

**PÖHARA, TÖNUI, KÖKIRI: POVERTY, PROSPERITY, PROGRESS  
SECOND BIENNIEL AOTEAROA NEW ZEALAND INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT STUDIES NETWORK (DEVNET) CONFERENCE**

**17-19 November 2000-11-19  
Victoria University of Wellington**

**Working Paper**

**MAORI ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS NATION BUILDING**

**Manuka Henare  
The University of Auckland School of Business**

The setting out of some ethics and principles of economic development might be helpful in a discussion of Pöhara, Tönui, Kökiri: Poverty, Prosperity, Progress. The Mäori words used in the conference title convey something of the framework in which I would like to speak today. That framework is within a Maori worldview with all its ethics, values and spirituality. Simply put, according to traditional thought economic activity is underpinned by a religious sense and a profound spirituality. Pöhara: idea of poverty, being poor, or cut off from opportunity  
Tönui: prosperous, prolific, prosperity – not in a utilitarian sense but in terms of the common good  
Kökiri: the idea of a group moving decisively forward but with a purpose, a goal, a target.

One lesson from international development experience is the insight that development practice and theory have a connection with the commitment to social change. Without the social change factor, Mäori development is constrained because the status quo is maintained whereby the dominant culture continues to have both comparative and competitive advantage. In this scenario, Mäori remain labourers and servants, albeit well educated and sophisticated. Social change leading to a transformation of the status quo and recognisable modification of the comparative advantage of Pākehā are necessary prerequisites authentic development in Aotearoa New Zealand..

Let me briefly recap the historical context in which Mäori are to be located. Mäori became a minority population in the 1860s and experienced the onslaught of colonisation and near extinction. This loss of control over the country and destiny came about despite a Mäori Declaration of Independence in 1835 and an 1840 Treaty of friendship with the British Crown, which Mäori considered guaranteed their sovereignty. However the British Crown and later NZ Governments considered that sovereignty was ceded forever.

However the idea that a free people would openly and willingly cede their sovereignty to virtual strangers has always been a puzzle to me. Both my development experience and knowledge of development theory contradicts the idea that the giving up of one's freedom is normative, especially if it is hoped that in doing so the quality of life will somehow progress through the political act of cession. While history correctly

informs us that Māori wanted a relationship with Great Britain, one in which certain guarantees were made by both sides intellectually and morally it is a puzzle. The most recent elaborations of economic development theory from the pen of the 1998 Nobel Prize winner in economics, Amartya Sen, argues that freedom is the necessary condition for actualising capabilities and enjoying entitlements. Freedom is the motivator for most civil society organisations and the basis of human dignity.<sup>1</sup> Perhaps from the civil society framework it is easy to understand why Māori continue the struggle for the maintenance of traditional social structures and institutions and for new types of Māori organisations, which care for our people.

The nineteenth century was one of high political and military activity over claims to sovereignty, and the twentieth century one of encounter against assimilation and integration as espoused by the dominant European society. However minority status was not always the norm. 1840 population estimates Māori society at 100,000 constituting the dominant group. It is also the beginning of colonisation and European settlement, largely from Great Britain. However with the first encounter of Māori and European in 1769 introduced diseases such as measles, tuberculosis, typhoid, venereal and other diseases new to Māori became a significant factor in population decrease into the twentieth century. By the end of the nineteenth century observers considered Māori a dying race, when the population had been reduced to 45,549 people by 1901. The alienation of land to settler ownership was almost complete, with some 66 million acres in 1840 to about 3 million acres in Māori control. According to the Chairman of Waitangi Tribunal, Chief Judge Edward Taihakurei Durie:

...Māori land comprises today 5% of the national total, much on poorer land and some 7% unworkable.... The spread of Māori land is not even and there is little or no Māori land in some tribal areas.<sup>2</sup>

Historically, and with the progressive diminution of property rights and obligations, the education and skills training systems have not prepared Māori for ownership and management practice. Rather, Māori were educated and trained to serve someone else's interest.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Amartya Sen (1999) *Development as Freedom*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf; "Promoting peace by empowering people", *CIIR News*, October 2000, p 17.

<sup>2</sup> See Chief Judge Edward Taihakurei Durie, "The Process of Settling Indigenous Claims." Speech to the Indigenous Peoples: Rights, Lands, Resources, Autonomy International Symposium and Trade Show, Vancouver Trade & Convention Centre, British Columbia, Canada, March 20-22, 1996. URL = <http://webnz.com/tekorero/durie>. See also Manuka Henare and Edward Douglas "Te Reo o Te Tiriti Mai Ra Anō. The Treaty Always Speaks" in *The April Report Future Directions Associated Papers*. Volume III Part One, Report of the Royal Commission on Social Policy. (Wellington: The Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988), 79-220. See also Claudia Orange, *An Illustrated History of the Treaty of Waitangi*. (Wellington: Allen & Unwin in association with the Port Nicholson Press, 1990), 67.

<sup>3</sup> Barrington & Beaglehole 1974.

The colonial history and Māori experience of it, and New Zealand society's attempts to deal with its past and make a new present so as to move into the future represents a new experience. In Māori worldview the past is like a pathway in front of the present, which leads to the future. The past is never behind but is considered as always being in front of the present. Māori relive the past in the present and in so doing find the future.

Outlined below is what can best be described as a koru of traditional ethics. Koru is a Māori term for a spiral, which visually portrays the idea of traditional ethics that flow outwards from a centre and returns back to it. A spiral of ethics simultaneously present Maori worldview and act as a check on that worldview. The double spiral is a motif popular in wood carving in which like a fern's frond the inner core is revealed when it unfolds. The ethics below illustrates that we must understand the parts in order to understand the whole, as they are all integrated and interdependent with each other and with clusters of other values of importance to Māori. It is not a hierarchy of ethics, rather, they begin in the centre of the spiral and together with the traditional values they constitute a Pacific Polynesian view of holism and way of linking humanity and economy in a relationship of reciprocity and respect. They can be stated as follows (Henare 1999):

- ethic of wholeness, cosmos (*te ao mārama*)
- ethic of life essences, vitalism, reverence for life (*mauri*)
- ethic of being and potentiality, the sacred (*tapu*)
- ethic of power, authority and common good (*mana*)
- ethic of spiritual power of obligatory reciprocity in relationships with nature (*hau*)
- ethic of the spirit and spirituality (*wairuatanga*)
- ethic of the right way, of the quest for justice (*tika*)
- ethic of care and support, reverence for humanity (*manaakitanga*)
- ethic of belonging, reverence for the human person (*whanaungatanga*)
- ethic of change and tradition (*te ao hurihuri*)
- ethic of solidarity (*kotahitanga*)
- ethic of guardianship of creation (*kaitiakitanga*)

The focus of my presentation is on human economic development from the perspective of indigenous peoples and small nations in the context of the phenomenon of globalisation. It is a review done over of a twelve-month period, June 1999 – June 2000, of research and study in Scotland, Wales, England and The United States of America. My aim was to reflect on where Māori of Aotearoa New Zealand were heading in the new millennium through studying the process of devolution in Scotland and Wales. I wanted to understand the principles of devolution that might inform ourselves as to what extent the Scots and the Welsh were gaining their freedom to choose the political and economic direction of their respective nations. Second, could the constitutional changes that devolution brings in Great Britain be applicable to this country.

The key lesson on devolution is that it is a seductive concept and practice and will not be a principle that will contribute to Maori aspirations for sovereignty, self-determination and freedom. Its fundamental political ethos is the retention of power and decision making at the centre, in the case of Great Britain, all power remains with Westminster. So while much is devolved to other centres where decision can be made at a more local level, the locus of power remains with the Westminster Parliament.

Under legislation the Scottish Parliament and the Welsh Assembly can be dissolved at the stroke of a pen. While politically this would not be popular, the fact is that the power to do so is available to whom-ever controls the power at any given time.

Devolution in New Zealand to Maori tribal authorities or Maori organisation is limited or restricted power allocation with the proviso that the New Zealand Parliament through the government of the day may take it back. Devolution is the illusion of freedom in development and political terms, because there the ability to be free and to exercise genuine choice is restricted.

It is useful to remember that when we discuss poverty, progress and prosperity there is a pattern world-wide for indigenous peoples to be identified as the poorest of the poor or among the poorest of the poor. In my mind this statement holds irrespective of whether we follow the idea of 'the standard of living' set of criteria of conventional economic interpretations, which are stated in terms of 'utility' and 'wealth'. Or, whether we follow Amartya Sen's contra standard of living interpretation, which is in terms of the 'capabilities and freedoms' that states of affairs do or do not allow.<sup>4</sup> Whatever the standard of living interpretation used, indigenous peoples are at the lower-lowest end of the utility and wealth criteria, or are peoples whose capabilities to function are restricted by their relative lack of freedom. The issues of capabilities and freedom were brought home in my study of the reports of the Harvard Project on American Indian Economic Development. In the Projects' reports the Harvard team have been able to identify some of the critical factors that have enabled some Indian nations to do better in economic development than others.

The work of the French philosopher and mathematician, Louise-Joseph Lebet (Goulet 1974; See Lebet 1961), on the economy and humanism offers some philosophical criteria, which when applied to Aotearoa New Zealand provides a global ethical test to the direction of new economic development. According to Goulet successful overseas development projects have the following overriding thrust; a concern for social justice and for the need to create conditions fostering human dignity, the emphasis on a world community, the solidarity of all human beings riding space-ship earth, the need for co-operation among all dwellers in the global village, and a consensus model of development. The idea of space-ship earth and all people living on board together is similar to the ship metaphor described earlier for 1840s Aotearoa New Zealand. A universalist cultural approach is helpful because it can act as a forceful corrective to ethnocentrism and narrow parochialism currently in vogue.

Following Goulet (1974:35) we find his diagnosis and prescription assists our understanding of the Aotearoa New Zealand development dilemma:

- Development is a continuing task of forging new values while at the same time maintaining traditional values in a setting where most institutions contradict these human values and aspirations.

---

<sup>4</sup> See Amartya Sen (1987) *The Standard of Living*. Geoffrey Hawthorn ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- The only valid path is to seek optimum growth both in terms of nga tikanga (values) me nga ritenga (practices), and in terms of resource constraints and limitations.
- Planning is futile unless it stems from a permanent association between decision-makers and communities at the flaxroots.
- Equity in the distribution of wealth and the achievement of dignity for all are priority targets of development efforts.
- Eliminating the privilege systems of Pākehā to allow Māori to close the social and economic gap can only solve conflicts of interest between Pākehā and Māori.

Lebret's study and practice of development offers some themes relevant to this discussion (Goulet 1974:35). Māori under-development is not mainly an economic problem; neither is it simply the inability of social structures to meet the demands of a formerly passive society. Māori underdevelopment, as with all underdevelopment, is a symptom of the continuing world crisis in human values. This is particularly so for the Anglo-American world.

New Zealand's development task is to create a new civilisation in this State - a country of apparently chronic inequality and disequilibrium. This new Aotearoa-New Zealand civilisation will be Treaty of Waitangi and Declaration of Independence based, and will require new sets of relationships and new patterns of solidarity. Economic development therefore is concomitantly about cultural and spiritual development. It is a mistake to consider Māori development simply as modernisation or an effort to overcome an economic or technical lag.

**The aim of Māori and Pākehā development is to achieve a more human New Zealand economy.**

According to Lebret the discipline of development is really a study of how to achieve a more human economy. The French expressions, "plus avoir" (to have more), and "plus être" (to be more), underscore an essential difference in the purpose of economic development (Goulet 1974:43). This qualitative difference in aspiration also exemplifies a critical difference between Māori and some aspects of Pākehā economic and social aims and purposes.

Māori aim to be more, that is, Māori aim to be more Māori. "Kia mau ki tō koutou Māoritanga - Hold fast to your Māoritanga" was the exhortation of Sir Timi Kara earlier last century. After the horrors of World War I Māori were urged to firmly grasp the finest attributes of the culture - industriousness, helpfulness, consideration for others, loyalty, cheerfulness and so on. Kara's exhortation, made in another time of moral and ethical crisis, aimed to boost people's morale, confidence and hope (Parker 1978:191). As we near the end of the century, we can recall the Maori women leader Miraka Szászy's and her challenge to Maori for a clarification of our ethics on sustainability, hope, love and service. It implies that the one criterion of value "is not production or possessions but the totality of qualitative human enrichment" (Goulet 1974:4').

With Le Bret (economy and humanism) in mind (Goulet 1974:44-45; Henare n.d.), the following attributes or criteria might be seen as essential to a concept of Māori development.

- It must serve the basic human needs in an equitable order based on urgency and importance, it must build a human economy.
- All major problem sectors must be attacked in co-ordinated fashion. Coherence in policy is a critical factor. There can be no sacrifice of one segment of the population to another. This does not rule out a strategy of planned correction of imbalances.
- Innovation must be homogeneous and must respect Māori and Pākehā peoples' past history, i.e. their patrimony and matrimony, and their present capacities. There must be no rupture with a people's cultural heritage.

Finally, unless development leads a society to the capacity to direct itself autonomously (C.f. Durie 1994), it is invalid. This demands a struggle against dependency, assimilation, passivity and inertia. Mana motuhake and the exercise of tino rangatiratanga will give Māori society the autonomy expected and contradict dependency, assimilation passivity and inertia

### **Globalisation and Indigenous Peoples**

The word global is some 400 years old (Malcolm Waters) and historically speaking is the roots of globalisation. The word globalisation was coined in 1960s and gained popularity in 1980s and became a buzz word of 1990s coinciding with an end of cold war<sup>5</sup>

A philosophy of globalism involves a new consciousness of the world as a single place. We have had other terms that pointed the way to such an understanding, the global village, space ship earth. However is globalisation recent? There are at least three views

1st - a process going since humans populated the world

2nd - a process that took off in 15th & 16th centuries

- with the rise of trade capitalism
- enlightenment/modernisation
- decoupling of religion & science
- nation-state formation
- colonisation

3rd - a more recent process, of the 1980s

- Deng's Open door politics, 1979
- Gorbachev's Glasnost & Perestroika, 1980s
- economic growth in Asian Tigers, other Third World states
- discovery and use of Information & Communication Technology

---

<sup>5</sup> Ruud Lubers & Jolanda Koorevaar (n.d.)

– collapse of Communism is a signal of beginning (Ruud Lubers & Jolanda Koorevaar)

### Signs of globalisation

- ❖ *global patterns of consumption/ consumerism*
- ❖ *cosmopolitan life-styles*
- ❖ *global sport*
- ❖ *world tourism*
- ❖ *nation-state sovereignty decline*
- ❖ *global military system*
- ❖ *world-wide ecological system*

### Signs...

- ❖ *world-wide health problems*
- ❖ *world political systems*
- ❖ *global political movements*
- ❖ *concept human rights extended*
- ❖ *interchange between world religions*

### In globalisation there are -

- ❖ *two contradictory processes of homogenisation and differentiation*
- ❖ *a complex interaction between localism and globalism*
- ❖ *powerful movements of resistance against globalisation processes*
- ❖ *a modern form of imperialism*

### Globalisation is more than economics..

- ❖ *Prof. Anthony Giddens (Reith Lectures 1999)*
- ❖ *refutes idea that phenomenon is solely economic*
- ❖ *involves political, technological, cultural and economic*
- ❖ *emphasises role of tradition in society in global context*
- ❖ *Enlightenment gave tradition a bad press*

### Globalisation and the global paradox

- ❖ *the bigger the world economy, the more powerful its smaller players*
- ❖ *the more universal we become, the more tribal we act*
- ❖ *as the importance of the nation-state recedes, more of them are being created*
- ❖ *as the global economy gets larger, the component nation players get smaller and smaller*

John Naisbitt, 1994.

Let me outline some idea of the size and extent of the global indigenous peoples community and the populations in our part of the world.. According to the World Bank there are 264 million indigenous peoples in world<sup>6</sup> on 7 continents and more than 85 countries. In Asia and the Pacific the populations are:

- ❖ 211 million in Asia (80%)
- ❖ 140 million in India & China (60%)
- ❖ 11 million in Burma,
- ❖ 7 million in The Philippines
- ❖ 7 million in the South Pacific Forum

According to the UN Economic and Social Council, Commission on Human Rights, Indigenous Populations are composed of the existing descendants of the peoples who inhabited the present territory of a country wholly or partially at the time when persons of a different culture or ethnic origin arrived from other parts of the world.

#### Economy of affection, embedded in society

- ❖ *invisible economy in which the affective ties based on common descent and common residence prevails (Hyden 1980)*
- ❖ *maintains cultural integrity and the world view*
- ❖ *supports the kinship system*
- ❖ *allows redistribution of a limited range of goods, services and cash.*
- ❖ *Economy embedded in society (Karl Polanyi 1944, 1977)*

#### **Maori economic Development is Nation building.**

Link between sovereignty – economy-  
Subsidiarity, devolution, identity maintenance  
Creation of wealth, goods and services – sustainable

New models – Scotland, Welsh (lessor extent) Basque of Catalonia, American Federal systems more adequately – flexible to notion of divisible sovereignty? has sovereignty.

---

<sup>6</sup> World Bank 1991