

The Economics of Indigenous Survival and the Development of Culturally Relevant Governance

Sir Tipene O'Regan
Upoko, Awarua Ngai Tāhu

Vincent Lingiari Memorial Address
Charles Darwin University, Darwin NT

- Mihi whakatau na Kāi Tahu ki te manawhenua iroto o Te Reo.
- Mihi ano : Acknowledgement of my own Ngāi Tahu people to the traditional owners, past and present of the **Larrakia** people upon whose ancient lands we stand.

‘Mo tātou, mo ka uri i muri ake nei’ : ‘For us and our children after us’. When I was first appointed to the old Ngāi Tahu Maori Trust Board in 1974 this was the motto that adorned our letterhead and our Common Seal. Except that back then it was in English. Today, though, it appears only in Maori and in the southern dialect of the Maori language. Like all mottoes, it is aspirational. In our history, this aspiration was connected to our seven-generation struggle with the Crown over the Ngāi Tahu Claims – it manifested **purpose**. It told of why we were engaged. Our motto, *Mo tātou, mo ka uri i muri ake nei*, is still aspirational, it still has that nice pious ring to it and it decorates almost everything we undertake, from cultural festivals to exhibitions, to tribal superannuation saving schemes. It’s all over our tribal and subsidiary company websites. But, now we have settled our Claims and made peace with the Crown, what is that aspiration? What is our new purpose? What does the motto mean now?

I make no apology for viewing the matters I propose to discuss with you through the prism of my own Ngāi Tahu tribal identity and experience. You will have to take my word for it, though, that the issues that I will attempt to raise confront in various forms just about every indigenous minority I have either experience or knowledge of - other Maori tribes in New Zealand, Native Americans in the USA or First Nation groups in Canada. They have a resonance, too with Saami and Inuit peoples in Scandinavia and Northern Europe.

I want, this evening to tell you something of this tribe from which I descend through my Ngai Tāhu mother and to draw from our experience some sense of the challenge we face in the evolution of a culturally relevant model of governance as we assume command of our own future on the back of our own capital for which we are now responsible both to protect and to grow. Having deprived ourselves of the consolations of grievance, how do we rid ourselves of its smell? Who is there now, to blame? We are, after all, very much like most citizens in most liberal democracies – we know in fine detail what we **don’t want** and what we **don’t want to be!** We are far less clear on what we do want, on **what** and **how** we want to be.

First, though, I need to spend some time telling you of who we are and where we’re from before I offer any ruminations as to where we’re going.

My mother's people are Ngāi Tahu. We are the tribe which holds *manawhenua*, or traditional authority in Maori terms over the greater part of *Te Waipounamu* - the South Island of New Zealand. We are formed of three broad streams of descent the last of which began its movement into our island from the East Coast of the North Island in the second quarter of the 17th. Century. From our traditional histories we know that by the late 18th. Century these three originating streams of descent had melded into a '*relatively cohesive*' single identity as a people calling itself Ngai Tāhu.

I deliberately choose the expression, '*relatively cohesive*'. I do so because I should not like you to think that the process of establishing '*relative cohesion*' over the 17th and 18th Centuries would meet with approbation of today's Human Rights Commission or even the community consultation standards of the NZ Resource Management Act.

On the contrary, the traditional histories offer us a richly textured history of retributive warfare between the groups that were to become Ngāi Tahu – warfare over claims to resources of land and coast; over women, over issues of *mana* and status – all the myriad causes that people everywhere have ever gone to war about. Those of you, even moderately schooled in British and European history or, indeed, contemporary world politics, would find I am sure, a familiar story.

Our vast tribal territory was matched with a small population of about 3000 living in far-flung, largely coastal, settlements. This diverse collection of closely related but vigorously autonomous communities, spaced out over large distances, travelled and communicated incessantly. They were all connected by a reinforced mesh of *whakapapa* (genealogy or kinship) constantly refreshed by inter-marriage. The seasonal availability of resources dominated everything – including warfare. Seasonality controlled the East / West trade movement – indeed, all trade movements ; trade in *titi*, in *pounamu*, in *taramea*, in *tikumu* and a large inventory of preserved foods. Seasonality controlled the annual intra-group exploitation of inland areas where *weka* was hunted and processed and where so much inter-group fighting and inter-marriage took place. Warfare, as with our contemporary rugby, netball and Parliament – had its season.

It is probably fair to say that , as in the Super 12 competition, Canterbury tended to dominate most set play but it didn't (as most recently, in respect of the Waratahs) always have its own way. From time to time our more northerly relations indulged in their own internal orgies of self-destruction. One such event, the *Kai Huaka* feud – so named because close kin were killed and eaten – in the early 19th century, left this region exhausted and open to the raiding of the musket-armed North Island Ngāti Toa and their Maori and Pakeha allies. The slaughter of the musket-less Ngāi Tahu from Kaikoura through to Akaroa was massive. Ngāi Tahu's *Upoko Ariki*, or paramount chief was captured and most cruelly murdered by the invaders. Death and destruction abounded.

This new violence, though, was different. It was intrusive, the aggression came from without. It was not the ordinary business of inter-kin feuding. In most kin groups external aggression or threat unites the most discordant households. So too, with the 1830s Ngāi Tahu. The southern Ngāi Tahu of Otākou and Murihiku had been developing extensive trading relationships with Sydney and Hobart. They were well equipped and militarily competent. These musket-armed southern Ngāi Tahu with their modern whaleboats and canon, their

supply lines stocked with the newly adopted potatoes and farmed meat, had clear lines of battle-ready and experienced leadership. They rapidly overcame their familial discontents and tribal discord. They rallied to the tribal call to defend the realm and by the mid – 1830s they had driven the invaders from Ngāi Tahu’s traditional territories and the tribe was beginning its healing re-unification. This means it was returning to a more or less normal climate of inter-regional, inter-group and inter-personal tension.

But Ngāi Tahu’s southern world had changed for ever. Muskets, whaleboats and war had changed everything. The kinship remained but the institutions and structures, the alliances and relationships built up over a couple of centuries of shared experience were shattered.

Above all the community and tribal leadership structures were in disarray or gone. While the base unity of kinship was there it had lost its form and structure. At the very time Ngāi Tahu needed new and visionary leadership to steer them into the new global economy and political culture which was surging – tsunami-like – over them, their old internal tensions, freed from their traditional restraints of chiefly marriage and relationships, constrained them from cohering into a new unity to meet the new challenges.

There was sufficient cohesion, though, to allow for the transactions with the Crown following the Treaty of Waitangi of 1840. Between 1848 and 1863, the whole of the Ngāi Tahu territory passed to the Crown subject to provision for reserves and various other requirements. Within short order, however, it became clear that the Crown (rapidly transforming itself into a Settler State) was failing to honour its own contracts with regard both to land reserves and *mahinga kai*, or food resource zones, and the long battle for the Ngāi Tahu claims had begun.

Ngāi Tahu now had a new external enemy, a new threat in a common foe. A fresh and emergent basis for unity had been found.

The history of that struggle on which I was to engage in the 1970s, of the struggle to amend the Waitangi Tribunal legislation and the subsequent marathon hearings and Ngai Tāhu Report, of the further eight years of litigation (some of it at the Privy Council in London), negotiation, and final agreement is another chapter in the saga. Suffice to say that when the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act was finally passed into law in 1998 the resultant struggle with the Crown had absorbed some seven generations of Ngai Tāhu. The Act and the subsequent Crown Apology referred to the Crown’s ‘*Treaty Breaches*’ – what used to be euphemistically called ‘*non-performance of contractual obligation*’. The language of debate had changed and the history had become much less contested. Our position had been largely confirmed by Tribunals, Judges and Parliament – the gatekeepers of the Power Culture had conceded. The ‘*noise*’ surrounding that debate is now reduced – the concern now of academic historians. It is done. I refer to it and stand it to one side.

For my mother’s generation and those before her, being Ngāi Tahu was synonymous with ‘*Te Kereeme*’ – ‘*The Claim*’. All the things that are today seen as culturally iconic in the Maori world – *tangi*, *hui*, the arts, the language – they were ordinary, normal parts of her everyday life. The thing that made them Ngāi Tahu, that made them distinctive from other Maori, that bound them into their whole sense of tribal being, was their shared consciousness of dispossession and grievance against the Crown. Over the course of that long struggle our identity as a people had become rooted in grievance – in a sense of collective loss. If this, then, is the core of one’s identity, the crucible of one’s culture, it’s not a great basis on which

to foundation a future! What was there in that heritage that could fire a transformation to a notion of the future – or a **new way of being** as a people?

In the 150 years of the *'The Claim'* – from 1849 to 1998, Ngāi Tahu had endured – like other Iwi – all the grinding misery imposed by colonisation. Their legal personality as a people had been deliberately *'vaporised'* by the settler Parliament. They had been decimated by disease and poverty, deprived of their capital base in land and fisheries and had no means to take up the opportunities presented by the new global economy which now surrounded them. In the South of New Zealand they had absorbed the full initial impact of settler colonisation *per se*. It was much later, and slower, in its impact on North Island tribes.

What is extraordinary about that 150 years is that this disparate grouping of far-flung communities that I have described to you, was able to maintain, let alone grow, any sense of tribal community at all. All the forces of demography, geography and NZ history were in numerous ways conspiring against any survival of that identity. Yet it persisted and it continues to persist – despite the regular pronouncements of that assorted accumulation of line umpires and commentators who think it shouldn't – who suggest that the very concept of the tribe is at once both archaic and anarchic – that it has no place in this new millennium of liberal democracy. And it doesn't just persist – it flourishes in ways my own generation, let alone my mother's, could not have dreamed of.

Ngāi Tahu is the third largest of all Maori Iwi – or tribal Nations. The 51,000 individual New Zealanders (and Australians) who identify as Ngāi Tahu clearly wish to continue doing so. What is it, though, that moves them to maintain this distinctive element in their identity – to pursue their historic and cultural heritage, to maintain their connection? Despite our now substantial tribal wealth and assets, no more than a handful of them will ever gain employment within our economic structure. Probably no more than, say, 2000 of them would be actively *'in communion'* with our marae communities – feeding visitors, fixing *urupa*, painting fences or attending *tangi* (our funeral ceremonies). Even if we take that number out another couple of thousand or so to include the more casual participants in our wider culture, and then another few thousand to cover those connected by education scholarships and support, the enrolled tribal membership vastly exceeds the number of those actively involved in tribal life and affairs. There is evidence aplenty, however, for this great passive membership having a high degree of adhesion to their Ngai Tahu identity and making ample assertion to that effect. Minus the adhesive grievance of past generations, then, the sense of collective identity just seems to want to keep on keeping on.

It is not my task here to ruminate too much on the nature and character of a tribally-based indigenous minority identity immersed within a majority culture and economy which is itself a mere minnow in an ocean of global economics and culture. New Zealand itself survives as a distinct cultural and economic identity by dint of geographic isolation as well as on account of its global and economic irrelevance.

But wait, there's more! Ngāi Tahu is not just a minority within a larger ethnic Māori minority it is also southern. It is rooted within *Te Waipounamu*, the South Island of New Zealand. With some two thirds of the population living in Auckland or thereabouts, even the Pākeha with whom, Ngāi Tahu deals on a day to day basis are a minority. As people of the Northern

territory, you may have some sense of the geographic and political irrelevance to which I refer. But that sense still doesn't do much to explain how a distinctive minority identity such as that of Ngāi Tahu, persists through generations even when the circumstances giving rise to it are virtually reversed.

Because, reversed they have been. Peace has now broken out – relatively speaking. The Crown and Local Government now increasingly talk of '*partnering*' with our tribal structures on everything from Marine Reserves to the Christchurch re-build. We are now '*consulted*' on place-names, water conservation orders, irrigation projects and all manner of regional plans and schemes. Our traditional marae facilities routinely host gatherings at the request of the local and regional communities and marae visits by schools have grown exponentially.

And we are, relatively, now wealthy with net assets of close to **\$1 billion** (and rising) with a tribally managed superannuation scheme of more than **19,000** members and **\$35.3 million** of funds under management. We are a significant force in the tourism, fishing and farming industries. We are major property developers and investors. We own a number of major government properties within our traditional southern territory which are leased back on commercial terms. Since our settlements in 1998 we have distributed approximately **\$300** million of funds back into our tribal structure, communities and to individuals.

All this is widely seen to be successful and very worthy and there is a substantial level of self-satisfaction permeating the Ngāi Tahu community in respect of it. Not too much, though, because there are still enough people with sufficient comprehension of reality to understand that there are huge tasks before us in establishing a new foundation for this '*Ngāi Tahu Nation*'.

How do you insulate your cultural and historical knowledge base from the power culture surrounding you? How do you create your own search engines, your own archives, commission your own histories, your own analyses? How do you take command, as a people, of your own heritage and identity and insulate it from all the gatekeepers of the arts councils, libraries and academia, the lottery boards and all the other caring agencies? All these people and organisations by whom we are surrounded are not **bad** people, they are not malevolent – some of them know more about us than we know ourselves, some of them care more about our history than do many of our own. But command of your own culture and heritage, being the primary proprietors of your own history is a first priority of cultural autonomy – of actually owning who you are. How do you develop within this '*Nation*' the intellectual infrastructure to nourish that identity you say you want to hold. How do you build and maintain this '*Tabernacle of the Ngai Tahu Covenant*' as the focal point for that identity?

More importantly, perhaps, is the question that follows. Just how do you establish processes within that disparate and dispersed 51,000 individuals which allows them **access** to the underpinning knowledge base of this identity, how best to you assist them to the recovery of their ancestral *Reo* – their language, their *waiata* – their chant poetry, their *korero pūrakau* – their traditional histories? How do you ensure their access to the tribal story of Ngāi Tahu's culture contact history of the 19th. and 20th. centuries, indeed, to the extraordinary history of the Ngāi Tahu Claims and their resolution. How do you enliven their attention to the tasks yet to be undertaken in the areas of customary rights in the forest and on the coasts and in the rivers.

I've asked a lot of questions! Rest assured, I don't propose to bore you with attempting answers here. There's quite a band of, now, quite well remunerated and culturally competent people working on those questions. I am also happy to report that those charged with the business of tribal governance are slowly becoming seized of those questions themselves and this is important because they are the people who are ultimately responsible for the assets of our people and the distributions arising from them.

Having spent the bulk of my life engaged in the struggle to re-capitalise my people on a basis of their Common Law and Treaty rights and having achieved a measure of success in that regard, I am now largely devoted to the challenge of putting metric tonnes of paper in some preliminary order, establishing the tribal record and supporting the development of the corpus of cultural and heritage content I've been referring to.

This late-life's work is being conducted under the general mantra that virtually all indigenous minority economic activity which is collectively owned has its primary purpose the intergenerational maintenance and ongoing evolution of **the group's heritage and identity**. There is of course, a need for expenditure, generated off the back of the re-capitalisation I have referred to, on a range of social objectives in health and education and various other good works – in subsidising the benefits of citizenship to which we as entitled as our fellows and on account of which we are taxed as citizens and as ratepayers. There is a need, too for ongoing expenditure in *'defending the realm'* the constant and ongoing struggle with the State in its various forms – even just enforcing the agreements **so recently and solemnly** entered into. Assuming such matters suitably provided for, however, I return to sustaining of that heritage and identity.

As a consequence of that over-riding inter-generational purpose, the capital assets are typically not for sale but many are themselves seen as inter-generational cultural assets. For various cultural and historic reasons they are, in addition, generally weighted towards land and natural resources – to the primary sector. Within the Maori frame, the first question is typically not *Ko wai koe? 'What is your name?'*, it is *'No hea koe?'*, *'Where are you from?'* Geography and place are central to identity. The word for the umbilicus is *'whenua'*, it is also the word for land. Place, then, is an important marker of who you are in tribal terms.

My point is that this inter-generational capital supporting an inter-generational heritage is not just seen as a cash generator funding arts festivals and scholarships. Just **how the wealth is generated** is necessarily congruent, to some degree at least, with the purpose which it serves. Travelling a highway past tribally-owned lands and forests or taking food-fish from your own coast can be as much a cultural imperative as knowing the meaning of your own place names and speaking Maori. It helps that land and natural resources are also usefully important vehicles for containing capital on an inter-generational basis. Ask Warren Buffet or the Harvard University Endowment Fund! For the moment, though, I only note that while we are doing increasingly well in advancing the maintenance of our heritage and identity in our new spending, it is not much reflected yet in how we invest.

My focus, though, is not on the ethnic subset of the particular form of capitalism which dominates economic life in Aotearoa New Zealand. A considerable proportion of Māori collective capital is in Māori Incorporations and Trusts in which shareholdings are privately

held. Their purpose and consequently, their governance, is little different in structure and requirements from the corporately owned assets in the wider economy. Their ownership is in kin-based Māori entities - the only thing that is structurally distinctive about them is the Māoriness of their ownership..

My purpose, rather, is to focus on the nature and role of those collectively owned Maori enterprises which **are not** characterised by individual private share ownership. My focus, is on those enterprises which are owned and governed by Maori tribes and , of course, sub-tribal entities. Although the businesses they own may *swim in the same pool* and compete in similar markets to comparable business in the general economy, they are of a **fundamentally different character to other enterprises in that economy**. That essential difference lies in the inter-generational purpose for which they are owned and the inter-generational character of their ownership. The singular differentiating characteristic, and the one that makes it different from individually owned Maori enterprise, is that it has **shareholders who never die**. On the other hand, general democratic capitalism may be said to be premised on the notion of **“shareholder death”**.

Democratic capitalism, moreover, has a second premise beyond shareholders who *‘die’* This is that assets will be sold, broken up, subdivided, regrouped, rearranged at least once ,often much more frequently, in every generation - it’s called *‘The Market’*. This continuous breaking up and redistribution of capital which is the hallmark of democratic capitalism is the very **antithesis** of the maintenance of capital on an intergenerational basis. Yet such a basis is the only possible way in which an Iwi can ensure that it can provide for its existence as an economically autonomous entity into the next 30, 40 or even 50 years.

I note that an Iwi economy cannot ignore the Market, neither should it. In our world it will always be surrounded by it and, to some extent, it must participate in it to *“pay the grocery bill”* – for its day to day cash requirements. However, being surrounded by it and having a limited participation in it is one thing but being a fully paid up, subscribing member of it is entirely another. This is so because the basic task of an Iwi economy is **different and distinct** from the economy it sits within. It has a multi-generational time horizon and thus a fundamentally different requirement from its capital. It must produce wealth over the long term and not just for the generation in which it finds itself. In the case of Ngai Tahu, for instance, it has essentially guaranteed some of its infant members that their tribally supplemented Whai Rawa savings will be there for them when they arrive at their 55th birthday. It can’t securely promise that on the basis of exposure to the turbulent waters of a constantly shifting market. When the tribe takes the decision that it actually wants to exist as a culturally identifiable, kinship or *whakapapa*-linked community in a context of its traditional territory - in two or three generations time - it has to take decisions **now** as to how it is going to fund, protect and develop that culture over time. **It is that underlying strategic requirement that must inform it’s economic governance.**

Having established , I hope, that an indigenous minority has a difference of long term economic purpose and, consequently, a need for a different form of economic strategy and governance, I turn to the question of what such an economy and its governance might look like.

Now, most of the prescriptions for economic and administrative governance have been evolved within the framework and ethic of Western Capitalism - humanised to some degree by a range of variants of liberal democracy. There exists an international government and business sub-culture of line umpires and regulators and controllers and analysts who make a very good living analysing the achievements of others. Their adjuncts are Think Tanks and university Business Schools and MBA programmes. From time to time the whole economic structure stalls, stumbles, gathers itself and stumbles on – generally following taxpayer funded interventions. It all works well enough for a market-based system made up of continuous cycles of buying and selling, trading and short-term investing. It accommodates failure, losses and collapse – and stumbles on. It is driven, though, by an ethic which has never been able to accommodate a notion of inter-generational capital maintenance. Without indulging myself in that whole sub-text represented by inflation, I hope I've said enough to make plain my view that the norms of governance one encounters at seminars of the Institute of Directors verge on the irrelevant in a context of such a concept as a tribally based intergenerational economy.

(I might add, in passing, that I rejoice in being a Distinguished Fellow of the Institute to whom I have, in the past, addressed a paper entitled, *Managing the Shareholder Who Never Dies.*)

Suffice to say that an over-riding aim of inter-generational wealth maintenance is a tall order. There are very few examples worldwide of where this has been achieved successfully especially by communities existing as minorities surrounded by larger capitalistic environments whether dominated by State capitalism or private capitalism – New Zealand, Australia and Scandinavia being characterised by a blend of the two. There are no satisfactory examples in which the shareholding community is expanding generation on generation and in which capital wealth is being expanded at a similar rate or in the same proportion. Even the most successful examples of economic longevity – the overseas Chinese and the Basque Mondragon Co-operative depend, ultimately, on a reduction in numbers.

To return to the problem; The primary requirement in formulating this more suitable paradigm of indigenous governance is a **sense of purpose**, a clear notion of **what and how** the group wants **to be** . Formulating and articulating such a sense is the necessary pre-requisite of any developed strategic direction.

In the case of Ngāi Tahu, we spent six or seven generations persisting with a sense of identity built around a grievance (as I have earlier recounted). We have historically persisted in our identity as a tribal nation and that made it possible for us to overcome the grievance (or at least set it aside). We could not have done that unless our forebears actually wanted their world and that of their *mokopuna* (descendants) to be different. In their time, though, they had no articulated vision beyond the end of the war – achieving justice in *Te Keereme* – The Claim. All they have left us is the clear demonstration that **survival is possible**. But what kind of survival?

Some years ago, now, our tribal structure faced that question in an attempt to give itself focus and strategic direction. It produced and promulgated a document called '*Ngāi Tahu 2025*' – that document has now reached it's half-life. The document was well meant and carefully considered. It contains some very fine aspiration together with 5 year and 25 year targets. It

was put to the annual *Hui-a-Tau* of the tribe in 2000. There was great enthusiasm. All formal decisions by the governing body since that time have been required to carry a signed assurance that the decision is consistent with *Ngāi Tahu 2025*. We describe this document on our website as ‘*our tribal map that, in the year 2025 will have carried us to the place where we are empowered (in our various manifestations) to realise our dreams*’ The difficulty is that maps don’t carry you anywhere. At best they can only assist with directions.

I can only observe that the aspirations remain intact at the half-way mark but I remain deeply sceptical that they can be achieved on the basis of present settings. Today we own less tribal land than we did following Settlement in 1998, we rent out to others the bulk of our fisheries quota (however profitably) and our Maori Language revitalisation effort (although staunchly persistent) cannot be said to be winning. To be fair, though, we are vastly wealthier and making some great strides – in a variety of worthwhile operational and commercial directions. We are doing some things, especially on the cultural and heritage side, better than we ever envisaged in drafting the 2025 map. And, again to be fair, we have endured in our heartland one of the world’s more destructive recent earthquakes and that has been hugely pre-occupying as well as being a unique economic opportunity.

Thus we can look at ourselves and say we have a heritage of persistence which we want to transform with a new sense of direction and we have dreamed and articulated that direction. We have collectively concluded that we want to **continue to be** and we have some notion of **how we want to be**. We have established the foundations of that inter-generational self concept of which I’ve been speaking and we have adopted an horizon for its achievement. But, just as maps are only a guide to direction, horizons, of their very nature, recede as you move towards them.

But we have, though, a substantial disconnect between this intergenerational dream of a Ngāi Tahu heritage and identity and the economic structure we have established to fund it. That structure, our Ngāi Tahu Holdings Corporation, has good directors and management – all selected by tidy conventional governance processes. It’s standing in the surrounding economy and its reputation amongst the denizens of those surroundings is one of good repute and we are collectively happy to receive the approbation of the business media and officialdom.

We constructed (during my own time at the helm of our diminutive ‘*Nation*’), a high level of separation between our commercial arm and our political arm. The management convention of that period was to **de-politicize** the commercial function and we took it to heart. We followed, in quite a large measure, the precepts being developed in New Zealand of that time for State Owned Enterprises. We failed, though, to appreciate that an SOE has a quite specific commercial function in a defined area – electricity generation, roads, statistics etc. We created a structural ethic of separation very successfully. So successful that, as owners, we now have a difficulty in placing any constraints or giving any direction to those charged with wealth generation on our behalf.

This is not necessarily the fault of the directors. Our own political representative structure has absorbed the ethic of separation. It sends letters of expectation to its commercial directors on

an annual basis but refrains from imposing its wider policy aspiration on them. To some extent that reflects a quite understandable unwillingness to have to grapple with big visionary questions. That requires a level of intellectual commitment that few politicians – of any ilk – manifest. Far easier to deal with minutiae and saying no to proposals – it's just normal political sloth.

This quite normal form of political sloth that I describe avoids debating the form and implication of a long-term intergenerational strategy in case it might find itself wanting to impose it and then be confronted with tensions which could endanger the flow of cash distribution from the spring. I personally suspect that the Directors might welcome a clearly articulated long-term economic strategy with some expression of preference for areas of activity or investment. I am sure they would welcome debate on the merits of alternative strategies. For the moment, then, there's an amiable relationship but an intellectual distance between these two key elements in our structure. And that distance has already resulted in the diminution of our land footprint and our fisheries involvement notwithstanding our enhanced wealth.

It's all a bit like the *'Keep Politics out of Sport'* debates which were rife in past discussion of South Africa's apartheid regime. And it has the same answer – as our then Prime Minister, Muldoon, found out at Gleneagles, and as did our nation in 1981 – you can't!

I have given more than sufficient indication, then, that I believe an intergenerational aim requires an inter-generationally aligned economy. Such an economy requires an aligned form of governance and that is not to be found in the churn of Western market economics and its conventions of governance. Indigenous economies funding their own future require governance designed to manage and contain assets in the very long term.

So, I'm saying this mantra we've had *'for us, and for our children after us'*, offers a very interesting proposition, and a very tall order. There are few examples worldwide where a good level of capital growth matched with a rising population has been successfully achieved. This is even more true of communities existing as minorities within larger capitalistic environments, whether they're dominated by state capitalism, or private capital. The New Zealand/Scandinavian type model, which is essentially a blend of the two, comprised of state capitalism (basically over infrastructure) and private capitalism in terms of the operational cash-flows of society, offer a context in which this might be achieved but only by a deliberate intent. It won't happen without that. The intent requires substance in terms of identifiable and clear policy goals. I am not conscious of such goals being abundantly evident in the Maori organisations with which I am familiar or in a developed form, at least, amongst my North American contacts. There is, though, no shortage of pious aspiration – but it is without a great deal of evident substance.

The challenge of inter-generational capital maintenance within an Iwi group must be seen, then, as very much a work in progress. In many ways the opportunity for thinking differently has never been better in my lifetime. The past few years – and especially the recent tectonic economic shifts – have clearly demonstrated the fragility of the underlying concepts of Western Capitalism as well as those of Western Socialism. The vaunted statuary of both lie

shattered all around us. The fashionable economic mantras of the chattering classes and their media commentariat have been reduced to negative equity. Their patronising oversight of indigenous economic development and its aspirations can now be politely set aside while we chart a different course towards building an economic paradigm **which is consistent with our dream of what we want to be**. That paradigm is a work in progress and its most fundamental requirement is that we are clear, Iwi by Iwi, tribe by tribe, nation by nation, of **what and how we want to be**. To the extent that I have, this evening, reported on Ngāi Tahu – I can say that along with other indigenous communities, we are still some distance from the political, cultural and economic alignment that our governance requires.

There are just a few other considerations that should be referred to.

All federally organised groupings and especially those with a high degree of geographical separation such as Ngai Tāhu are subject to a constant pressure to **desegregate** - be they national rugby unions, automobile associations or tribal groupings seeking greater autonomy for their constituent parts. There is a constant process – akin to oscillation – shifting from regional to centralised control or influence. Keeping the scrum together is relatively easy when the group is under external threat. In times of peace or relative prosperity it is more difficult. Constant political attention will be required of indigenous groupings to maintain their cultural and kin-based cohesion as their relative economic position improves. One of the key ways to ensure such unity is to avoid an over-centralisation of wealth which renders the constituents mere recipients of privatised welfare. Dependency on one's own centre is still dependency. And all dependency is ultimately resented.

There is no glue like the glue of equity. An active strategy of shared or joint economic enterprise between centre and region with a strong sense of mutuality of benefit might go a long way to minimising the tendency to desegregate. As well, a strategically informed policy or investment spread across the regions will counteract desegregation and reduce the risk of parochial resentment. This may well be counterintuitive to the commercial rationale of the tribe's investment advisors who might criticise such a policy as *'political'*. However, if the alternative is a possible political break-up of the shareholder and its assets by desegregation, the need for an active strategy of the alignment of which I spoke earlier would need to be forcibly presented.

Then there is the huge impact of demographic change. By the mid-century the Maori and Pacific Island community in New Zealand will be third in the queue behind Pakeha (New Zealanders of European descent) and Asian. The Pakeha will be ageing rapidly and the core taxpayers supporting them will be largely of non-European descent. The society will be dramatically more culturally and ethnically diverse. The youngest in our family – a great-grand-daughter – will be 38. Her adult world will be infinitely more complex in a cultural sense than ours has been. At that mid-century there will be close to twice as many New Zealanders as there are now. What does this mean for Ngāi Tahu as a minority within a minority within a minority? What will be the political status of our settlement contracts with the Crown, of the Crown Apology based around the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. Will those things still matter? Do we formulate a strategic policy for our wider relationships beyond other Maori, beyond the Crown? With a wider world?

On this last query ; it's worth remembering that our own Ngāi Tahu relationships with *Poihākena* (Sydney) and China were fundamental to our ability to repel those northern invaders in the 19th century – is that precedent enough for a more independent future? Is that where we're heading? We're already participating in trade missions to China and Japan and sending our own delegations to communities in other countries, on our own as Ngai Tahu, with other Maori and sometimes as a '*haka team*' component in government missions. What might this future duality of citizenship look like – New Zealand citizens, participating fully in the life of the nation state and citizens of the Ngāi Tahu Nation – maintaining a distinct identity within a broader ethnic minority? I'm comfortable enough with that duality – will our successors be?

It is clear that I'll have much to ponder from the comfortable security of my *urupa* – my graveyard on the hill!

All the foregoing, though, begs the larger question. It is a question posed by our past experience that I have been recounting. It is inevitable that our successors will find themselves in a comparable situation to that in which we found ourselves following the historic settlements of my generation. In 2025, in 2050, in 2075 – they will find themselves in a changed and different context. The demographic frame in which they exist will have changed. Our traditional tribal culture will have further evolved. Indeed the majority culture surrounding them will be – as different, as in our own case, from the world of our parents and grandparents. A quite different view of all that heritage and identity may then exist. Just as we found ourselves searching for ways to transform our concept of ourselves as a tribal nation, different from that which we had inherited, so might they. Our prescription for the future will by then be the past – we will be ourselves mere footnotes in their history - archival artefacts, framed photos on a Meeting House wall. Will they still want to be – to exist as a tribal people? Will they still cleave to their Ngāi Tahu identity and the heritage it carries?

With reasonable attention to their financial accounts in the interim, however, our successors will be able to address those issues from even better fortified positions. I trust that those positions will have been more strategically selected than ours were. We had no choice but to fight from where we found ourselves. But we, in our time, have gifted them with a **power of choice** denied to our own ancestors. At the very least, they should be able to wrestle with the challenges of their future unworried about a potential shortage of muskets!

I have raised numerous questions with you this evening and I have answered very few with any certainty. I am consoled a little by my awareness that many of these questions are being wrestled with by indigenous minority communities around the world. From the perspective of what are generously described as one's autumn years it is comforting to know that we're not the only ones wondering as to whether or not our generation has been wasting its time.

Aristotle's injunction, '*First, know thyself!*' seems to have some resonance – but it remains only a preliminary question!

Darwin
August 2014

