habitation presence in times past. It is a fairly small and steep valley, coursed through by a river and waterfalls. In at least a decade prior to 2003, the valley had been used by

a tourism-oriented company offering kayaking, motorsports, tram rides, and “Polynesian” nightly revues. The business however began to fail in the few years prior to 2003, coming to be nearly condemned by Hawai`i state authority. In June of 2003, the Audubon Society received control of the valley, for what was to be a thirty-year tenure. However, events turned and the valley, as of January 2008, came under control of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA), of the State of Hawai`i.

### **Grass-Roots Conservation- Challenges in Marginalization and Progress**

The pie of land that is Hawai`i is small in relation to those groups who each want a piece of it. Between the many NARS and TNC reserves, aside of State and Federal lands set aside as public parks, for Military use, and public property and development, little terrestrial area remains with which to start community-led reserves or conservation projects. However, the predilection for people to be seaside in Hawai`i is telling for what is happening at the grass-roots level. It seems community involvement is marginalized in two respects, as few slices of the “pie” remain. Often small groups and individuals find ways to engage themselves within those larger, professional and more prevalent projects. Secondly, many turn to marine-oriented projects, which are smaller, more manageable, and closely located to most communities, and conceptually lie at the intersection of international dialogue and local esteem. What follows, traces the challenges many natives identify in engaging themselves as individuals or in communities, within the larger conservation milieu.

### **Community Involvement: Its Expressions and Challenges**

The large professional programs, however helpful they are to the environment, strictly are not community-initiated reserves, but do speak to the overall situation of conservation in Hawai`i

and the extent to which communities and individuals are involved in these major avenues of conservation by way of volunteer efforts. Before conducting fieldwork in Hawai`i only one source for locating such projects came to light, Community Conservation Network (CCN). An interview and contact session was prearranged to take place as part of fieldwork to be conducted in Hawai`i. I met with Evan, a non-native of Hawai`i, who holds a key position within the organization. His own background includes solid experience and education in matters of conservation problem-solving, sustainable financing, and on-the-ground management in community-based conservation projects. Evan was kind enough to meet and discuss their organization's goals, work, his own involvement, and the state of community conservation in Hawai`i to the degree he was aware.

Evan mentioned that Hawai`i has many other organizations, similar to CCN, that engage in conservation projects through building public awareness and pools of labor volunteers. Most of these organizations tend to work collaboratively with one another, with volunteers, with government agencies, and field experts to accomplish their goals. His organization works to build community strength and capability in leadership, believing that in-situ leaders are better situated to produce effective community conservation. For this reason CCN provides training and hands on work, to identify, develop and empower strong, passionate, community leaders. In aggregate, he mentioned that to his knowledge most community-initiated projects within Hawai`i were fairly small/modest and marine-oriented. He mentioned several other non-profit organizations that engage in grass-roots conservation, such as Malama Hawaii and Hawai`i Wildlife Fund. Evan indicated that he came to be interested in conservation from a human-environmental relations perspective over the course of various endeavors, saying that he enjoys his work immensely.

On another day, field work developed an interesting tangent manifest in the work being done at Waimea Valley Audubon reserve. I visited there and called upon the facility's director. I was introduced to Stacy, a senior staff member with Audubon at the facility. She indicated that they had taken over the property, hoping to manage it for 30 years. Already they had accomplished a good deal of work, but she mentioned far more needed to be done. She conceded that the valley could never be returned to an unadulterated state as the valley, or portions of it, had in times past been used as a botanical garden, with scores of non-indigenous biotic introductions. The valley, due to some evidence of modest ancient Hawaiian occupation, does tend to draw more attention in the way of volunteers from the nearby local communities. Indeed, there are allegedly 14 claims to land in the valley made by various Hawaiians who assert a . However, of the volunteers, Stacy mentioned that few seemed to be Hawaiian or Polynesian. Moreover, she observed that difficulty arises in working with natives for the lack of any recognized central authority, which impedes progress and decision making.

The Nature Conservancy has a strong presence in Hawai'i, and seemingly a strong interest in engaging communities in conservation work. I met with Lori to discuss aspects of community, culture and conservation in regards to Hawai'i in general and in relation to TNC's efforts. With mention of Maungatautari, she indicated she was to a degree aware of it. Recently, members of the trust had visited the Hawai'i chapter of TNC and had presented to them an overview concerning the project's work and accomplishments. Our discussion turned to the nature of culture, and how it changes and varies over time and at any time from place to place and perhaps even, in each person's mind. We discussed the situation on Molokai – such as in the NAR reserve Pu'u Ali'i (for which the initial management plan was drafted by TNC), wherein those locals who enjoy hunting and eating the non-indigenous feral goats and pigs, have done so

their entire lives and likely families have done so over generations (Pu'u Ali'i information from personal communications, Christen Mitchell, Bill Evanson, August 30, 2007, August 31, 2007, September 6, 2007, and (<http://www.dofaw.net/nars/index.php>, accessed as recently as April 8, 2008). They do not want complete eradication of these animals for it would rob them of this tradition, the food, and sport. Reserve management, with the goal of restoring the preserve's native ecology, is focused on complete feral goat and pig eradication from within the preserve. Thus, the goals between the groups differ based on variances in culturally-embedded traditions and values. The locals see their culture in a bi-focal lens, seeing the past and the present culture together as one, despite any differences due to change over time- it is all one lens. Thus, the hunting eating of non-indigenous feral pigs does not differ constitutively from raising and eating those pigs brought to Hawai'i by Polynesian immigrants. Reserve management however, plugged into an international environmental discourse, seeks the complete removal and eradication of pest species, including the feral pig and goats. Here again we have this socio-cultural collision between conservation goals and those that espouse them, and indigenous cultural values and behavior. Such collisions can erode what collaborative action is taking place, or preclude such action.

Lori, a native resident of Hawai'i, indicated that TNC Hawai'i knows they can do nothing alone, acknowledging that they do need local help and support. In Hawaii, they receive only U.S. \$10 million a year for their budget, an amount that is not nearly enough for the work that needs to be done. Partnerships then are key to the success of their work. Many projects are in fact partnerships that involve other agencies, government departments, community groups and non-profit organizations. Culturally-oriented groups are consulted more often for input on large issues than small ones. Nonetheless, she admits that misunderstandings do occur. Citing a



recent event, TNC encountered criticism from locals when it hired the professional New Zealand hunting group Prohunt to hunt and remove a quota of pigs and goats. Lori said that TNC often turns to local hunters at intervals in what amounts to a limited and brief partnership, to hunt and remove various animals, citing their reserve Pele Kuna as an example. However, local hunting in this instance was deemed potentially dangerous and ‘not effective enough,’ and Prohunt was hired to achieve management extraction goals safely. The matter came to be more or less resolved when TNC addressed the *kupuna* group (local elders group) and members of the Molokai Hunters Association and advised them that the presence of Prohunt was to hunt in dangerous areas and was not permanent. This highlights a difficulty associated to work in Hawai‘i. Partnerships do occur but often remain tenuous and limited by differing end-goals.

The Nature Conservancy does seem however poised to work on a local scale, tailoring each interaction by island and possibly by community. Lori indicated that many individuals do approach them for opportunities to contribute volunteer labor. Locals groups also approach and find ways to assist. On O‘ahu, the martial-arts oriented group, Lua, has members who volunteer regularly to improve aspects of a nearby reserve. For each island that TNC has a project on, there is a director, a resources manager, field workers and technicians, all of whom live on the island and are part of the local community. The work for each island’s various projects is relegated to the manager and his team. TNC has, she said, made the effort and investment to find, enlist and train individuals on the islands that are already well established members of the community and familiar with the island. They leave the management and conduct of work in the hands of these locally-based managers, thus permitting them to evaluate case by case who on the team is best positioned to work on a particular aspect of a project and engender community assistance for it. In this way, and contrary to the restrictive re-tape hampered nature of

government based work, she said that TNC sees itself (in Hawai`i at least) at the forefront of ecological conservation work, by being able to socially innovate and push forward on work.

Lori continued saying that she has detected a change in TNC's approach to conservation. The elemental component of this change is the recognition that there cannot be a separation of people from the land and its resources. They now seek a balance between ecosystem conservation and permitting practical, culturally-oriented human usage. Hula schools, for example, need to regularly obtain traditional flowers to make leis from. They are allowed access into certain reserves to pick the flowers, in connection with oversight for safety reasons. Moreover, there are efforts being made by the staff to learn Hawaiian culture, traditions, and values and incorporate such where possible in the work that they do (e.g. saying a Hawaiian prayer-chant when entering a forest or sacred area). Indeed, even in their own office, a Hawaiian staff member conducts a seminar every first Monday of the month, to educate staff concerning Hawaiian *maoli* (culture, language, and values).

### **Native Enumeration- Leadership, Land, and Links of Lineality**

I met with this staff member of TNC, and participated in the Hawaiian language and culture class with him and the staff, culminating in a shared lunch between us. Kevin, a senior staff member at TNC's Honolulu office, grew up in Hawai`i and obtained a Ph.D. on the mainland in the biological sciences. Returning to Hawai`i and under tutelage, he became a Hawaiian speaker and figure of cultural authority both in the wider Hawaiian community and within TNC. He emphasized the importance the local-leader program has to TNC, stating that it effectively breaks down the "us" and "them" perception that he says many locals see between themselves and TNC. Moreover, he reiterated Lori's sentiments that there does not seem to be

any clear leadership with whom they can work and that Hawaiians and locals disagree on many issues. This could be the result of or causal factor to the lack of prevalent and recognized local leadership. Their program, he said, is responsible for developing many local leaders across the islands. In the few instances where no local candidate became available or stood out for the program, a staff member, who being assigned to live and work there, is encouraged to and does actively engage him or herself in the community.

Kevin and I turned our discussion into consideration of Hawaiian culture and the state of conservation in Hawai`i. In addition to his position with TNC, he is on the board of the Department of Land and Natural Resources. Herein, he mentioned he has the duty to ensure that both culture and community are involved in conservation work. Moreover, he holds a governor-appointed position on a state-level Hawaiian culture advisory panel, that councils government agencies in relation to Hawaiian culture and protocol. In consideration of *kapu* (equivalent to Māori *tapu*) as part of the aboriginal Polynesian belief and protocol system, it is connected to *mana* (spiritual/supernatural power or essence) which is recognized to be within all that exists (Kanahele 1986:96,497; Young 2004:49). *Kapu*, being connected to *mana* then, was sacred taboo, or sacred restriction or a setting aside of some element in their world around them based on a respect for its *mana* (Kanahele 1986:40-43; Osorio 2002:10-11; Patterson 1992:13; Young 2004:49-50). In a practical sense, observance of *kapu* regulated behavior and directed usage patterns (Kanahele 1986:43; Young 2004:49-50). Thus, I asked if the notion of *kapu* in any way influences conservation in Hawai`i. He remarked that whatever remains of *kapu*, it does not influence local conservation thought. We discussed relevant history regarding the loss of any active notions of *kapu* in the culture -namely the jettisoning of *kapu*, along with many other Hawaiian religious beliefs by King Kamehameha. This may have directly led to the acceptance

of personal ownership of land, facilitating the acceptance of the *mahele* land ownership system, which resulted in the alienation and dispossession of Hawaiian lands (Osorio 2002:44-45). Thus, it seems that there is a cultural-historical link that exists between Hawaiian culture, its change and loss over time, and past land possession and control, to the present situation in Hawai`i.

There are current events that illustrate a heightened recognition, indeed a desire for, the inclusion of culture in contemporary Hawaiian conservation. I met with Alex in regards to the cultural and environmental roles the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) plays in conservation. On several fronts, Alex was positioned to speak with some authority on these matters. He is native to Hawai`i and he considers himself a Hawaiian. Additionally, he does hold a senior position in OHA. For him, there is no distinction to be made between land and culture. Thus, he assured that the organization had a goal to integrate cultural-care into conservation efforts. Yet, he recognized an area where difficulty can arise. He indicated that it seems non-Hawaiians do not care who owns or controls the land, but rather more about conservation. Hawaiians he felt, though concerned with conservation, care more about who owns and controls the land. The agency he works for, in recently gaining control over some land, will be developing a management plan to carry forward recent conservation efforts there and incorporate more those cultural dimensions associated with the land. In doing so, local assistance will be courted. Help is projected to arrive from three socio-cultural groups: Hawaiians connected to the land in question via past familial links, Hawaiians in general, and any who are interested in helping. He conceded however that his organization will likely, and of necessity, listen more to those lineally connected to the landscape in question and to those who actually come and provide service work and assistance. In sum, he declared that conservation in Hawaii cannot succeed without the inclusion of Hawaiian culture and practice.

Elements that play a role in regards to the level and extent of conservation in Hawai`i include familiarity with conservation needs and problems, some level of connection felt towards a particular piece of land/shoreline, and socio-economic status. Koli, a resident of Hawai`i from birth, has been involved with conservation education and efforts involving communities for many years now. In his various positions he has labored to connect communities to their local area, and specifically those portions needing conservation work. He said that after eight years of this work, he came to realize that considerations of culture, and culture itself, cannot and should not be removed from the work. He feels that a balance can be reached between accomplishing cultural aims (referring to cultural resources connected to land) and conservation goals. He asserts that encouragement and education concerning conservation know-how should begin early for several reasons. First, early on, children should be made aware of their own local surroundings, with grade school lessons stressing less the typical Western-world history, teaching rather principles and lessons more through events and history closer to home for the students- a place-based education. This, he feels, would build a stronger connection between people and the land around them. Knowledge then of Hawai`i's biological uniqueness and fragility would be more acute.

Koli also indicated that he felt such education would foster collaboration and cooperation, as involved parties gave up romanticized views of Hawaiians, realizing that they did not have all the answers (i.e. ancient Hawaiian/Polynesian lifeways did have caustic and destructive elements along with some good elements of stewardship). He cited a study by a researcher named Olsen, which found that immediately following Polynesian landings, local seabird populations plummeted. Lastly, he sees a connection between these elements with early

land dispossession and current socio-economic standings, which collectively inhibit local community authority over land and hence efforts at conservation. Land dispossession, he said, driven to a degree in Hawai'i by Christian Missionization, translates to disproportionate land holdings. A few own a vast majority of land and the many now struggle in an expensive tourism-focused landscape by holding multiple waged jobs. In this situation, he indicated that locals have less connection to land and moreover are too busy to engage in conservation efforts, being too busy trying to provide for themselves and family.

Koli mentioned other roadblocks to local conservation efforts that bespeak of valorization for other cultures and their epistemologies. At the 2003 North American Association for Environmental Education (NAAEE) conference held in Alaska, Koli indicated that the value of indigenous knowledge in regards to land and biotic relationships was discussed at length. It seems conference consensus advocated the need for such knowledge to be used judiciously on par with western scientific knowledge. Moreover, Koli said the scientists or workers themselves need to be integrated within or come from the communities related to the conservation projects near them. He acknowledged that while all interested parties should be consulted and their cultural views respected, it should be recognized that each has an agenda to forward. Even so, he also sees difficulty in moving forward due to fragmented local and Hawaiian communities, characterized by the presence of disparate constituent groups produced from a lack of centralizing-homogenizing leadership and disagreement on how to reach essentially similar goals.

The following day afforded a meeting with Koli and Uilani at a particular lagoon where some initial conservation efforts had taken place. Koli was there to help Uilani, a local resident

and UH graduate student living near the lagoon, develop further community involvement in a project to restore the lagoon to its former state of a Hawaiian fishpond. The lagoon, a wide shallow marine area with small islets, was many years ago to be dredged and developed into a marina. However, Uilani's grandmother was instrumental in mustering the community to oppose and prevent this. The lagoon was thereafter designated a wildlife sanctuary in the 1970s. Uilani related that since that time, and especially more recently, families in the community and various others connected to local conservancy groups in adjoining communities, have worked to clean up portions of the sanctuary. Not all in the community, however, see eye to eye on the efforts they are making. Some residents complained about and misunderstood their presence in the sanctuary while doing work, choosing to focus on the very temporary side-effect of birds not landing there amidst human intrusion and noise. These people she said are those whose backyards and property straddle the edge of the sanctuary affording them some scenic views of wildlife, solitude, and privacy. This highlights a challenge Uilani expressed in regards to effective community-wide communication concerning conservation goals and the work to be done, and a state of disunity within the community in regards to these goals.

I asked Uilani why she was interested in working at the sanctuary in an effort to restore it and what some of the challenges were. She explained that her family over many generations had lived in this very area, developing a relationship with it; therefore she wanted to keep ties to both the land and the ocean by taking care of it. Being that she wants to restore it back to its previous state as a fishpond, she views the sanctuary as a cultural resource and links its restoration to both an acknowledgment of and the return of an element of previous Hawaiian lifeways. However, some residents do not want a change in the sanctuary's present character, not wanting fishing to return there. Additionally there is disagreement among community residents over who should

have access to fish there should it be restored to a fishpond in the first place. Moreover, the state owns some portion of land on the adjacent side of the lagoon; a fact which Uilani laments citing the difficulty in working with the state, since they have so many subdivisions and bodies of authority, miring processes, decision making, and ultimately, progress.

### **Identified Core Factors in Hawai`i**

These interviews and communications, in sampling aspects of Hawai`i's conservation, collectively enumerate core challenges and factors at play therein. Evan, Stacy, Lori and Koli all recognized the lack of a central and coagulating cultural or indigenous group leader, both within or without communities. Kevin and Koli identified the lack of land that Hawaiians possess and control, along with the need for indigenous Hawaiian knowledge and culture to contribute in local conservation. Both espoused education as a remedy for the latter concern. Lori acknowledged the existence of divergent goals among constituencies, based on ethno-cultural backgrounds, with some partnerships existing only to meet micro-goals in conservation, not amounting to real community involvement. Uilani also has experienced the difficulty of navigating the divergent cultural expectation divide, expressing her own drive to conserve and restore based on maintaining a previous family members relationship with the land. Koli and Alex each felt that Hawaiians are concerned with land control first and conservation second. Lastly, Koli asserts that poor participation can be attributed to not only few available areas natives can try to start projects with and a lack of control or influence over land, but also the socio-economic condition occupied by indigenous Hawaiians that often precludes discretionary time to lend to such projects. These issues point to Hawai`i's history and culture as housing events and culturally-embedding values that presently impinge themselves upon contemporary socio-cultural relations within the context of bicultural or multicultural community conservation.



The following chapter briefly examines these socio-cultural and historic events and aspects, as  
cued by these identified concerns and issues.

## CHAPTER VII

### HAWAII'S PAST MADE PRESENT

The examination of Hawai'i continues in like fashion of the New Zealand chapters, so as to facilitate a competent comparison between the two. The long-distance investigations ahead of the fieldwork, and the fieldwork itself, identified key socio-cultural and historically originated factors related to the present state of community conservation and conservation in general throughout the state of Hawai'i. What then follows in this chapter is a brief examination of those factors that are seen as relevant and contributory to the present expression of Hawai'i's conservation, based on the influence of culturally-determined institutions and beliefs in conjunction with events that are now part of Hawai'i's historical fabric, a fabric which ever so presently clothes Hawai'i's contemporary socio-cultural society.

#### **Hawaiian Kinship, Social Organization, and Land**

It has been posited above that Māori kinship and social organization is a prototypical Polynesian manifestation; if this is the case, then the assertion that Polynesians were not originally highly-politically organized or socially-complex, having instead an organization more akin to clan organization, may very well ring true for Hawai'i (Goldman 1957:374-375; Keesing 1947:58,88; Williamson 1975:206). Williamson (1975:206-207) states that originally Polynesian colonizers as a group, were small family/kin based entities, that only far- removed from the colonizing event, developed localized patterns of kinship and social organization, as group size and competition increased, leading to splintering and domination by some over others. In Hawai'i's case, greater concentration of authority fed more powerful chiefs, creating an elite and reducing the number of chiefs in general; as ties became removed between chiefs and

kindred, a separation of genealogical descent and chieftainship occurred, due to a merging of descent and ancestor respect, ultimately creating a sacred chieftainship and a highly stratified society (Cordy 1981:18; Goldman 1955:680; Williamson 1975:207).

In such a system, land tenure patterns were far different from previous conventions that were more based on a kin and tribe structure. Within the complex chiefdoms that developed in Hawai`i, land holding was a reward for service to the chief, and territorial divisions were arbitrarily formed as land grants (Cordy 1981:18; Goldman 1957:385-386). Royalty was based upon seniority and followed the lineage principle through descent lines equally through either males or females (Goldman 1957:385-386). Only on the issue of land tenure was the lineage principle broken (Goldman 1957:385-386). Higher *ali`i* (chiefs) granted large tracts to subordinate *ali`i*, who in turn allocated subdivisions to their followers, or the commoner-farm laborers who collectively reserved the right to change alliances and land if maltreated (Goldman 1957:385-386; Trask 1993:5-6). Goldman (1957:385-386) concedes that this later condition differed significantly from an earlier condition, referring to what may have been a near contemporary manifestation of what previously persisted throughout Hawai`i, in the Ka`u district on the big island of Hawai`i. In his division of Hawaiian civilization into five epochs, the first three are said to be ruled by males with seniority, title, authority and land, with a maintained relatedness between commoners and chiefs (Goldman 1970:212). Indeed, what had before existed in Ka`u, likely was the picture of Hawaiian social, kinship and land organization before the onset of highly-stratified chiefdoms and the post-European contact kingdom that followed (Lane 1960:1101).

The kinship and social organization in the district seems to have been this earlier prototypical system that existed among Polynesian voyagers and colonizers. Residents in Ka`u regarded themselves as one people, and as one tribe being bred from a single parental stock, and tied to that particular `aina (territory), by ancestry and birth (Handy and Pukui 1958:viii-ix, 2-3, 40). Hawaiians of Ka`u memorized and passed on recitations of their genealogies, connecting them to their past and ancestors, garnering prestige and status thereby (Handy and Pukui 1958:195-196). Descent in this region departs from the so-called “Hawaiian” system of bilateralism, as male children there were claimed by the father’s side and the females were claimed by the mother’s side (Handy and Pukui 1958:43). In Ka`u, biological relationship was ordered along three factors: generation, genealogical seniority, and sex (Handy and Pukui 1958:43). Descriptive kinship terms were still used, except that parents were not called by any parental name but rather by their first given names (Handy and Pukui 1958:44). The family here, stratified by generations and status, was determined by genealogical seniority and not by generation or age seniority- thus identification with a senior genealogical branch could grant members of a younger generation more status than persons older than them who belonged to a genealogically inferior branch (Handy and Pukui 1958:43). Lane (1960:1101) having reviewed the material, asserts that Ka`u was predominately endogamous with post-marital residence being matrilineal among the commoners and patrilineal among the chiefs. The district still seemed to have some stratification within it, having lesser and higher or paramount chiefs who were nonetheless relatives of those under them, along with priests of the gods *Ku* and *Lono*, and outcasts (Handy and Pukui 1958:198-199, 202). Handy and Pukui (1958:41) and Goldman (1970:214) characterize the people of Ka`u as a kin-based, territorially and not politically organized tribe with connections to specific land, adding that tribes once existed throughout

Hawai`i in areas separated by natural boundaries, with groups asserting a common ancestral origin (e.g. Kalalau, Hanapepe, and Waimea on Kauai, the great valley communities of west and east Maui and of windward Hawai`i, such as Waipi`o and Waimanu).

### **Hawaiian Worldview, Cultural Values and Beliefs**

The ways in which a group of people collectively envision and view the world around them, frame the ways they think and interact, based on the values and beliefs connected to this worldview (Dudley 1990:91). Hawaiians are no exception to this axiom. Polynesians, not excluding Hawaiians, hold an evolutionary view of the cosmos (Dudley 1990:39,129).

Traditional Hawaiians felt that all that exists in the world around them, does so as part of an evolutionary chain, progressing up to man, with a shared divinity and *mana* to man, nature and the cosmos (Dudley 1990:42; Kanahale 1986:497). This view sees man as both kin-related to and part of a conscious environment (Dudley 1990:91-93). With this consciousness or sentience, the environment is a partner to man, requiring communication for cooperation, with each caring for the other (Dudley 1990:93,101). Moreover, as plants (e.g. *kalo* or *taro*- the Hawaiian staple crop) were most closely related to man, caring for the environment was in fact caring for kin, and thereby this kin took care of humans in return (Dudley 1990:94,101; Kanahale 1986:40; Trask 1993:6). *Kapu* in this belief system, was the observation of sacredness within, and the guarding of it through prohibition or guidelines to usage (Kanahale 1986:40,42). Adherence to *kapu* pleased the gods, whereas the opposite brought their displeasure, wrath, or the sentence of death (Kanahale 1986:42-43). The idea of the holy, and the usage patterns it demanded, became a self-policing system that governed interaction with the surrounding world, ranging from the regulation of taking fish when not in spawning season to proper human waste disposal (Kanahale

1986:40,42-43; Trask 1993:6). Hawaiian culture then valued all around in a view that saw relatedness between land, flora, fauna, and man, requiring respect between them all.

### **Culture Collision, Culture Loss**

At the time the United States was still endeavoring to maintain independence from Britain, Captain John Cook reached Hawai`i in 1778, bringing to the island's population a knowledge of the western world and a cultural collision they could not have envisioned (Kuykendall and Day 1948:v). The ensuing collision introduced the diseases of syphilis, gonorrhea, tuberculosis, smallpox, measles, leprosy, and typhoid fever, which in connection with the changed life patterns from the destruction of their moral code, the chiefly land system, and religion, resultantly reduced Hawaiians from an estimated 500,000 to 1 million persons at the time of Captain Cook's arrival, to less than 40,000 by 1890 (Osorio 2002: 9-10, Trask 1993:7-8). Not long after the time period of Cook's visits and death, Kamehameha, who was likely already on the trajectory of conquering all the islands, used foreign recruits, boats, technology, and advice to unite all the island's peoples under his rule, establishing the first Hawaiian monarchy A. D. 1792 (Fornander 1968:213-214; Kuykendall and Day 1948:23-28; Osorio 2002:9).

Culture loss came primary through the loss of lands and beliefs. Christian prohibitions and missionary efforts eroded the ancient belief systems, dejecting notions of land, gods, *tapu*, *mana*, *pono* (righteousness, balance) and their beliefs of man's connection and responsibility to them (Osorio 2002:10-11; Trask 1993:7-8). The traditional system of *kapu*, which included a separation of men and women while eating, especially among the ali`i, was challenged and done away with when Kamehameha the II, influenced by those around him, broke this tapu by eating with women (Osorio 2002: 10-11). With the abasement of *ali`i*, who formerly were looked upon

as something greater than men, and the rejection of *kapu* through his act, came a rejection of the entire religious system, and an erosion of the land system and views toward land (Kuykendall and Day 1948:40). Between 1845 and 1850, the *mahele*, a sequence of actions and land sales, which produced a redistribution of land and introduced private land ownership, especially among and benefitting foreign residents, came about through pressure and influence by missionaries and businessmen (Kame`eleihiwa 1992:287; Osorio 2002:44-47). The severe disease toll killed so many Hawaiians that the *mahele* in reality came to be a foreign way to manage emptied land (Osorio 2002:47-49). These events in aggregate left a reduced and weakened population that was dispossessed of land and with a crippled culture and belief system, was living in a manner far divergent from their ancestors.

### **Sovereignty to Statehood- Implications of Imperialism**

Rebuilding a decimated society and country required foreign input and economic stimulus, which led Hawai`i and her people to new situations, difficult decisions, and ultimately a changed place. In succession, the sandalwood trade with its spectacular rise and fall, and the rise of the sugar industry markedly changed the face of the land and the constituency of the nation, as land was cleared for use and foreign nationals were brought in to buttress depopulated areas in need of workers (Kuykendall and Day 1948:42-43,51,87). Over time, the government increasingly became more Western and infused with American businessmen and missionaries, who in seeking to benefit themselves economically, undermined the monarchy in conjunction with a rogue U.S. Senate representative, the Military under his control, and a callous U.S. President Cleveland (Kuykendall and Day 1948:69-186; Liliuokalani 1964:173,177-178,179,180-182, 209-210,234-241; Trask 1993:21-25,49,62). Hawai`i's last monarch, Queen Liliuokalani (1964:241-242) relates with indignation and resignation, that those who

accomplished the Monarchical overthrow and theft of her nation, did so with the self-righteous and telling proclamation “to protect American life and property!”

These events, the results of western imperialism upon Hawai`i’s people, culture and lands, has left a Hawai`i bereft of self-determination, an intact culture and people, and way of life built in-situ over 1400 years. Land increasingly came under foreign control while a society became ever more heterogeneous (Kuykendall and Day 1948:186,189,211-212; Trask 1993:88-89). Successively, Hawai`i went from Republic, to U.S. territory, and lastly to U.S. statehood (Kuykendall and Day 1948:184-193). With the Spanish-American War in 1897, the U.S. Military gained a presence, which has grown and remained ever after (Kuykendall and Day 1948:188). These events indicate that Hawai`i has little land available for Hawaiians to control and use. The land is overrun by settlers, capitalists, and of course by tourists; many Hawaiians then are dislocated, subjugated, and abused (Trask 1993:21-25). For those Hawaiians who are still able to live in Hawai`i, the culture and land is vastly different from what their ancestors knew.



## CHAPTER VIII

### DISCUSSION

The foregoing chapters related resident's comments from New Zealand and Hawaiian communities in relation to the challenges, problems and issues attendant to community conservation. Moreover these chapters identified some key clues to socio-cultural and historical factors currently at play. Thus, additional chapters briefly identified the relevant background factors for these Polynesian-multicultural societies. The remaining task at hand for the purpose of this study, is to comparatively analyze the data to highlight the key contemporary cultural and historical socio-cultural factors influencing the cross-cultural communication and collaboration within the Maungatautari project and community.

#### **Māori and Hawaiian Links to Land**

In the case of Maungatautari, Māori were involved from the inception to the present. Those in the area were familiar with local Māori and their formal group connections, and likewise the Māori in the area were familiar with the community, being a part of it. There was little debate or doubt as to the Māori tribes or subtribes that were intimately connected to and involved historically and culturally with the mountain and region. This fact enabled easy identification of those who were connected to the mountain and region, and thus needed contact and engagement as the project began. Two Māori subtribes are currently present in the area and have a physical presence in the form of their *marae*. These *marae* again constitute a sacred, localizing, focal point for the *hapu* members, connecting them to the land. The meeting houses on the *marae* carry carvings of ancestors who are connected to the land and therefore extend this connection to the land through to extant progeny within a tribal and subtribe system.

The tribal nature of Māori then is a key element to Māori identity and presence through the marae. Representing a more proto-typical Polynesian kinship and social organization, Māori kinship, social, and political structure was expressed at once through a kin-based entity, the *hapu*. In this structure, the highest political entity was the chief, representing the strongest male link to a common ancestor. This individual, however, remained family in every sense of the term and was not separated out from the group, but rather lived in the village or village area with all their kinsmen. The family's (i.e. the *hapu*) social life revolved around itself, its leader and head father. Each individual existed as part of this group identity, through linkages to a chief who was not considered a god or god-like. Group unity and its expression then emanates from the marae and its shared nature.

With the lack of high to extreme social stratification in Māori *hapu* society, the *marae* takes on more significant and a larger role in every subtribe's experience. Māori society again had chiefs and commoners, yet these commoners emphasized their close connections to the elite and the elite themselves lived not far above the commoners. The *marae* then was not an elite's residence or place of worship, but rather it was and is a gathering place for the subtribes members, no matter their status. All alike played a role in the *marae*'s activities and responsibilities. In modern times the subtribe no longer lives together in fast communities, yet the *marae* remains. The *marae* now in a sense, is an extended family's gathering place, wherein identity is maintained, where ties to each other and the land are expressed and affirmed, and a location where the 'other' can come to and find a distinct and a unified entity that is connected to the area. Indeed, for all these reasons, the *marae* can well be considered the "heart of Māori society" (Kanahele 1986:xv).

Concerning Hawai`i, the social and kinship organization started off at colonization as prototypically Polynesian, evolving away from the flat, kin-based structures to the highly-stratified chiefdoms. We have some evidence in the work of Handy and Pukui that the tribal social structure existed in Hawai`i, at least in Ka`u on the Big Island, and at other locations where it is also inferred to have existed. The familial kin-based chief evolved into a socially separated and sacred chieftainship, wherein kin ties to the commoner were downplayed if not outright disavowed or proclaimed no longer existing. Indeed, as chiefdoms developed further, commoners became workers of land that held no ties to them; each island came to be controlled by a single paramount chief called the *Mō`ī* (Kame`eleihiwa 1992:51). Chiefs through prestige and the projection of mana and power, attracted followers or subdued them, to work on their own lands. In return, this unrelated chief met the material needs of his subjects. Thus, commoners and chiefs in Hawai`i came to have no expressly clear and distinct relations, existing and relating socially and politically in chiefdoms far and away divergent from tribal and kin-based groups. The lack of a centering tradition, that stressed kinship ties, enables the acceptance of the lack of any sort of Hawaiian *marae* equivalent.

Hawai`i had no distinct, localizing, focusing, land-connecting, ancestor-linking form such as the Māori *marae*, which produces important implications regarding land tenure and identity. The vast majority of Hawai`i's inhabitants did not necessarily live on land specifically linked to them through ancestral genealogies, thus lacking land tenure in the commoner segment of the population. Moreover, how could such ties exist or come to exist, when generation to generation did not inherent any such link to maintain and pass on? This is not to say that Hawaiian peoples did not have strong felt feelings for land, rather there is no culturally-embedded and ubiquitous presence of a kin- or tribal-based institution or structure that linked a group through ties of

kinship to a specific area or plot of ground. Without such a recognizable structure at the subtribe level or higher, be it socio-cultural and or physical, there is no easily recognizable entity to approach for any specific plot or area of ground. Thus, for any group approaching an area for conservation work, there is no specific single group with which to negotiate and work. Alas, there are no equivalents to the *marae* in Hawai'i.

### **Cultural Beliefs and Values**

The Māori worldview centers on the belief that asserts kin relationship to the surrounding world and all that is within it, be it animate or inanimate. The *Atua* or gods were to be seen in the world, in its structure and life. From such a belief, the world and what it provided was to be used in respectful appreciation through the convention of *tapu*, which can be characterized, when disconnected from spiritual-religious connotations, as sustainable use. However, it has been archaeologically shown that much extinction (e.g. the Moa) took place at the hands of Māori, especially in the earlier periods following arrival and initial colonization. Yet, it has also been concluded that the distinctiveness of New Zealand's environment, being significantly divergent from the standard environments with which Polynesians were accustomed, likely challenged these new arrivals in new ways, producing a period wherein both mistakes and maladaptive practices occurred, while yet producing through trial and error, more sustainable practices. That the Māori reached a balance has been debated. However, are there significant indices which indicate that in some aspects, such a balance was reached under the rubric of *tapu*. The *huia*, a flightless wren, was prized by Māori for its feathers, which came to be used as ornamentation upon the heads of those having great mana (Young 2004:94). They became such prized possessions of the Māori that exquisitely carved boxes (*waka huia*) were made just to hold the feathers when not in use (Young 2004:94). Through the restraint of *tapu*, all indicators point to a

pattern of sustainable use (Young 2004:94). When a feather was placed in the bowler hat of the visiting European Duke of York, a craze was started that in conjunction with habitat loss and feline predation, ultimately caused its extinction (Young 2004:94).

Another significant point, underscored by various inputs, needs to be made concerning the transmission of Māori traditional beliefs. Any belief system intended to transcend time, and remain ubiquitous, is only as good as its mechanisms for retention and transmission. If the guiding beliefs of a group or society are not remembered and passed on to successive generations, then those beliefs no longer hold any potency. The tribal and specifically the sub-tribe organization among the Māori facilitated effective transmission of their cultural beliefs through the generations. The strength of the hapu, translated into the strength of the belief system's longevity and effectiveness. However, there is significant culturally-based heterogeneity among Māori in that continuity remains the prevue of the *hapu*, and somewhat less so in the *iwi*, but outside of these organizations, that is from tribe to tribe, diversity exists. Each *hapu* maintains its own unique traditions and beliefs. However, conversely this means that should a treasured cultural belief become altered or rejected by any person of great significance, or any *hapu*, the change, whatever it may be, such as *tapu* or connection to land, is not institutionally implemented in the remaining tribes. There is no one blanket Māori cultural authority. Thus, should a significant change occur in one group, there is no obligation by any other group to follow suit. A change in a key or central belief would not necessarily spread among the entire population.

Hawaiian cultural beliefs and values do not vary much from those of Māori. In their worldview they do have an evolutionary view of the cosmos and assert the condition of a shared

divinity between all that exists, with all related as kin. Respectful use of the environment was in no way different from that of caring for a next of kin, realizing that they then in the future may be cared for by this kin. Moreover, 'nature' is sentient, and thus deserving of communication as when human may come to bear upon it. Thus, the observance of *kapu* (same as Māori *tapu*) was integral to human-environmental relations, which when practiced adroitly, produced the beneficence of the gods, and in a practical sense, sustainable use practices (Dudley 1990:94,101; Kanahele 1986:40,42-43; Trask 1993:6; Young 2004:51-52). But did such holistic and balanced relationships always exist? Here, of course we see the same pattern as before. Certainly, extinctions occurred with the arrival of Polynesians who would become Hawaiians. However, these taper off, developing into a human-environmental relationship that came to support 300,000 to possibly 1 million Hawaiians (Redman 1999:71). However, this is not to say that this large population figure equates to unequivocal harmonious living. Archaeology has well demonstrated the transformative and somewhat deleterious effect of intensive agriculture within Hawai'i's Polynesian past (Redman 1999:70-73) and in New Zealand (Young 2004:43). Yet here again, in comparing this to New Zealand, we find that trends of environment destruction distinctly speed up and widened soon after the time of Western colonialization (Redman 1999:70-71).

However, the real point here lies in the notion of cultural transmission. In Hawai'i notions of *kapu*, connection to land, the gods et cetera, likely became more abstract in the absence of familial or tribal-based land and the connections to it. Just as the character of the status lineage changed by losing its patrilineal features, kinship unity and eventually its economic, religious and social functions changed as well with the loss of the patrilineal tribe or subtribe (Goldman 1957:388). Thereafter, the character of cultural belief and belief systems

changed, since they were less anchored within the new social-cultural structure. A belief system in such a less-integrated and more abstracted position is both more difficult to generationally pass on and would be susceptible to challenges of validity. The key cultural notions seen to have been thus weakened, and thereby critically relevant to the developments that frame modern Hawaiian society in terms of conservation work, is the suite centered around *kapu*. *Kapu*, when operational, links notions of respect for gods and their creations, respect for kin that exists as elements of the environment and respect for a person's ancestors who inhabited the land before, and passed it on. In this linkage, identity, group solidarity and connectedness to land was maintained. Within this socio-cultural milieu these very notions and linkages, absent extra-societal influence, are more transmissible and far from being ephemeral.

### **Entre into a Western World**

New Zealand and Hawai'i in their early histories experienced many similar stops in the course of Western contact and colonization, and yet both arrived at very different destinations. The deviations between the two are of particular import to this comparison, as they are identified to be the background factors to the present socio-cultural, political, and economic configuration each nation/state possesses. Recall that New Zealand as a nation possesses as its foundational document, the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, and as such transparently evinces the coming together of various Māori tribal chiefs and Pākehā to discuss and sign the treaty. Debate surrounding the treaty centers on discrepancies between the Māori language version and the Pākehā or English one, which can be attributed jointly to the difficulty inherent in translation and the negotiations between culturally-embedded constructs, and to purposeful deceit and machinations to obtain land. The treaty does indicate that a preponderance of Māori leaders wanted to create a society wherein foreigners would be reined in by the Crown, Māori would be every bit as equal and part

of a new society, and the interests of both parties concerning land and resources would be met under the protective scrutiny of the crown. However, over the years following its official enactment date in 1840, the Treaty became a legal avenue for settlers to obtain land and dispossess Maori, with the situation reaching an apex in 1870's declaration that the treaty had "no legal status and [that] tribes [were] to have no customary rights enforceable in the courts" (Smith 2005:49). Also in the latter half of the century, disease, land wars, and foreign immigration resulted in a large swing to a Pākehā majority and a fifty percent reduction in Māori lands. Indeed, the treaty's ink contained lofty aspirations yet to be reached.

However in 1975, events culminated in the passing of the Treaty of Waitangi Tribunal Act, affording Māori redress for land and cultural grievances, and thereafter, with additional legislation, extending such redress retroactively to 1840. Part of this entire development can be attributed to a Māori cultural resurgence through many factors, but primarily in the form of new energetic leaders (Metge 2001:2; Smith 2005:227). The tribunal and its significant advisements to the government in favor of Māori and the environment, fueled the resurgence onward and brought to the nation's discursive surface notions that the treaty was not in fact a singular example of the crown's beneficence, nor an absolute cessation of sovereignty by Māori, but rather that its signatories meant to create a unified nation (Williams 1989:64; Metge 2001:4). In this development we discern the surfacing of longstanding problems into the national mind and discourse, and more importantly, the re-conceptualization of the treaty as a document constituting a covenant relationship between the cultural groups that comprise New Zealand society and a national birth certificate (Williams 1989:64).



Land ownership has not only been significant for only Māori, but for Pākehā as well. Pākehā identity and culture in New Zealand includes multi-generational ties to land, enjoyment of the environment, and discussion that finds commonality in a shared British heritage. Immigrants of western Europe and specifically the British empire, shared a language and past steeped in the adamantly proper culture of a stratified society, and upon arrival in New Zealand, found a land wherein a new more broadly equal, land-owning society could be constructed (Bell 1996:4-7). Moreover, all participated in and were subject to various discourses that in seeking for a national identity obfuscated the bloody and disharmonious relationship with the Māori and their indigenous rights to land and self-determination (Bell 1996:9). It is on this point that Rōpata's comments become especially relevant. His life experience of being half-Māori and raised Pākehā and now endeavoring to return to the former, straddles two cultures, and sees the discourses of both. He has begun the process of healing the wounds received from Pākehā cultural oppression by reconnecting to his land, his family (*hapu*) and *marae*. His own healing stands as analogy for the entire contemporary society that still seeks to heal old wounds and hone a national kiwi identity.

Hawai'i's entrance into the Western world initially mimics that of New Zealand's, diverging significantly thereafter over time. The Sandwich Islands and all Hawaiians became united under one ruler with Kamehameha subjecting all the islands under its first monarchy near the end of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. A single ruler now had the control over all the Hawaiian peoples, and placed the monarchy in a position to significantly influence Hawaiian culture. Indeed, in the infancy of Kamehameha the II's rule, *kapu*, and by extension many interrelated traditional cultural-religious beliefs, were jettisoned in the face of western ideals and Christianity. The wide-spectrum erosion of significance and relevancy attached to many influential notions,

specifically, the related notions of resource and land sacredness, opened the way for cultural acceptance of the commoditization, divestiture, and redistribution of land to foreigners through the *mahele* system.

Presently in Hawai`i, Hawaiians have little significant control over any of the land. A cursory look at land area maps reveals three things. First, a preponderance of communities and people in Hawai`i live close to shorelines for topographical and likely desirability reasons; second, a portion of land is devoted to agricultural enterprises (sugar cane and pineapple); and thirdly, a much larger portion of land is usurped collectively by organizations (e.g. city and residential areas, military bases and state or international agency conservation projects). The majority of conservation, in terms of land area, is controlled through state agencies and international conservancy groups. The practical barriers then for the germination of a large community-controlled terrestrial project includes both the lack of conveniently located suitable land to conserve and a lack of political-positionality requisite to assert enough influence to control land sufficiently and thereby have a place to conserve. It can be argued then that this present situation can be linked to the *mahele* process. Moreover, the *mahele* is linked to the official rejection of *tapu* and other core beliefs as part of encroaching Western influence and the deleterious effects brought on by cultural collision within colonialization.

### **Ultimate and Proximate Factors**

Comparison has identified and highlighted the ultimate and proximate factors behind the culture of conservation at the Maungatautari. The differences and similarities Hawai`i's conservation climate presents, indeed has highlighted the factors present in New Zealand that are lacking in Hawai`i. This is not to say that community conservation in Hawai`i cannot become

like or on the scale of what is occurring in Aotearoa, rather again it merely highlights the key factors that are at work in New Zealand's case. Therefore, the ultimate factors are those socio-cultural and socio-cultural-historical background factors that affect the current situation by being farthest and broadest in terms of a deeper time relationship to the phenomenon in question, and having a wide and general relationship with it. The proximate factors are those factors that are seen to have evolved from the ultimate factors and are much closer in time to and or synchronic to the phenomenon.

A primary and ultimate factor that more broadly affects the current socio-cultural milieu and bicultural community collaboration is the presence of a tribe or sub-tribe system. The Māori tribal system, expressed most outwardly through the *hapu*, constitutes a broad and long-standing element that has also produced a number of expressions that compose proximate factors. Through the tribal system, the social structure remained more flat or less-stratified. Moreover, each tribe and sub-tribe maintained its own version of the larger culture, effectively compartmentalizing Māori culture, which has the effect of both facilitating unique localized variation and yet bolsters against radical cultural change from extra-cultural or top-down sources. The tribal structure founded on a close ancestral kinship system, maintained strong linkages to land, cultural values and traditions. Furthermore, when such linkages remain intact and vibrant, and in particular those that encompass connections to land and ancestors, the strength and cohesiveness of the group in its beliefs toward the land is more effectively passed on over generations. An objection here might be posited: did not Māori engage in a great deal of internecine warfare and experience thereby, drastic and varied land control/occupation change? Indeed these events are empirically established as occurring with regularity. However, the focus on and desire for linkages again provided those new to an area by conquest, to find a connection

to it, just as any one individual could decide which ancestor they wished to emphasize connections to, whether through their maternal or paternal lines. It may also be the case that new occupiers to an area did not mind appropriation and the adoption of a new 'ancestral' land. In any case, land then subsequently obtained by conflict, quickly became linked to the group over a few generations. Thus, through tribal kinship and social organization, strong ties to land are maintained to land, and transmitted from generation to generation.

Juxtaposed to Hawai`i, New Zealand Māori did not have a highly-stratified social organization, but rather a simple-ranked structure with minimal social distance, that was linked to a small territory (Cordy 1981:42-43). The presence of such a system far precluded the trajectory of a complex-chiefdom. Hawai`i of course was at the chiefdom stage at European contact and moving toward full island-chain domination by one chief. In New Zealand, the lack of conglomeration posed a natural barrier to sweeping political machinations and easy subversion of cultural beliefs. However, in both cases, land possession is key, or more specifically, the control of land. While New Zealand possessed the Treaty of Waitangi, this did not prevent the dispossession of land from Māori. However, in contemporary times, the presence of the treaty does at least afford Māori a path of recourse. In Hawai`i, the absence of any such grand and wide treaty leaves no direct recourse for its indigenous peoples.

Additionally, the Hawaiian monarchy, which was subjected to Western culture and surrounded by powerful Western cultural groups living in Hawai`i, participated in the change of important cultural construals, starting at the highest echelons from where it filtered down into the greater society. Machinations by outside groups need only instigate change at this high level to effect top-down change in cultural structure and belief systems. It was through such changes that

core cultural beliefs and values came to be weakened and rejected in Hawai'i, facilitating the disaffection of land and the control of it. Moreover, taken to its fullest extreme, the monarchy also came to be weakened and finally marginalized, subverted and negated. The country was then led away from serving its core constituency, to the service of resident foreigners. With the removal of land and control over it, how can land be inherited or transmitted down over generations? Moreover, without such land and control passed down to the present, how can indigents primarily control and initiate a conversation project in the first place?

The retention of key cultural beliefs is also a proximate factor linked to the ultimate one of tribalism. In New Zealand, the notions of *tapu*, balance, and of a clear connection to land and ancestry directly influence contemporary conservation. With a minority status in New Zealand, Māori of necessity assert their rights and interests. Through national and international environmental discourse, the trust, and to a degree the whole of New Zealand, has come to realize the value of indigenous knowledge and inclusion. In this case, Māori knowledge includes not only concepts and practical applications for conservation, but also protocol and practical guidelines for the navigation of cross-cultural communication and decision making (see Metge 2001).

The Treaty of Waitangi itself is another key factor at work here in the middle ground between ultimate and proximate. The community around Maungatautari is of course part of a larger society that is endeavoring to create a national identity. In having the treaty, both parties can at least see what each party was in the past, trying to jointly create. The treaty's signatories at least wanted to create a new entity together. What that 'something' is, is of course debated. Yet, at least there is open debate with listening occurring on both sides. Also, it can be said that

the Waitangi Tribunals would never have come about, if in the first case there was no treaty. The fact that the Tribunal recommendations are being heard, considered and in some cases followed, indicates that the listening is real; and that contemporary society is interested in creating or reinvigorating the joint 'kiwi' identity.

In this larger milieu, Pākehā, having arrived more recently to New Zealand, have straddled two cultural worlds. Ties to England remain in language conventions, food, sports, and even car driving habits (e.g. right side drive vehicles). Yet, in the land of the long white cloud (*Aotearoa* -Māori name for New Zealand), they have had to navigate an all-together different society. The lack of a well-established British social stratification, could be a negative or positive element depending on one's views; but in New Zealand's case, a larger proportion of the immigrant population came to own land as they worked to carve out lives in their new home. Multi-generational ties to land, land seemingly tamed from wild bush by one's immigrant pilgrim ancestor, provide an important link in much the same way it does for Māori.

For many of the Pākehā living near to and involved in the Maungatautari project, the return of native biota is increasingly important. It was expressed by some, that native birdsong and flowers are missed and much desired to return. It could be said that desiring the return of a particular bird so that one may enjoy the birdsong again, is a bit selfish. However, the return of native birdsong, and hence native birds, is in a sense recapturing the land that one's ancestors knew. In the case of Uilani in Hawai'i, this is exactly what she is doing. She is endeavoring to restore her own family's link to the lagoon through mimicry of her own grandmother's interest and work there; thereby she preserves the relationship of her grandmother to the land and ocean,

and her own relationship to her grandmother, by conserving the lagoon and thus reestablishing links to it and creating a shared cultural-environmental link between them.

Another proximate factor lies in the simplicity of New Zealand's political divisions and institutions. New Zealand is relatively politically flat or less stratified than the United States, having fewer hierarchical government institutions. It does not have states, rather having districts and cities. Less governmental hierarchy translates to fewer parties vying for inclusion, control or oversight. In New Zealand, fewer agencies produce less red tape and hurdles to get over in establishing a conservation project. Moreover, decision making and movement forward is aided through effective and sufficient communication, coordination, and collaboration, whereas with too many divisions and agencies, decision making becomes overly complicated, resulting in forestalled action. In much the same way cross-cultural misunderstanding also complicates decision-making processes and forestalls action forward. Bureaucratic redundancy and pettiness, along with cross-cultural misunderstandings, both effectively constitute deterrents to community-led, located and orchestrated conservation projects.

Lastly, both sides engage in give and take. I was informed that some individuals wanted to use the trails on Maungatautari to mountain bike. The Māori purportedly objected to this and the idea was rejected. On the other side, again, recall that all bird populations are being assisted to the utmost in making a recovery through the willful abatement of hunting. For those Māori in the area who retain the strong culturally-derived desire to eat the bird, when nearing one's end of life, the decisions to not take the bird constitutes a concession as well. This give and take occurs in discussion and decision-making that includes representatives of all involved parties. It is through such dialogue that New Zealand's society is being re-envisioned from the ground up.

## CHAPTER IX

### CONCLUSION

In undertaking complex and intricate projects, such as conservation reserves, there are nearly innumerable pieces of the puzzle that need to be placed together, akin to a jigsaw puzzle, to ensure success. It is the argument of this paper that for any productive action to take place, wherein the pieces are gathered together and identified as to where they need to be, effective communication needs to be first established to produce collaborative work. This is ever more applicable in multicultural communities that house differing cultural histories and experiences. In the Maungatautari community, the Māori and Pākehā members have and currently engage in the management and implementation of a complicated and audacious conservation project. The collaboration that has taken place has included and institutionalizes continuing involvement of both parties together in the trust organization, in the work it undertakes, and further cements and establishes the community's identity.

#### **A Culture of Biculturalism**

The question asked about this development has focused on the culture at work in this community and collaboration and the factors behind this culture. In addressing this question, interviews have been conducted with individuals and organizations on the ground. To highlight the most relevant factors, a comparison has been employed. The socio-cultural histories of New Zealand and Hawai'i have been explored to buttress and contextualize the factors attendant to the phenomenon. Through the comparison, a suite of factors has been identified, some interrelated, some more distant in time, and some more recent, as creating the conditions wherein the members of the Maungatautari community have constructively navigated the differences



associated with bicultural societies. Culturally embedded values, beliefs, and traditions, often differ among cultural groups, and some to an extent that collaboration is precluded or so exceedingly difficult that progress is mired or non-existent. In the case of the Maungatautari community these differences do exist, yet they have found a path that both cultural groups created and jointly proceed on.

The Māori community constituency brings to the collaboration an ease of identification concerning their connection to the area and of their own group-ness and identity through the subtribe organization and the *marae*. It is through this kinship-based social organization that they have and do retain a connection to the land and its biota. Also, it is through these institutions that the Māori groups in the area have retained many of their core beliefs that influence how they interact and the very conservation strategies they help develop. The notion of *tapu/kapu*, though no longer practiced widely or traditionally, still does inform conservation efforts. Māori have chosen to enact this sacred restraint in new ways, engaging use-limits that have no known expiration in order to allow all possible benefit to the restoration of species. Māori discourse concerning collaborative engagement, discussion, and decision making, has entered the national mindset, through the efforts of many; and quite effectively through the efforts of Dame Joan Metge and her Māori friends and cultural advisors (see Metge 2001).

The Pākehā community also brings to the collaboration a fondness for the land that has sustained them and their recent ancestors. They share a recent cultural background that in New Zealand identified the opportunity to make anew a society and home in a land that they have both come to depend on and respect. Those in the community clearly communicate that they do see land as far more than a usable resource, but as something to be cherished, relished and

enjoyed. Affinity for indigenous biota has prompted many to endeavor for their return. The national discourse concerning the valuation of indigenous knowledge has found root in the minds of many. This discourse itself is informed by international outlets of discourse including anthropology and national discourse as exemplified by Joan Metge's publications.

Māori and Pākehā in the community and over the entire nation, find another common root in addition to land. The Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 laid the ideological groundwork for the modern nation of New Zealand. Debate concerning its originator's intents and its modern implications merely provides a venue for both cultural groups to discuss and formulate a re-envisioning of it to address the needs of the modern society. Through the Waitangi Tribunals, both cultural groups are brought into discussions of the mistreatment of Māori for over a century by ignoring the treaty. It also becomes a modality wherein these misdeeds can be assuaged and Māori can seek recourse and redress. In this manner, a new re-envisioning of the treaty takes place, creating a new 'kiwi' identity.

These socio-cultural elements and factors in aggregate constitute what I call a culture of biculturalism. The two cultural groups are ever more aware of the others' beliefs and traditions. In such a milieu respect and understanding is aspired to and engendered. Most especially each group is learning to value the other's cultural construals as they come to understand them in context. Cross-cultural communication has come to be more than exchanging words across a room through a translator. It has become a concerted effort to seek out each other's *tikanga* (ways of doing things and beliefs) to endeavor to both value, and in culturally-appropriate ways, include these cultural elements in an emerging community identity, and perhaps a national

identity, that is based on mutuality. What has emerged in this community around Mount Maungatautari is a culture of biculturalism.

### **Practical Implications**

I am aware of the limitations of this study, as well as the danger of taking any situation, or more specifically its elements, out of context by trying to universally apply them. This study needs more on-the-ground time with those in communities most closely associated with the work. What has primarily been gained is a sense of the primary socio-cultural factors, both historical and contemporary, that currently are seen to be shaping community conservation efforts in a bicultural, rural New Zealand community and district. Taking any aspect of this situation elsewhere in hopes to apply it and benefit other communities must require judicious application. This somewhat tenuous effort though can perhaps be of benefit. In Hawai`i, Uilani, in her aspirations at starting a community conservation project, expressed concerns that the community already is divided on some of the goals of the project and well as on any actions that should be taken. She expressed interest in learning how other communities have navigated such bi- or multicultural divides to move forward and progress in their projects. In a larger view, mounting scientific evidence concerning both the increasing scope of environmental degradation and the problems this situation holds for human existence, along with the challenges associated with confronting them on any scale, be it local, regional, national, or international, and those challenges including limited governmental resources and funds to address such problems, easily highlights the brilliance in having independently-managed community conservation projects. Knowledge of what has been accomplished and what can be accomplished, including the successes and strategies associated with reaching that success, is the beginning for others to likewise engage in such projects themselves.

## **Future Research Opportunities**

The conclusions formulated here compel continuing and deeper research into the subject. Much more needs to be done. The research, conducted with limited time and funding, can be improved with more on-the-ground research within the community over an extended period of time. Moreover, the same can be said for the Hawaiian aspect of the research. It is hoped that the author will be able to accomplish both of these goals as part of a doctoral program. In another vein, the importance of the Māori tribal system and the movement away from it in Hawai'i engenders questions in itself that merit further attention. Particularly, it would be interesting to investigate further their particular cultural situations and the factors that influenced the retention and rejection of tribalism respectively. In another vein and in a wider sense, investigation into, and the school of anthropological thought associated with, community conservation is relatively nascent. What role does anthropology play in conservation and environmentalism? Much more data needs to be collected and evaluated going forward. Herein, anthropology holds a particularly advantageous position; a community conservation project's success first depends upon collaborative communication across cultural groups and organizations and this subject affixed to the socio-cultural realm remains the stewardship of socio-cultural anthropology.

## **REFERENCES**

## List of References

- Aginsky, Bernard Willard and Te Rangi Hiroa  
1940 Interacting Forces in the Maori Family. *American Anthropologist* 42(2):195-210.
- Anderson, Atholl  
2002 Faunal Collapse, Landscape Change and Settlement History in Remote Oceania. *World Archaeology* 33(3):375-390.
- Barlow, Cleve  
1991 *Key Concepts in Maori Culture*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, Claudia  
1996 *Inventing New Zealand: Everyday Myths of Pakeha Identity*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
- Berkes, Fikret; Johan Colding; Carl Folke  
2000 Rediscovery of Traditional Knowledge as Adaptive Management. *Ecological Applications* 10(5):1251-1262.
- Best, Elsdon  
1914 The Peopling of New Zealand. *Man* 14:73-76.  
  
1952[1924] *The Maori as He Was*. Wellington: R. E. Owen Government Printer.
- Brosius, J. Peter  
1999 Analysis and Interventions: Anthropological Engagements with Environmentalism. *Current Anthropology* 40(3):277-309.
- Buick, Thomas Lindsay  
1972 *The Treaty of Waitangi: How New Zealand Became a British Colony*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition. Freeport: Books for Libraries Press.
- Clark, Jeffrey T. and John Terrell  
1978 Archaeology in Oceania. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 7:293-319.
- Craig, John and Sandra Anderson; Mick Clout; Bob Creese; Neil Mitchell; John Ogden; Mere Roberts; Graham Ussher  
2000 Conservation Issues in New Zealand. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 31:61-78.
- Dominy, Michele D.  
1990 New Zealand's Waitangi Tribunal: Cultural Politics of an Anthropology of the High Country. *Anthropology Today* 6(2):11-15.
- Dudley, Michael Kioni  
1990 *Man, Gods, and Nature*. Honolulu: Na Kane O Ka Malo Press.

- Fagan, Brian M.  
2004 *People of the Earth: An Introduction to World Prehistory*.
- Fornander, Abraham  
1969 *An Account of the Polynesian Race*. Tokyo: Chas. Tuttle.
- Goldman, Irving  
1955 Status Rivalry and Cultural Evolution in Polynesia. *American Anthropologist* 57(4):680-697.
- Goldman, Irving  
1957 Variations in Polynesian Social Organization. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 66:374-390.
- Goldman, Irving  
1958 Social Stratification and Cultural Evolution in Polynesia. *Ethnohistory* 5(3): 242-249.
- Goldman, Irving  
1970 *Ancient Polynesian Society*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Handy, E. S. Craighill and Mary Kawena Pukui  
1958 *The Polynesian Family System in Ka`u, Hawai`i*. Wellington: The Polynesian Society Inc.
- Hiroa, Te Rangi (Sir Peter H. Buck)  
1950[1949] *The Coming of the Maori*. Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs, LTD.
- Irwin, Geoffrey  
1990 Human Colonization and Change in the Remote Pacific. *Current Anthropology* 31(1):90-94.
- John Craig; Sandra Anderson; Mick Clout; Bob Creese; Neil Mitchell; John Ogden; Mere Roberts; Graham Ussher  
2000 Conservation Issues in New Zealand. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 31:61-78.
- Kame`eleihiwa, Lilikalā  
1992 *Native Land and Foreign Desires: Ko Hawai`i Āina a me Nā Koi Pu`umake a ka Po`e Haole*. Honolulu: Bishop Museum Press.
- Kanahele, George Hu`eu Sanford  
1986 *Ku Kanaka Stand Tall: A Search for Hawaiian Values*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Keesing, Felix M.  
1947[1945] *Native Peoples of the Pacific World*. New York: The MacMillan Company.

- Kirch, Patrick V. and Roger C. Green  
1992 History, Phylogeny, and Evolution in Polynesia. *Current Anthropology* 33(1):161-186.
- Kottak, Conrad P.  
1999 The New Ecological Anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 101(1):23-35.
- La Barre, Westin  
1970 *The Ghost Dance: The Origins of Religion*. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Lane, Barbara  
1960 Review: The Polynesian Family System in Ka`u, Hawai`i by Craighill Handy and Mary Kawena. *American Anthropologist* 62(6):1101-1102.
- Liliuokalani  
1964[1898] *Hawaii's Story by Hawaii's Queen*. Rutland: Charles E. Tuttle Company, Inc.
- Orlove, Benjamin S. and Stephan B. Brush  
1996 Anthropology and the Conservation of Biodiversity. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 25:329-352.
- Osorio, Jonathan Kay Kamakawiwo`ole  
2002 *Dismembering Lāhui: A History of the Hawaiian Nation to 1887*. Honolulu: University of Hawai`i Press.
- Metge, Joan and Patrica Kinloch  
1978 *Talking Past Each Other: Problems of Cross-Cultural Communication*. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Metge, Joan  
1967 *The Maoris of New Zealand: Rautahi*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, LTD.  
  
2001 *Korero Tahi: Talking Together*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Milton, Kay  
1996 *Environmentalism and Cultural Theory: Exploring the Role of Anthropology in Environmental Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Patterson, John  
1992 *Exploring Maori Values*. Palmerston North: The Dunmore Press Limited.
- Pool, Ian  
1991 *Te Iwi Maori: A New Zealand Population Past, Present and Projected*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.



- Redman, Charles L  
1999 Human Impacts on Ancient Environments. Tucson: The University of Arizona Press.
- Reedy, Tamati  
2000 Te Reo Māori: The Past 20 Years and Looking Forward. *Oceanic Linguistics* 39(1):157-169.
- Robertson, J. B.  
1957 The Role of Tribal tradition in New Zealand Prehistory. *The Journal of the Polynesian Society* 66:249-263.
- Sahlins, Marshall  
1958 *Social Stratification in Polynesia*. Seattle: The University of Washington Press.
- Smith, Philippa Mein  
2005 *A Concise History of New Zealand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sponsel, Leslie E.  
1995 *Indigenous Peoples and the Future of Amazonia: An Ecological Anthropology of an Endangered World*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Trask, Haunani-Kay  
1993 *From a Native Daughter: Colonialism and Sovereignty in Hawai'i*. Monroe: Common Courage Press.
- Williams, David V.  
1989 Te Tiriti o Waitangi - Unique Relationship Between Crown and Tangata Whenua? *In Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*. I. H. Kawharu, ed. Pp. 64-91. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, Robert W., ed. Ralph Piddington  
1975[1939] *Essays in Polynesian Anthropology*. New York: Cooper Square Publishers, Inc.
- Young, David  
2004 *Our Island, Our Selves: A History of Conservation in New Zealand*. Dunedin: Otago Press.