MARAE AND TRIBAL IDENTITY IN URBAN AOTEAROA/NEW ZEALAND

Paul Tapsell
Auckland War Memorial Museum

This article examines the ceremonial courtyard called a *marae,* the quintessential focus of tribal Maori society, which not only represents customary authority over surrounding land but also provides the forum on which *taonga* (ancestral treasures) are ritually performed. Historically rooted in the Pacific, the tribal *marae* has stayed intact for countless generations serving generations of kin communities in their ever-changing social, political, and economic contexts. After World War II the *marae* underwent new transformations as descendants began migrating in their thousands from relative rural isolation to newly developing metropolitan areas. Competition and accessing new opportunities based upon ethnicity gave rise to new community morales at the expense of customary practice and brought about the genesis of the nontribal and immigrant-tribal *marae.*

To comprehend the dynamics involved in maintaining a Maori tribal identity within Aotearoa/New Zealand, it is important to understand the most central of all Maori institutions: the *marae.* The *marae,* a ceremonial courtyard usually extending from the porch of a *whare tupuna* (ancestrally named meeting house; see glossary, following endnotes), continues to provide the paramount focus to every tribal community throughout the country. When evoked, it is a physically bounded three-dimensional space, capable of spiritually joining Papatuanuku (land) with Ranginui (sky) into which *ira tangata* (the human principle) may enter and commune with *ira atua* (the divine ancestors).

The role of the *marae* and how it might function as the central focus of any kin group's identity become most apparent during life crises, such as *tangihanga* (death rituals), when non-kin-group visitors are ritually wel-

Pacific Studies, Vol. 25, Nos. 1/2—March/June 2002

comed across the *marae* threshold. Home ritual maintains the boundary between host and visitor until such time as it is successfully negotiated via oratory. During such ritual, tribal leaders often empower and perform the kin group's *taonga* (tangible or intangible treasures passed down from ancestors) on *marae* (Tapsell 1997). Ceremonially layered, these performances assist descendants and related visitors to relive their common genealogical ties to each other, to ancestors, and to the land. The associated meeting house and other prominently named buildings and structures of the *marae* further reinforce both individual and kin group identity in relation to outsiders by physically representing ancestors to which all members of the *marae* community genealogically trace their origins.

Consequently, the *marae* can be interpreted as a dynamic, Maori-ordered, metaphysical space, embracing the fundamental kin-based values of *whakapapa* (genealogical ordering of the universe according to *mana* descent and *whanaungatanga* kinship) and *tikanga* (the lore of the ancestors maintained by senior elders), where rights of access, especially in times of ritual, continue to be proscribed or prescribed solely by kin leaders. Moreover, these core values—*whakapapa* and *tikanga*—encapsulate what it essentially means to be Maori. That is to say, tribal membership for Maori is codefined first by genealogical links to a common ancestor after whom the descendant group —*iwi* (tribe) or *hapu* (subtribe)—is often named (for example, Ngati Whakaue —the people of Whakaue) and second by individual members from time to time attending the community's *marae* during important *hui* (ritual-associated kin group meetings) so they may fulfill various roles as designated by their elders. Maintaining such an ongoing presence, therefore, enables descendants born or residing beyond the physical confines of the community (for example, in faraway cities) legitimately to uphold their *turangawaewae* (home birthright, place to stand) and to interact with their ancestral *marae* and associated *papakainga* (village).

While conducting my doctoral research (1996–1997), I asked my Ngati Whakaue of Te Arawa elders about their understanding of the *marae.* For all of them, the *marae* represents the core, the very essence of their genealogical identity to the surrounding lands, which they interpret as *mana o te whenua* (supreme ancestral authority of and over the lands). They see their home *marae* as both a tangible (physical) and an intangible (spiritual) space to which they belong—*turangawaewae*—where the "now" is metaphysically embodied within their ancestral past. This past reaches back beyond the shores of Maketu—the original landing place of the voyaging Te Arawa kin group in Aotearoa—to the sacred temples of Rangiatea (Ra'iatea) in Hawaiki (the ancient Polynesian homeland of Te Arawa). To the elders the *marae* is a living genealogical connection not only to the distant past, but also to the

land itself, Papatuanuku. The tribe's *whare tupuna,* which in my region is an elaborately carved eponymous ancestor, is deemed to be the ultimate *taonga* of the people, because it brings both physical and spiritual authority to the *marae* on which it rests. The house genealogically reinforces the prestige of the *tangata whenua* (home people—descendants of specific ancestral lands) and leaves *manuhiri* (non-kin-group visitors) in no doubt as to who is in charge, at all times, within the *marae* space. The elders use references such as ancestral warmth, presence, reverence, respect, *mana* (authority), *tapu* (restricted), *wairua* (spiritual presence), and *mauri* (life essence) to highlight that a *marae* also has *taonga*-like qualities.[1] Unlike *taonga,* however, the *marae* is considered inalienable,[2] because it is ultimately associated with the living soil of Papatuanuku.

My research also revealed that existing literature on *marae,* especially from a tribal perspective, is scarce. Apart from work by Kawharu (1968, 1989) and Marsden (1987), most other writings reviewed (for example, Walker 1975; Salmond 1976; Tauroa 1986; Barlow 1991) provide generalized understandings of *marae,* but they do not explore its dynamics regarding tribal identity maintenance within modern contexts. My recently completed doctoral thesis provides a tribally informed perspective on the genesis of *marae* and its roles in modern New Zealand (Tapsell 1998). Here I have limited my focus to the recent development of the urban *marae* phenomenon and its associated tensions.

I have identified two main types of urban-located *marae: tangata whenua* (tribal) and *taurahere* (immigrant), with the latter being further divided into two basic categories: nontribal and immigrant-tribal. From each of these three main categories I have chosen an example that best demonstrates the roles each category (tribal, nontribal, and immigrant-tribal) plays in maintaining a sense of Maori identity and community in an unfamiliar urban setting. As my first case study I chose Orakei Marae, because it graphically illustrates many of the difficulties urban-encircled *tangata whenua* groups have been experiencing in New Zealand's city regions over the past fifty years. John Waititi Memorial Marae, also in Auckland, was chosen because it is credited with being the first non–tribally organized urban *marae* in New Zealand. The third *marae* example, Mataatua in the city of Rotorua, has been selected because it represents the first ever immigrant-tribal *marae* to be erected in a New Zealand urban setting under the authority of the *tangata whenua*—home people. Belonging to the moral communities each of the above *marae* categories represents is as much dependent on individual choice as it is on the associated *marae* group accepting one's membership. Whereas tribal-type *marae* require genealogical connection, they nevertheless differ little in terms of moral obligations from nontribal *marae,* inasmuch

as maintaining membership ultimately depends on participation, especially during life-crisis *hui.* But when the freedom to maintain a tribal identity is taken away from the individual—as was the case with Orakei, when the tribe's *marae* was abolished owing to outside political forces, or at John Waititi, where an urban leadership strategy unwittingly obviated the importance of *tangata whenua* status and genealogical identity—the morality of belonging to an urban Maori community becomes more a question of personal benefit than a realization of an individual's ancestral responsibility (whether *tangata whenua* or *taurahere*) to uphold the *mana* of the land on which he or she stands and its associated tribal community.

Tangata Whenua Marae

No one knows for certain where the *marae* originated, but the evidence suggests that this organizing concept of Maori tribal society has been among my ancestors for hundreds if not thousands of years. In "*Taonga:* A Tribal Response to Museums" (Tapsell 1998), I provide a historical narrative, drawn from archaeological, written, and oral evidence, of how today's tribal *marae* evolved from the time that kin groups like Te Arawa, Tainui, and Mataatua arrived in Aotearoa from their Hawaiki homeland of Rangiatea over twenty generations ago. I investigate from a Te Arawa perspective the development of the *marae* and its subsequent transformations on arrival in Aotearoa. These transformations can be understood as dynamic responses by kin group leaders to geopolitical crises. So long as the *marae* has survived, the kin group's identity to its ancestral estates—as represented by *taonga*—has endured. Successful adaptation, over generations, to new climactic and environmental conditions, inter-kin-group competition, the introduction of Christianity, and European colonization guaranteed tribal identity. Kin groups that failed to adapt ceased to exist.

Today, tribal *marae,* like Te Papa-i-Ouru at Ohinemutu, endure as the accepted customary focus of Maori society. Whether it is tribal discussion, the hosting of dignitaries, or providing for life crises and *hui,* a tribe's *marae* represents customary authority over its associated ancestral landscape. Most important, it provides a tangible link to Hawaiki, the spiritual homeland of past illustrious tribal leaders who are still called on to visit their descendants in times of crisis through the *marae* performance of *taonga.* The *rangatira* (kin group leader) and his or her *tohunga* (spiritual advisor) control these performances, centered on the core values of *whakapapa* and *tikanga,* enabling descendants to refocus their tribal identity while fully participating in an ever-changing Western modernity. The *marae* provides a place to stand —*turangawaewae*—where the values of Hawaiki continue to synthesize

with the challenges of the present, giving descendants new directions into the future while still keeping sight of their ancestral past.

By belonging to the Te Arawa kin group Ngati Whakaue, I am perhaps fortunate insomuch as my *marae,* Te Papa-i-Ouru, has not been engulfed by the urban growth of its surrounding city of Rotorua. Late colonization, ongoing control of tourism, and legislated sharing of natural resources (see Stafford 1967:524) have helped maintain my tribe's profile in the overall governance of Rotorua. Tribes in other urban centers have not been so lucky. For example, Ngai Tahu in Christchurch and Dunedin, Te Ati Awa and Ngati Toa in Wellington, and Ngati Whatua O Orakei in Auckland have all been subjected to the humiliation of becoming *marae*-less on lands their ancestors initially sought to share in good faith with the incoming colonial power. The following case study is a poignant example of how the Crown, in pursuit of obtaining desirable real estate in New Zealand at all costs, breached its treaty promise to uphold Ngati Whatua's customary authority over their Orakei lands and villages.

Case Study One: Orakei, a Tribal Marae

Unlike the exceptional situation of Ngati Whakaue in Rotorua, where a Western-urban city developed around its tribal *marae* communities as a direct result of tourism (Tapsell 1998), the Ngati Whatua people of Orakei in Auckland were never seen as part and parcel of the metropolis that encircled them.[3] Instead their presence was seen as a stumbling block in Auckland's progressive development. The Orakei lands represent the most desirable real estate in New Zealand, and the Crown was prepared to go to extraordinary lengths to procure title and to eradicate an aesthetically displeasing community in the process. By the 1950s the Crown had prevailed. It stripped this once powerful kin group of all their lands and evicted them from their Okahu Bay–located *papakainga* (ancestral village) and *marae.*

When the Crown had signed the Treaty of Waitangi three generations earlier in 1840, Ngati Whatua's descendants were numerous, having established permanent settlements and *marae* around both the Waitemata and Manukau harbors. Their principal *papakainga (pa)* was located on the volcanic cone *pa* named Maungakiekie, better known today as One Tree Hill. However, by the mid–nineteenth century Ngati Whatua of Tamaki had relocated its headquarters to the *papakainga* at Okahu Bay in Orakei to take advantage of the Pakeha trade and commerce that began flowing into the Waitemata after 1840. Nevertheless, the tribe's undisputed domain at this time stretched from the western Waitakere range, east to Awataha and as far south as the Tamaki River and Onehunga, covering over five hundred square kilometers.

Soon after the treaty was signed in 1840, the Crown, on Ngati Whatua's invitation, shifted its new capital from the northern township of Russell to the southern shores of the Waitemata at Horotiu (the bottom of Queen Street, central Auckland city). Three thousand acres of surrounding land was duly made available *(tuku rangatira)* in exchange for cash and goods, which officially cleared the way for the new township of Auckland to be established (*Orakei* 1987). This transaction marked the beginning of a one-hundred-year-long concerted Crown acquisition program during which almost all of Ngati Whatua's land in the Tamaki isthmus passed into Crown ownership (ibid.). Kawharu, a kin group descendant, comprehensively documented how Ngati Whatua lost their last seven hundred acres (280 hectares)—the Orakei Block—in his 1989 publication *Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi.* His evidence demonstrates that three generations of tribal leadership struggled to have their Maori land tenure protected. Numerous protests were lodged with the Crown and its agencies after the first troubles, which arose in 1869 when thirteen trustees were awarded title to the Orakei Block. It soon became obvious to the tribe that their last remaining seven hundred acres of inalienable estate, now vested in individual trustees, was in fact titled land to which communal ownership had been extinguished (Kawharu 1989:218). On one hand, the leaders of the tribe protested time and again to the Crown for proper trusteeship over the Orakei Block to be recognized and resecured, while on the other hand individuals sought to convert their fortuitous ownership into personal windfall (ibid.). Successive rafts of legislation compounded the situation and provided the Crown with further opportunities, as self-appointed sole purchaser, to acquire more and more Orakei land for Auckland expansion (ibid.:221). Eventually the last ten acres, which included the community's *papakainga* and *marae,* was taken under the Public Works Act in 1950, just months after the prime minister of New Zealand, Peter Fraser, publicly criticized the Okahu Bay village as "a blot on the landscape" (in ibid.:222).

Kawharu's 1989 account outlines the events that led his Orakei people to be evicted from their *papakainga* and *marae* in 1950 and forced them to burn their tribal meeting house, Te Puru o Tamaki, rather than allow the Crown to desecrate it (also see Kawharu 1995–1996). The Kawharu passage written in 1975, however, perhaps best captures the pain and consequence of his tribe's irrevocable loss:

> The necessary proclamations were issued in March, all appeals had been heard and summarily dismissed by May, and the meeting house was burnt down in December. At the time, the wells of anguish in the hearts of those who gathered mutely above the

> cinders of their meeting house seemed likely to never run dry. And perhaps those who came to pass judgment on the ensuing apathy of these people need not have looked further for causes. (Kawharu 1975:12)

With the last *marae* forcefully abandoned, the Crown had effectively erased Ngati Whatua of Auckland from their own ancestral landscape. All that remained under the tribe's direct *mana* was a single quarter-acre cemetery and chapel, and a dislocated community rehoused in state-owned properties on the nearby Takaparawha Ridge subdivision. As the Ngati Whatua *tohunga* who spoke on behalf of the Orakei people at a later tribunal explained:

> [I]t was unthinkable that they should surrender their marae for that was but the heart and soul of their papakainga. To surrender the marae was to surrender their papakainga, and by association, their mana, their tapu and mauri. After their forced ejection and relocation . . . they were tenants of the Housing Corporation living in houses and on land that did not belong to them. They were not tangata whenua; their status was as that of any other Maori, or for that matter of Pakehas, who were tenants of [the Crown]. Turangawaewae, as the symbol and kernel of the land, unless they [are] firmly established on their own land, is a meaningless concept. He tuporo teretere. [Without a *marae* they are] but floating logs. (Marsden 1987:3)

From 1951 onward, Ngati Whatua O Orakei had become a people without land, any obvious *taonga* (e.g., their meeting house), or *marae,* and for all official intents and purposes they were a ward of the state. Their *turangawaewae* had been pulled from under them, and the loss of their last *marae* in Tamaki prevented Ngati Whatua from asserting their *tangata whenua* status over the wider Auckland metropolitan area. Before eviction the elders pleaded: We will go but leave us our *marae* (Kawharu 1989:224). But to no avail. Without their *marae* the tribe were not only denied their symbolic expression of political, cultural, and spiritual legitimacy over the surrounding ancestral landscape, but were also prevented from maintaining their kin group identity. In effect: cultural genocide. The community's relocation into state houses on Crown-purchased lands of their ancestors resulted in the despairing deaths of many elders. Not surprisingly, the new generation raised on Boot Hill was culturally impoverished as the community struggled to maintain a sense of pride on lands that no longer belonged to them. The appropriate *marae* forum by which countless generations had observed and

learned ancestral lore and practice from elders had been forcibly removed. Tribal identity, once openly expressed on *marae* in lavish hospitality and in honoring the dead, was forced underground for forty years. The community's lack of an appropriate facility brought shame to its members, who had to make do with inadequate private residences or call on their Reweti relations in the Kaipara to assist with life crises such as *tangihanga* (Marsden 1987:5). The Okahu Bay cemetery and its chapel provided the community with its only source of symbolic identity, spiritual in its delivery but nevertheless a sanctuary from the everyday humiliation of being bereft of both land and *marae* (Kawharu 1995–1996:87).

In 1954 the Crown exacerbated the tribe's plight by setting aside an acre or so of the original Orakei Block as a reserve for the use or benefit of Maori (*New Zealand Government Gazette* 1950:1340). The land was located on the higher ground of Takaparawha Ridge beside the rehoused Ngati Whatua descendants. In 1959, at a time when the immigrant Maori population of Auckland was estimated to be between twenty and thirty thousand, the Maori Land Court was persuaded to vest this land, designated for *marae* purposes, in an ad hoc agglomeration of trustees. This persuasion came from a very small coterie of influential Maori welfare officers, tribal committee personnel, and university lecturers, together with elders of the Orakei *hapu.* But the elders stated that they wished not to "prejudice any possibility, however remote, that their former marae in Okahu Bay might be returned to them" (ibid.:226). Nevertheless, the court decided that the Crown land reserved on Takaparawha Ridge was to be a multicultural *marae.* Moreover, only four of the sixteen appointed trustees were from Orakei, along with eight Pakeha and four Maori members of parliament. This imbalance, according to Marsden, "effectively neutralised Ngati Whatua's mana in any future control, planning, organization or decision-making of the new marae" (1987:4).

In 1973 the trustees, who had earlier developed a major building program and attracted funding from the wider Auckland community, council, and government, began the erection of a new meeting house on the *marae* reserve. Elsewhere in Auckland, four other *marae* projects were also being built. Two were non–*tangata whenua* tribal developments: Mahurehure in Point Chevalier, which was the initiative of urban descendants from the powerful northern tribe of the same name, and Te Tira Hou in Glen Innes, which was constructed by Tuhoe immigrants from the Bay of Plenty who now lived in Auckland. The other two *marae,* Te Unga Waka in Epsom and John Waititi Memorial Marae in Henderson, were not too dissimilar in the multicultural aspect from the new Orakei project. They all sought to build a complex, Maori in nature, that would offer a sense of home to persons who were not *tangata whenua* of Auckland. The difference with both Te Unga

Waka and John Waititi was that they opened membership to anyone of Maori descent. As a matter of record, only the two *marae* that were tribal in nature sought the full blessing of Ngati Whatua O Orakei before commencing with their respective projects, whereas the new Orakei Marae, Te Unga Waka, and John Waititi Memorial Marae did not.

When the Orakei Marae meeting house shell was completed in 1974, the southern tribe of Tainui ritually opened it under the noses of Ngati Whatua. Further insult was to follow. The Pakeha ethnologist from the Auckland Museum had the name Tumutumuwhenua ritually bestowed on the shell by the visiting tribe. In an instant the proposed meeting house had been transformed into a *whare tupuna*—an ancestral house—because Tumutumuwhenua represented "the eponymous ancestor of all Ngati Whatua from Maunganui to Tamaki." Thus a major decision, "which no Maori dare to make without consultation with all of Ngati Whatua whose tupuna had been chosen, was made by a Pakeha" (Marsden 1987:4). Finally, the ethnologist also decided the names of all the ancestors to be represented in the house, and the responsibility for carving them was then passed to a non-Maori from Australia. Thereafter, Ngati Whatua had to endure the pain of living in the shadow of a *marae* to which they had no *tangata whenua* status or controlling authority: a *marae* built on their dispossessed lands that now officially belonged to all the people of Auckland. Not surprisingly, the morale of the Orakei community was arguably at its lowest ebb during this difficult time (Kawharu 1975).

An opportunity to begin rebuilding Ngati Whatua O Orakei's *mana* after more than a century of Crown desecration presented itself in the form of the Orakei Block (Vesting and Use) Act in 1978. Land on Takaparawha Ridge, which had been taken decades earlier for public works, was returned to the tribe after the Crown decided it had no use for it (Kawharu 1995–1996:80). The Public Works Act gave the *hapu* title to its former rental housing estate and restored in substantial measure the *hapu*'s claim to the status of *tangata whenua* (Kawharu 1989:227). It also allowed for the formation of a seven-member Trust Board, which provided seats for four elders. Beneficiaries were decided on by *whakapapa* rather than any prior certificates of land title, and the returned land was vested to the tribe under one inalienable title (Kawharu 1995–1996:90). Initially, the Trust Board was preoccupied with administering the repurchase of houses on the tribe's recovered estate so as to consolidate the new *papakainga.* But one major problem remained: The community still had no *marae* to call its own. The return of residential land had effectively reestablished the tribe's position as *tangata whenua.* Without a *marae* exclusively available to host *manuhiri* and conduct *tangihanga,* however, the tribe was trapped in a humiliating position. Their lack of control over the Orakei Marae's administration resulted time and again in Ngati

Whatua being unable to provide for visitors and death rituals in times of crisis. Building a new *marae* was also inconceivable so long as Tumutumuwhenua continued to cast his shadow over the Orakei community (Kawharu 1989:227).

Ngati Whatua's *marae* dilemma was eventually addressed on 8 October 1983 at a specially convened *hui* in Tumutumuwhenua. Attending the meeting were numerous representatives from tribal and other Maori organizations, the minister of Maori affairs, the member of parliament for Northern Maori, and the highly respected Ngapuhi leader Sir James Henare. A proposal was placed before the Crown to vest Tumutumuwhenua and the Orakei Marae in Ngati Whatua O Orakei with the full support of all the Maori groups and tribes present. As Sir James said: "Without a marae the people are nothing and a marae is nothing without the people [i.e., *tangata whenua*]" (in Kawharu 1989:228). Consent and agreement were reached at this *hui,* and the minister of Maori affairs returned to Wellington with a promise that he "will go back and see if we can put procedures in motion" (ibid.:230). Unfortunately for the Orakei people, the minister failed to act immediately, and during the 1984 snap election he lost office with the change of government. The new minister of Maori affairs was predictably cautious and wished to consult all interested parties personally (Hon. Koro Wetere, in ibid.).

From 1869 to 1986, three applications to the Maori Land Court, three Supreme Court hearings, one Committee of Inquiry, one Commission of Inquiry, and one Royal Commission of Inquiry, not to mention the Bastion Point protest (see Walker 1979 and 1980–1988 for a commentary on this pan-Maori occupation protest) and a direct appeal to a minister of the Crown, made little impact on Ngati Whatua's loss of its *marae* (*Orakei* 1987:152). Then in August 1986 members of the Orakei Trust Board along with the Reverend Maori Marsden took the opportunity to submit their *marae* proposal to the Waitangi Tribunal:

> We therefore appeal to the Tribunal to recommend to the Crown that it rectify its administrative oversight forthwith and so remove the insult inflicted upon a tribal group that continues to be prevented from exercising its rights and responsibilities in the name of its ancestor [Tumutumuwhenua] according to custom. (Tumahai et al. 1986)

In November 1987 the Waitangi Tribunal released its "Report on the Orakei Claim" and in its findings stated that the Orakei Marae and the ancestral house Tumutumuwhenua "symbolised not only Ngati Whatua's loss

of their land, but the takeover of even their culture—by Europeans and Maori from other places" (*Orakei* 1987:137). After reading the tribunal's findings, the Crown announced on 1 July 1988:

> The key to restoration of tribal mana to Ngati Whatua of Orakei is the marae, so it is very pleasing to confirm the vesting of the Orakei Marae, church, urupa and access strip in the Ngati Whatua of Orakei Trust Board. The marae will now be a place where Ngati Whatua of Orakei have standing as of right once again. (Crown press statement, in Kawharu 1989:231)

While the final drafting of legislation was awaited to give official recognition to Ngati Whatua's standing as *tangata whenua* of the Orakei Marae, the ancestral house, Tumutumuwhenua, was badly damaged by fire in February 1990. In 1991, the Orakei Act 1990 was passed into law. It included the return of lands, an endowment of NZ$3 million, and the vesting of Orakei Marae along with the burned-out skeleton of Tumutumuwhenua back to the tribe. The Orakei community received the *marae* with appropriate ritual, whereupon the decision was made to rebuild Tumutumuwhenua.

There can be no doubt that since this time Ngati Whatua O Orakei's *mana* has been restored. Their *marae* redevelopment program includes new *poupou* (interior carved ancestors) for Tumutumuwhenua and a proper dining hall to entertain guests suitably. The Trust Board's responsibilities have increased dramatically in recent years, and it is now a professionally run tribal administration. It not only provides an array of social services, such as housing, health, and education to its beneficiaries, but also participates as the major investor in the overall commercial development of Auckland's new multi-million-dollar waterfront, sited on railway lands purchased back from the Crown by the tribe. Today, all of Auckland's major civic functions and receptions include Ngati Whatua *rangatira* as a matter of course. These elders are honored as VIPs and when appropriate are called on to provide the necessary *tangata whenua* rituals of prayer and welcome. A recent example was the 1999 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) meeting where Sir Hugh Kawharu, on behalf of Ngati Whatua, welcomed distinguished world leaders to Auckland, New Zealand. After his *mihi* (public speech), Sir Hugh symbolically joined the *tangata whenua* with the *manuhiri* by performing the customary *hongi* (pressing of noses) with the then president of the United States, Bill Clinton. This image was reproduced by the media throughout the world, reinforcing Ngati Whatua O Orakei's status as the *mana o te whenua* of Auckland.

Since the return of Ngati Whatua's *marae* and the associated restoration

of their *mana,* the dominant presence of nontribal urban Maori organizations, which arose out of the recent decades of a Crown-induced *tangata whenua* vacuum, has begun to be countered. At the time the Crown promised to return Orakei Marae (1988), Kawharu reported: "While this news was pleasing to the kaumatua, it was their belief that even with the assistance of the Marae, it could take another ten years for their people to recapture fully the status of tangata whenua that their forebears had enjoyed during the first two centuries of their occupation of the Tamaki Isthmus" (Kawharu 1989:231).

It seems that the elders' prediction made one decade ago is proving to be uncannily accurate. Today, in 2002, there is no denying that Ngati Whatua holds customary authority over Auckland (Kawharu 2002). Some of its traditional boundaries, which in the past forty years have been disregarded and eroded by outside Maori kin group descendants, are being reestablished, but not without conflict. Auckland's city government departments, courts, councils, and administrative bodies are currently relearning this lesson as they begin to realize that consultation with ad hoc Maori groups concerning *tangata whenua* issues and Treaty of Waitangi partnership principles will not provide them with long-term solutions. Ngati Whatua O Orakei is regaining the social, economic, and political influence they once unconditionally exercised as *mana o te whenua* in Auckland. The prominence today of their Orakei Marae and house, Tumutumuwhenua, stand not only as a powerful testament of this return to power, but also as confirmation that *whakapapa* and *tikanga* remain relevant in a metropolitan context.

Taurahere Marae

In contrast to the *tangata whenua marae*—based on concepts of *mana o te whenua* developed over countless generations—the two types of *taurahere* (Maori immigrant) *marae* have recently come into existence in New Zealand's urban centers. Their genesis appears to be more the result of urban migrant Maori wishing to reconstitute their sense of moral community in a foreign environment than exploration of common genealogical connections on another tribe's ancestral land.

The first wave of Maori to migrate to Auckland arrived around the 1950s, when Ngati Whatua's *tangata whenua* identity was at its lowest. For a time everyone but Ngati Whatua prospered in the post–World War II boom years as tens of thousands of young Maori migrated to cities like Auckland and Rotorua, in search of a more prosperous way of life than that available in their impoverished homelands. Then in the late 1970s the country entered a deep recession, and Maori, as the main labor force, were hardest hit. Out of

this politically charged era arose the nontribal *marae* concept, which marginalized Ngati Whatua's *tangata whenua* status in favor of battling for nationalized Maori (nontribal) rights. One of the first such *marae* to be built in New Zealand was John Waititi Memorial Marae, opened in 1980 in West Auckland.

Waititi, however, was not the first immigrant *marae* ever to be built in an urban milieu. The first was in the fledgling township of Rotorua in the 1920s, where the maintenance of *whakapapa* and *tikanga* by Maori immigrants from neighboring tribes prevailed despite relocation. Whereas the Waititi *marae* evolved in a *tangata whenua* vacuum in Auckland (1951–1991), the Mataatua initiative sought to honor their high-profile *tangata whenua* hosts, and the subsequent building of the *marae*'s dining hall in 1969 and the rebuilding of its house in 1979 confirmed this. The customary identity factors of *whakapapa* and *tikanga* allowed a long-term relationship with the Ngati Whakaue of Te Arawa to be genealogically established and maintained through common ancestry, gifting of lands, and prestations of *taonga.* Thus, the dominance of customary core values ensures renewed vitality of Mataatua Marae as it travels through time and continues to be maintained by Tuhoe tribal immigrants living in Rotorua.

These two *taurahere marae* examples, John Waititi Memorial Marae and Mataatua Marae, are the first of their kind and have since been replicated many times over throughout city areas of New Zealand. The second part of this essay highlights and contrasts these two very different types of *marae* in order to provide a clearer understanding of the two disparate value systems underpinning today's immigrant Maori communities.

Case Study Two: John Waititi, a Nontribal Marae

Just sixty years after the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, it was commonly thought by the majority in New Zealand that the Maori were a dying race. From the 1860s Maori leadership battled to maintain control over their people and resources as the Crown pursued deliberate programs of land individualization, fragmentation, and alienation (Walker 1990). By 1900 the Maori population was at its lowest, confined mostly to poorly sanitized, disease-ridden reserves on marginal lands. Two world wars provided some opportunity for young Maori men to break the cycle and explore new horizons but at great cost. After World War II the Maori population resurged with new health and housing initiatives, and its younger members fled their economically isolated *papakainga* to embrace the new and exciting non-kinship-economic lifestyle offered by New Zealand's main city centers.

In the 1950s and 1960s, Maori support networks were created in response

to the needs of thousands of descendants who had resettled in new and unfamiliar urban surroundings. The 1962 Maori Welfare Act, administered by the Ministry for Maori Affairs, gave rise to new Maori Committees that, in Auckland, were operated by respected government officers like Monty Wikiriwhi, Peter Awatere, and John Waititi. The initial goal of these committees was to assist the transition of Maori from a tribal to an urban environment by forming support networks that reached into urban Maori communities. However, these networks also became, either consciously or unconsciously, effective vehicles for countering the integration and assimilation policies pursued by the Crown during this era. By the 1970s, the early Maori Committee initiatives were bolstered by autonomous national Maori organizations such as the New Zealand Maori Council, Maori Wardens, and Maori Women's Welfare League, which arose out of wider political and social needs of urbanized Maori. These national bodies, like the Maori Committees, also sought the continuation of culture and tradition, in reaction to Crown policies. This resulted in the creation of kinlike nontribal structures to assist Maori living in the cities. The consequence of these two waves of Crown-reactive initiatives in the 1960s and 1970s was to establish and reinforce a nontribal identity, overriding tribal affiliation. Within a generation, tribal affiliation was often superseded by a new sense of Maori identity, entitling individuals access to all sorts of opportunities, ultimately Crown-funded. In the earlier years this funding was plentiful because of the huge labor shortage in cities.

By the late 1970s, however, this all came to an end as the country fell into an unparalleled long-term economic recession. Overnight, urban-living Maori became a burgeoning social welfare dilemma. A large percentage of the unskilled urban workforce were Maori, and they now faced the prospect of long-term unemployment. While Pacific Island minority immigrants retained a strong sense of community—religion, inability to speak English, and large extended-family units living in close proximity assisted maintenance of ethnic identity in a foreign urban milieu—Maori found themselves relatively isolated and bound to state homes pepper-potted throughout New Zealand's main cities. Not surprisingly, the Pacific Island communities were better able to organize themselves to take advantage of the growing factory-driven employment opportunities that emerged in the late 1970s. In contrast, most urban Maori families of this era struggled to survive owing to lack of ethnic solidarity or requisite skills to step up into white-collar employment opportunities. Although their children were reaping the benefits of good education and health, the majority of city Maori remained financially dependent on the Crown through housing. Any notions of returning home to a supportive *marae,* elders, and community proved unrealistic given that rural Maori society continued to remain deeply impoverished as a direct result of the Crown's continuing land alienation policies.

During this time some Maori sought higher education as a means to escape the poverty trap, and a few of this number later became leaders of nationalized political protests against the Crown's abandonment of the Maori. Amidst soaring crime, unemployment, and political protest, an urban-driven Maori renaissance surfaced (Walker 1987, 1990), led by younger academic and union-trained descendants. These individuals publicly laid blame for the social ills of urbanized Maori at the feet of their coloniser, the Crown (and by extension all Pakeha), alleging that blatant land alienation policies and racism had, first, severed their generation from their ancestral heritage and, second, entrapped them in a cycle of low wage earning and social dependency (Greenland 1984).

Some, however, sought to reconstitute the *marae* in an urban context to fulfill immigrant Maori yearnings to belong to a moral community they could exclusively call home. In West Auckland's Waipareira community, a long-term *marae* project was already well under way by the late 1970s. Young charismatic Maori stepped into positions of authority and guided the *marae* project to become a vehicle of pan-Maori urban unity. It was decided that if city Maori had their own *marae* where they could maintain a sense of culture and tradition, then their self-esteem would also benefit. According to evidence given during the Whanau O Waipareira claim hearing to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1994, Ms. Tuoro stated: "With so many Maori coming to live in West Auckland (Waipareira), and many of them increasingly out of touch with their families at home and their culture and traditions we sought to establish a place where they could learn from and which they could belong to and identify with" (WAI 414).

The *marae* that the Waipareira community sought to establish was also required for welcoming *manuhiri* and holding *hui,* especially *tangihanga.* Eventually the present site was secured, and the Ngati Porou carver Pine Taiapa blessed the land. In due course, after years of fund-raising, the *marae* and associated house Nga Tumanako (aspirations) were built by Pine and his brother, John. According to Ms. Tuoro, this construction gave the *marae* a lot of *mana.* She went on to say that the "Marae was meant to be pan-tribal. [It] left no room for the tribal bit. You had to leave your tribalism at the door. . . . What we were trying to create . . . was a sense of family and a sense of belonging when people were no longer able to readily access their whanau ties in the areas they were originally from" (WAI 414).

Another person to give evidence in 1994, Tai Nathan, explained that even though people involved in the *marae* might not originate from West Auckland, "they have since been buried in Waikumete Cemetery and have kept their link with the land that way" (WAI 414). In other words, because their dead were buried in the land, this gave them a sense of *tangata whenua* status to their urban Waipareira district, not based on *whakapapa* (kinship

ties to Ngati Whatua), but on noncustomary occupation (Crown title, purchase) and a sense of community.

Some tribally oriented Maori, however, were not so accepting of the nontribal direction in which the proposed urban *marae* was heading, especially because it was taking place on another kin group's *mana o te whenua.* Dr. Pita Sharples is recorded as saying that half of the Maori people he and his committee approached about building a *marae* in West Auckland said, "No, my marae is [in] Ngati Porou and that's it," or "My marae is . . . in Te Arawa, and that's it, you can't have a marae in town" (WAI 414). Sharples disagreed with these answers because, in his opinion, "the street was our marae, our houses were our marae when *[tangihanga]* came up, our schools were our marae" (ibid.).

A paper written in 1976 by Pepe reviews these trials and tribulations, and records that Sharples, chairman of the *marae* planning committee, used the Tuhoe example in Rotorua (Mataatua Marae) to demonstrate to his many doubters that an outside group could build and own a *marae* in another tribe's territory. It appears, however, that the special *tangata whenua* relationship on which the Tuhoe example had actually been built and that is still maintained today (see case study three, Mataatua, below) was overlooked in favor of creating a nontribal *marae* to which everyone could equally belong. Sharples and his followers devised a new set of nontraditional rules *(kawa)* designed not only to prevent any one group from taking control of the proposed *marae,* but also to reinforce the Waipareira Maori community of West Auckland as one *whanau* (extended family) (ibid.). And so out of this philosophical stance the idea of a permanent nontribal *marae* was formed, "built by the people for the people, and [John] Waititi was chosen as an ideal that we might all aspire to. So with permission from Ngati Whatua elders . . . and with permission from Whanau a Apanui to carry John's name, we built this marae" (Sharples, in WAI 414)

Exactly who the Ngati Whatua elders were who gave this permission remains unclear, especially as the many tribes of Ngati Whatua extend over one hundred kilometers north as far away as Dargaville and Whangarei. According to the Orakei people of Ngati Whatua, who hold *mana o te whenua* on which John Waititi Memorial Marae (Waititi) was built, certain individuals may have been approached, but as a tribe they were never directly consulted (Kawharu, personal communication, 1998). In comparison, Tuhoe immigrants went to great lengths to acquire the mandate of the *tangata whenua* to build Te Tira Hou, and in return Orakei attended this *marae*'s opening in force. However, the lack of *tangata whenua* at the opening of Waititi indicates that proper communication with Ngati Whatua O Orakei was never achieved.

Interestingly, Sharples also stated in his evidence to the Waitangi Tribunal that Waititi was initially planned as a *takawaenga*—a place that could act as an intermediary *marae*—for the many thousands of Maori dwelling in the city (WAI 414). But then he says that the *marae* committee began noticing that Maori who moved to the city developed non-kinship relations out of which a new pantribal Maori community arose: "Obligations and privileges which we enjoyed with our [relations] . . . back home, we were now extending to our fellow Maori neighbours. . . . So to me it is very clear that . . . nontribal . . . Maori people in urban areas, have got to be recognised" (ibid.). It was, therefore, decided that instead of being a *takawaenga,* Waititi would become a pantribal focus of identity for Maori living in the Waipareira district. If the *tangata whenua* wished to participate on Waititi Marae they, like everyone else, were expected to leave their tribal identity behind at the gate. Again, such a decision was made without proper consultation with Orakei.

Confusingly, when the *marae* was opened in 1980, it was still being interpreted by visiting tribal Maori as a *takawaenga* where their urban-living descendants could learn skills and reestablish their kinship ties with their home *marae.* Te Arawa were under this impression when they appeared in force to support the opening of Waititi. But some time after being welcomed onto the *marae,* they realized that all things tribal were being overridden, and there were no *tangata whenua* present to reassert the *mana* of the occasion. When organizers stubbornly decided to reseat extra people, including women, directly in front of the *kaumatua,* it was interpreted as a transgression of *tapu* that could not be tolerated. This insult coupled with the realization that Ngati Whatua O Orakei were conspicuously absent finally made the elders realize that the John Waititi Marae was never going to be the *takawaenga* they had envisaged. Led by Tenga of Ngati Whakaue, Te Arawa controversially packed up midway through the opening ceremony and returned to Rotorua.

Nevertheless, since its dramatic opening, the Sharples nontribal response to the Crown's historical imposition of land alienation and consequent urban relocation has undoubtedly assisted many Maori in bridging their traditional sense of community with the everyday metropolitan reality of individualism. Waititi not only fulfills the educational aspirations of its leaders, but it has also successfully focused an urban Maori cultural revival in West Auckland at a time when Ngati Whatua, because of Crown intervention, were unable to extend hospitality to the thousands of incoming tribal immigrants settling on their lands. Over the past two decades, Waititi has made a positive contribution to eviscerated tribal immigrants by providing them with an in lieu Maori identity built primarily on a sense of community. In an attempt to overcome the ancestral reality of the land on which the *marae* stands, Sharples

has on one hand used pantribally recognized Maori symbols, concepts, and elements as the cultural anchor to which its beneficiaries might hold firm, while on the other he has made it clear that the people of Waititi Marae are not claiming land, because they still recognize Ngati Whatua as *tangata whenua* of Auckland (WAI 414).

This proclamation indicates that Waititi accepts and supports, in theory, Ngati Whatua's *mana* over the surrounding Waipareira region. In practice, however, its non–tribally based cultural and social programs appear to be obviating Ngati Whatua's *tangata whenua* status. In its quest to create and uphold an affirmative community-based urban Maori identity, Waititi does not transmit to its members the Maori moral importance of recognizing tribal status both back home and in the cities. While the *tangata whenua* vacuum existed, this nontribal approach to rebuilding Maori identity worked quite successfully. But in more recent times, mainly as the result of the Waitangi Tribunal process, *tangata whenua* groups throughout Aotearoa have begun to reassert *mana* over their ancestral landscapes, and metropolitan areas are no exception. As a consequence, new conflicts of identity and authority between *tangata whenua* and nontribal groups like Waititi have begun to surface. Today, John Waititi Memorial Marae may still be perceived by its followers as "a symbol to pan-tribalism and multi-culturalism" (Tamihere, in WAI 414:37), but they can no longer avoid the fact that the *tangata whenua,* Ngati Whatua O Orakei, are not only back in the picture, but also have begun reasserting their customary authority over all things Maori in their Auckland territory (for example, the Maori Advisory Committee [Taumata-a-Iwi] at the Auckland War Memorial Museum).

In the future, therefore, it appears that *marae* like Waititi will need to reconsider their relationships with *tangata whenua* seriously if they wish to remain relevant and vital to all Maori. Reconsideration of the *takawaenga* concept, providing a bridge for the recovery of tribal identity, and cementing proactive partnerships with *tangata whenua* seem to offer an exciting new direction in which these *marae* might head.

By the same token, rurally based tribes will also need to implement new strategies by which they might best reclaim (Maaka 1994:311) and provide for their urban descendants all the benefits their relations receive back home. The current system of land share ownership, which only favors those still fortunate enough to own shares, excludes most descendants from benefiting both financially and in terms of identity. This Crown-imposed system needs to be reviewed so that it might genealogically recognize that all descendants of a selected common ancestor, no matter their residential locality on the planet, are equally entitled to tribal benefits. Thereafter, it is the responsibility of tribal chiefs to search out all their tribes' descendants so they might

once again participate as bona fide members. In this respect, urban *marae* like Waititi could perform a valuable role in partnership with urban *tangata whenua,* by bridging wider tribes with their urban descendants.

Case Study Three: Mataatua, an Immigrant-Tribal Marae

My third *marae* case study provides a tribal-orientated contrast to John Waititi Memorial Marae. It examines the background to New Zealand's first ever migrant-tribal urban *marae,* Mataatua, to demonstrate that *whakapapa* and *tikanga* can remain relevant and vital to non–*tangata whenua* descendants who live, work, and reproduce in an urban context away from their ancestral homes.

There are twelve *marae* in the city of Rotorua, but they are not all controlled by Te Arawa kin groups. The one notable exception is the *marae* generally called Mataatua, which belongs to the people of Tuhoe. Formerly a formidable enemy of the Arawa people, the Tuhoe are customarily affiliated with lands located in the bordering Urewera region of Whirinaki and Ruatahuna, some fifty or more kilometers from Rotorua. Oral traditions associated with *taonga* held by both kin groups provide rich accounts of the numerous conflicts waged over the generations, culminating in stories of warrior deaths, peace-making marriages, and subsequent births of new leaders (for example, the story of Pareraututu in Tapsell 1997). When Europeans began taking hold in the northern reaches of New Zealand, Te Arawa chose to embrace the opportunities the newcomers offered, including firearms, to keep kin groups such as Tuhoe at bay. Conversely, Tuhoe, who had no direct access to the sea or European trade, became more and more disadvantaged during the nineteenth-century colonial expansion on the North Island and chose instead to retreat into the relative safety of the densely forested Urewera mountains (Binney 1979, 1995).

Between the two tribes stretched the Kaingaroa plains, a traditional buffer zone where many intertribal wars were fought. Because of poor soil quality and wind-swept exposure, very few people ever permanently occupied it. Originally the plains came under the dominion of the Ngati Whare people, who are as closely connected genealogically to Te Arawa as they are to Tuhoe. In post–European contact years, Ngati Whare decided to retreat into the relative safety of the Urewera mountains among their Tuhoe kin of Ruatahuna. In the early twentieth century, during Ngati Whare's absence, the Crown high-handedly appropriated these scrublands and planted a huge pine forest. Ngati Whare were understandably aggrieved, because they had never ceded control of the Kaingaroa plains—including Murupara—to the Crown. (For examples of grievances associated with the Kaingaroa forest

and estates, see Tuhoe Waikaremoana Trust Board [WAI 40]; Ngati Whare Iwi Claims [WAI 66]; Ngati Tuwharetoa [WAI 269]; and Ngati Rangitihi [WAI 524]. Also see Crown Forestry Rental Trust 1996–1997 for claim objectives.)

By the 1950s, first harvesting in the Kaingaroa forest had begun, and then the fast-growing timber industry chose Rotorua as one of its central milling centers. The township rapidly expanded to city proportions in order to cater to the huge influx of labor required to fell trees, operate the mills, and provide supporting industries (Stafford 1988). During this time, hundreds of young Tuhoe and Ngati Whare descendants left their traditional homelands in search of a way of life that freed them from the poverty that had been strangling most central North Island tribes since before the First World War (Walker 1992). The post–World War II generation was not blind to the opportunities presented by the growing forestry industry, and many took up the government's offer of cheap housing to enable them to work and live a far less impoverished lifestyle in Rotorua. However, their parents and elders, who remained isolated in the Urewera mountains, continued to endure difficult conditions. Although contact with their remote home *marae* was maintained by migrants, especially in times of life crises, it did not come without friction from non-Maori employers who struggled to understand the underlying cultural importance of *hui.* The need to return to *marae* to take on senior duties as their homeland elders died neither assisted the migrants' job security nor their families' livelihood back in Rotorua. Compounding the situation was the fact that, as a new generation of Tuhoe was being born and growing up away from home, the original immigrants of the 1950s were not only aging but also dying. The ongoing difficulty of arranging *tangihanga* at *marae* in the geographically isolated regions of the Urewera, not to mention the ongoing kinship separation of elders from their urbanized grandchildren, rapidly drew Tuhoe into a head-on confrontation with Western world values.

Fortunately, when the Tuhoe immigrants of Ruatahuna and Ngati Whare arrived in mass in Rotorua in the 1950s, they had a distinct advantage over all other visiting descendants. Although Tuhoe had originally retreated into their mountains during the nineteenth century, they still desired access to Western goods and food products. Every January they used to travel down to Rotorua by horse and dray to camp on the outlying lands, now occupied by the Whakarewarewa Golf Club, and collect supplies for the upcoming winter. According to the esteemed Tuhoe elder of Ruatahuna, John Tahuri (personal communication, 1998), Ngati Whakaue in the 1920s took pity on their Ruatahuna and Ngati Whare relations and decided to make available a township block of land *(tuku rangatira)* named Nga Tarewa Pounamu

for their use. In 1923–1924 Tuhoe erected a large carved house on this block and subsequently named it Mataatua—in memory of an associated ancestral voyaging *waka* (canoe) from Hawaiki—and provided shelter for visiting Tuhoe and Ngati Whare until it became derelict in the 1950s. It was around this time that Ngati Whare were forced to sell some of Ngati Whakaue's *tuku rangatira* to the Rotorua County Council for nonpayment of rates. Fortunately, the remaining four acres, under Ruatahuna control, was vested as a Maori reserve that protected the remaining lands from further alienation.

In 1969 a *wharekai* (dining hall) was erected beside the old Mataatua house to allow Tuhoe immigrants to supplement *hui* with appropriate hospitality. Then in 1975 the old house was finally pulled down, and fund-raising for a new one commenced. Its development was guided by the *kaupapa* (vision) that it must represent all the Tuhoe who were by then living permanently in Rotorua, including descendants not only from Ruatahuna and Ngati Whare, but also from Ruatoki and Waimana. This guiding vision was to ensure that all descendants were provided with a bridge—*takawaenga*—home so long as they were born, lived, and died on the *mana o te whenua* of another tribe, Ngati Whakaue of Te Arawa. Native timbers were sourced from the Whirinaki forest, seasoned, and then taken to the New Zealand Maori Arts and Crafts Institute for carving by Pine Taiapa. Eventually the responsibility of deciding on the ancestors after whom the carvings were to be named was passed to John Tahuri because of his genealogical relationship to both Ngati Whakaue—the original donors of the land—and Ruatahuna—the original recipients.

In a taped interview, this Tuhoe *kaumatua* released all the knowledge he had surrounding the building of the new Mataatua, which was considerable (29 April 1998). He explained that the first *poupou* (on the left) in the house was named Maraki, because this Ruatahuna ancestor was also a direct descendant of the Ngati Whakaue leader Tunohopu. Another important ancestor to be depicted, this time as the *poutokomanawa*, was Rangiteaorere. He became famous for assisting his Te Arawa uncle Uenukukopako (the father of Whakaue) in capturing Mokoia Island, and many of his descendants make up Ngati Whakaue today (see Stafford 1967:61–74 for a Te Arawa–grounded history of Rangiteaorere).

After three decades of participating as unskilled labor in primary industries on the volcanic plateau,[4] Tuhoe were finally able to open their new Mataatua house on 2 June 1979 (Stafford 1988:365). The dramatic opening was marked by the Ruatahuna people presenting a famous *taonga (wahaika)* of their nineteenth-century leader Te Kooti, named Te Manaaki, to Ngati Whakaue as a peace offering. This was necessary because, as Kaki Leonard

noted, the *wharekai* (originally opened on 5 April 1969) should not have been given a name that included the *tapu* words "Te Arawa" because of the building's association with food (it was named Te Aroha O Te Arawa, "The Love of Te Arawa"). Apart from that one incident everything proceeded smoothly, and today Mataatua Marae provides the many hundreds of Tuhoe's Rotorua-based descendants with a *taonga*-rich place where they can bid farewell to their dead and conduct their monthly religious rituals (of the Ringatu Faith, held on the twelfth day of every month) first established by Te Kooti in the late nineteenth century (see Binney 1995 for background on Ringatu in the Rotorua region).

As for the *wharekai*'s name, nothing was immediately done, because Ngati Whakaue did not quickly provide Tuhoe with a more appropriate replacement. In fact it was not until the late 1980s that the Ngati Whakaue elder Tomairangi Kameta finally gifted to Tuhoe the Ngati Whakaue ancestral name Hinetai, while he was attending a *tangihanga* at Ruatahuna. He explained that Hinetai was not only the daughter of Tunohopu, from whom the land on which the Mataatua Marae stands originated, but she was also the ancestor of the famous Tuhoe leader Te Whiu Maraki. Tomairangi therefore suggested that Hinetai would meet with Ngati Whakaue's approval as a replacement for Te Aroha O Te Arawa as the name for the *wharekai* at Mataatua Marae in Rotorua.[5]

Around the same time the special relationship between the *tangata whenua* and Tuhoe was reaffirmed when Ngati Whare presented to Tomairangi a large *totara* log as *utu* for losing some of Ngati Whakaue's gifted Nga Tarewa Pounamu lands to the Rotorua County Council. From this log the 1990 Te Arawa *waka taua* (ceremonial war canoe) was expertly crafted by the master Te Arawa carver Lyonel Grant, and this *taonga* has since been paddled not only in New Zealand, but also overseas at the 1992 America's Cup regatta in San Diego.

Discussion

The purpose of this essay has been threefold. First, I noted that there are three types of *marae* operating in New Zealand today: tribal, nontribal and immigrant-tribal. Second, tribal *(tangata whenua) marae* belong to a genealogical continuum reaching far back into Maori society's ancestral Pacific origins, while the other two immigrant *(taurahere)* examples demonstrate diverse usage of cultural identity markers to maintain Maori identity in an urban context. Third, I have tried to make the reader aware that each of the immigrant *marae* situations operates under two disparate Maori value systems. On one hand, nontribal *marae* seem to have arisen out of urban

descendants' aspirations to counter Crown integration and assimilation policies, creating an institution to which all Maori who dwelled in the local city community might equally belong. On the other hand, the immigrant-tribal *marae* has developed out of special relationships forged and maintained with the *tangata whenua* that, from time to time, are reaffirmed through the prestation of *taonga* at specially significant occasions. Whereas nontribal *marae* have exclusively developed a pan-Maori identity in reaction to Crown policies and ethnic competition, immigrant-tribal *marae* have explored synthesizing genealogically ordered lore and custom *(whakapapa)* with the customary authority of the land *(mana o te whenua)* of the host tribal community.

While in the past nontribal *marae* have provided an effective vehicle to counter recent urban dilemmas, especially in the absence of *tangata whenua,* their current ability to adapt to the resurgence in tribal identity appears to be limited. The reemergence of *tangata whenua marae* in urban areas increasingly challenges the morality of any nontribal *marae* that resists honoring the primary status of *mana o te whenua.* Meanwhile, immigrant-tribal *marae* that offer alternative routes to ameliorating life crises, maintaining kin group identity, and conducting religious rituals without having always to return to geographically isolated homelands appear to be strategically well positioned to provide their descendants with a *takawaenga,* or bridge, into the twenty-first century.

Essentially, the recent urban transformations of *marae* are best understood as part of a cultural continuum of dynamic adaptation and fluidity that has existed for millennia. The more recent *marae* transformations, such as those experienced when kin groups moved from Rangiatea to Aotearoa, from pre–European contact to Christianity, from economic and social depression to an era of urbanization and treaty grievance settlements, are part of the continuum of Maori tribal society. Although tribes have been irreversibly entangled with European culture, religions, and values since the mid–nineteenth century, the *marae* has endured and is still the quintessential focus of Maori tribal identity. Ameliorating crises is part and parcel of each generation's responsibility for maintaining their kin group's long-term identity in relation to particular lands and the *marae.* Successful amelioration has assisted tribes over the generations to survive, recover, and prosper from one crisis to the next, ranging from climate changes, volcanism, and land contestation through to introduced diseases, firearms, Christian doctrine, and the imposition of foreign laws (as by the Crown). The secret to this survival seems to lie in each tribe's ability, first, to ensure that the lore of their ancestors persists in such a way that descendants can adapt to their changing social, political, and economic circumstances and, second, to prosper. This genealogical ability

of descendants to synthesize outside belief systems to complement their *marae*-associated core values appears to be at the heart of successful kin group crisis negotiation.

The challenge of living within an all-pervasive Western modernity is today's crisis for tribal identity and the *marae.* Core *marae* values of *whakapapa* and *tikanga,* carefully maintained for countless generations, have allowed descendants—the seed of Rangiatea—to maintain their kin relationship to their ancestors *(mana),* to the land *(whenua),* and to each other *(whanaungatanga).* The weakening of any one of these three essential customary relationships in the movement from one generation to the next represents a crisis to which kin group leaders must respond or risk the extinction of their *marae* and associated tribal identity. In the later part of the twentieth century, the weakening of all three of these kin relationships occurred as the result of urban resettlement, thereby disintegrating communities and presenting a threat to tribal identity. This crisis has been manifest on both an individual and a group level over the past five decades not only for those tribes being depopulated (rural-based communities), but also for the *tangata whenua* of metropolitan areas. It is the task of today's Maori leaders to respond creatively to this latest crisis, as their predecessors have done time and again over the generations, and to find new ways of allowing the *marae* values of *whakapapa* and *tikanga* to reinforce once again the group's kin identity to a community philosophically grounded in ancestral land.

The *marae* is a tried and tested institution designed to negotiate crises. But unlike in the past, today's *marae* is itself being directly contested. In 1951 the Crown confiscated Ngati Whatua O Orakei's *marae.* The repercussions of this action not only affected the *tangata whenua* but also the many Maori from tribes throughout Aotearoa/New Zealand who resettled in Auckland. For those resettling or born in the Auckland region between the years 1951 and 1991, Ngati Whatua were an invisible people. During that time, because there was no *marae* symbol upon the landscape proclaiming the tribe's presence, there was no statement of *tangata whenua* status. Consequently, the tens of thousands of Maori migrants entering the Auckland region were not provided the opportunity of customary recognition upon another tribe's ancestral domain. While the first generation of migrants maintained close contact with their home *marae* and kin groups (Metge 1964), this was not always the case for their children. The next generation grew up more familiar with their surrounding urban environment than with their parents' home *marae,* perhaps hundreds of kilometers distant. This generation was mostly unaware of Ngati Whatua's presence as *tangata whenua.* They began to form their own understanding of Maoriness, which had little to do with *whakapapa* and *tikanga,* but was instead ethnically molded in a Pakeha-dominated urban context. The result is a kinlike but nontribal structure—Maori kinifi-

cation (Rosenblatt 1997:18)—in which the customary *marae* concept has been revolutionarily adapted to represent a Maori identity devoid of genealogical connection to ancestral lands and the universe. In other words, as long as one is Maori, identity to nontribal *marae,* like Waititi, relies solely on residing in a particular region. These *marae* not only provide their members with a validation of their Maoriness, but give them a Maori-like platform to define themselves as *iwi* and even as *tangata whenua.*[6]

On one level, it could be argued that this nontribal urban *marae* phenomenon represents the successful indigenization of modernity (Sahlins, in Rosenblatt 1997:18), where urban leadership has apparently reconciled the crisis of metropolitan resettlement by providing descendants with a home *marae* in the city. From a tribal perspective, however, this attempt at ameliorating urban dislocation and Maori identity appears to have been counterproductive. Instead of harnessing customary values, which might continue to provide descendants with ancestral pride and identity in new circumstances (the urban milieu), *marae* like Waititi have discarded them in favor of a short-term solution. Urban Maori kinification obviates both *mana o te whenua* and *whakapapa.* Aside from the difficulties kinification ideology represents to the *tangata whenua,* it also prevents urban-born descendants from learning about their ancestral *marae* heritage of *mana, whenua,* and *whanaungatanga,* not to mention *taonga.* Denied this heritage, on death they are prevented from spiritually finding their genealogical pathway home to Rangiatea/Hawaiki.

Not all urban-dwelling Maori have chosen the nontribal route to maintain their sense of Maori identity. Many have continued to keep contact with their ancestral homelands either individually or as a group, via intermediary immigrant-tribal *marae,* even though they were born and raised in cities. During the years when Waititi was created, Ngati Whatua may have been *marae*-less, but this did not stop outside tribal groups from approaching the still distinct *tangata whenua* community of Auckland to seek their permission and guidance regarding the construction of an immigrant-tribal *marae.* The same also occurred in Rotorua when Tuhoe approached Ngati Whakaue. Such groups realized that lands on which cities have been built still have *tangata whenua,* whether or not their presence was obvious. Thereafter, customary understandings of *whakapapa* and *tikanga* have continued to guide these immigrant-tribal communities while they have dwelled on another kin group's city-covered *whenua.* Instead of an either/or situation, immigrant-tribal *marae* have become examples of urban adaptation without severing ancestral continuity. They successfully demonstrate that modern Maori aspirations can be achieved without having to sacrifice kin group identity.

In Auckland, Ngati Whatua's cultural slide into oblivion was finally reversed

when the Crown returned Orakei Marae in 1991. With their symbol of *mana* over the land restored, Ngati Whatua's presence in Auckland is slowly returning to full strength. A new generation of leaders have taken over the role of providing their descendants and all other Maori who choose to live under their *mana* with ancestral protection *(hunga tiaki).* This protection, however, is for the time being not accepted by nontribal *marae,* like Waititi, who continue to live and operate outside the lore of *whakapapa* and *tikanga.* Instead they are molding their Maori identity as an ethnic reaction to Pakeha values as dictated by the Crown rather than according to ancestral precedents as prescribed by *tangata whenua.* In the late 1990s these *marae,* represented by urban Maori authorities (UMA) like Te Whanau O Waipareira, engaged in a divisive public campaign against tribalism. One urban leader strongly and very publicly denigrated the maintenance of tribal identity as "a backward step [that] belonged in the dark ages" (Tamihere, in *New Zealand Herald* 1998:A5). However, in the same article a renowned tribal leader simply questioned: "If they don't have a whakapapa, how do they know they are Maori?" (O'Regan, in ibid.).

The late 1990s urban Maori campaign appears to have been the result of growing competition among tribal organizations for Crown-controlled assets and resources that have been promised to *"iwi."* Underlying motivations at an individual as well as a group level are undoubtedly complex. Closer inspection, however, reveals that the recent reinterpretations of nontribal *marae* as *"iwi"* bases are the latest urban counteraction to the Crown's ongoing divide and rule policies, which have been pitting Maori against Maori since the treaty was signed in 1840. More recently, the same urban-educated, legally trained Maori have shifted the battle for Crown resources back to the regions, especially those traditionally controlled by Tuhoe and Te Arawa *hapu.* The new prize is the capture and control of the Crown's multi-billion-dollar forestry assets that grow on the exclusive ancestral estates of distinct *hapu*—subtribes (WAI 791). Once again the Crown appears quite willing to enter into agreements with a non–tribally organized global settlement group (Judicial Conference File 2000), at the expense of the rightful descendants, who have remained relatively impoverished since original alienation in the late 1800s.

In the meantime, nontribal organizations like Waititi's Whanau O Waipareira have begun seeking investment opportunities outside normal Maori spheres in an effort to create a sound capital base from which a community can develop a long-term sustainable future. The most recent chief executive officer acknowledged that, as Ngati Whatua O Orakei continues to grow in power, it is imperative that a mutually sustainable partnership is forged (Te Rongomaiwhiti Mackintosh, personal communication, 2000). Such a part-

nership would provide benefit for both parties. *Tangata whenua* would finally be able to fulfill their obligations of *manaakitanga*—care and hospitality—to outsider Maori living on their lands, while nontribal urban authorities could provide the organizational mechanisms for the distribution of both Crown-controlled and tribal-originating health, education, housing, and employment resources to urban descendants. It remains to be seen how John Waititi Memorial Marae may respond to any such corporate initiative.

In the future I expect the customary precedent already set by urban immigrant-tribal *marae,* like Mataatua, coupled with responsible tribal and urban Maori leadership may well provide a positive path of development acceptable to both tribal and nontribal Maori organizations. One day this kind of development could deliver to all descendants, wherever they live on our planet, equal opportunities and benefits, while at the same time reinforcing their genealogical relationship with their home community of *marae,* elders, ancestral estates, and *taonga.*

NOTES

1. See Tapsell 1997 for a more comprehensive understanding of these central Maori concepts from the perspective of a *taonga*/kin group relationship.

2. In reference to Weiner's (1992) use of this concept as discussed in Tapsell 1997.

3. Following Kawharu 1989 I have decided to pluralize references to Maori kin groups within this essay so they might closer reflect the community reality that all tribes invariably represent collective ancestral and living identities.

4. The industries included forestry, dairy factories, and meat works.

5. This name has since been placed on the *wharekai,* and sometime in the future a special unveiling of the name is expected to take place, to which Tuhoe intend to invite Ngati Whakaue as guests of honor (John Tahuri, personal communication, 1998).

6. *Iwi* has until recently been translated to mean "tribe." But around the time I wrote the first draft of this essay (1998), urban Maori authorities, of which Waititi's incorporated trust (Whanau O Waipareira) is one, unsuccessfully tried to argue in the High Court that this concept is not necessarily based on kinship, only on residency (*New Zealand Herald* 1998:A5).

GLOSSARY

Aotearoa	accepted indigenous name for New Zealand
atua	ancient protecting ancestors, gods
hapu	subtribal group tracing descent from a common ancestor, which traditionally consisted of approximately three hundred members. How-

	ever, as the result of the 1840 treaty and the introduction of individual land title implemented by the Native Land Court, boundaries and kin group affiliation have become fixed. Consequently, *hapu* membership today can be on the order of thousands and may even be referred to as *iwi* (also see Firth, in Kawharu 1975:21); pregnant
Hawaiki	the ancestral homeland of the Arawa descendants: Rangiatea
hongi	ritual greeting by pressing noses
hui	kin group gathering on a *marae*
hunga tiaki	Te Arawa dialect term for *kaitiaki,* meaning guardian, manager, trustee
iwi	tribe: a large social grouping of related *hapu* connected by a distant common ancestor that temporarily came together in times of crisis or for political expediency (as in war). In more recent times *iwi* has also been used to define any group of Maori not necessarily connected genealogically; bones
kaumatua	male elders who are the kin group's orators on *marae*
kaupapa	charter, plan of procedure, business
kawa	protocol on the *marae*, rules
mana	authority, prestige
manuhiri	visitors to a *marae* not of *tangata whenua* descent
marae	ceremonial courtyard in front of meeting house
mauri	spiritual essence, life force
mihi	to give a public speech: *mihimihi*
Mokoia	island in center of Lake Rotorua, also called Te Motutapu a Tinirau
Ngati . . .	tribal *(hapu* or *iwi)* prefix meaning "the people of . . ." (followed by kin group's eponymous ancestor)
pa	village, fortified hilltops: *papakainga*
Papa	Papatuanuku—Earth Mother from whom all things descend: *marae*
papakainga	village community surrounding the *marae*
poupou	carved ancestral slab of wood inside a meeting house
rangatira	tribal leader, usually a male elder
Ranginui	Sky Father
Rotorua	one of nineteen lakes, inland Bay of Plenty; main township in region
taiaha	long hardwood fighting staff depicting an ancestor
Tainui	confederation of Waikato tribes named after their ancestral *waka*
takawaenga	intermediary, go-between, mediator
tangata whenua	kin group that holds *mana* over their customary-ancestral estates
tangihanga	death-mourning ritual on *marae*, which can continue for several days

taonga	any tangible or intangible item, object, or thing that represents a kin group's genealogical identity in relation to its estates and resources and that is passed down through generations
tapu	restricted, set apart; space/place associated with ancestors (c.f. *noa:* profane, common; space/place associated with everyday activities)
taurahere	immigrant Maori, non–*tangata whenua* Maori living in a town or city
Te Arawa	descendants of this ancient Hawaiki-originating *waka;* a mythical shark
Te Papa-i-Ouru	the ancient *marae* of Ngati Whakaue and all of Te Arawa
tohunga	spiritual leader, controller of *tapu* knowledge who supports the *rangatira*
totara	native tree used particularly for carving
Tuhoe	major tribal group of the Urewera region, Bay of Plenty
tuku rangatira	right of access to land and associated resources granted by home tribal group to an outside group
tupuna	ancestor
turangawaewae	a place to stand, home *marae*, ancestral land
utu	reciprocal payment, balance, revenge
wairua	ancestral spirit, soul
waka	general term for canoe, can be up to thirty meters long
wero	challenge
whakapapa	genealogy, philosophy of ordering the universe, weaving term: to layer
whanau	extended family, to give birth
whanaungatanga	interconnecting of kin during times of crisis, kinship
wharekai	dining hall on a *marae* complex; accompanies the meeting house and is usually named after a female ancestor
whare tupuna	meeting house named after kin group's eponymous ancestor
whenua	land; afterbirth, placenta

REFERENCES

Barlow, C.
1991 *Nga Tikanga Whakaaro*. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Binney, J.
1979 *Mihaia: The Prophet Rua Kenana and His Community at Maungapohatu*. Wellington: Oxford University Press.
1995 *Redemption Songs: A Life of Te Kooti Arikirangi Te Turuki*. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Crown Forestry Rental Trust
1996–1997 *Crown Forestry Rental Trust Report to Appointors, 1996–97.* Wellington: Crown Forestry Rental Trust.

Greenland, H.
1984 Ethnicity as Ideology: The Critique of Pakeha Society. In *Tauiwi: Racism and Ethnicity in New Zealand*, edited by P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, D. Pearson, and C. Sedgwick, 86–102. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Judicial Conference File
2000 WAI 791: VIP Claim, Wahiao, 27–28 November 2000. Waitangi Tribunal Deputy Chief Judge Joe Williams, Waitangi Tribunal. Wellington.

Kawharu, I. H.
1968 Urban Immigrants and Tangata Whenua. In *The Maori People in the Nineteen-Sixties*, edited by E. Schwimmer, 174–186. Auckland: Blackwood and Janet Paul.
1975 *Orakei, a Ngati Whatua Community.* Wellington: New Zealand Council for Education Research.
1989 Mana and the Crown, a Marae at Orakei. In *Waitangi: Maori and Pakeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi*, edited by I. H. Kawharu. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
1995–1996 Dimensions of Rangatira. Paper prepared under the auspices of a Hodges Fellowship. Auckland.
2002 Land and Identity in Tamaki: A Ngati Whatua Perspective. *Te Ara—Journal of Museums Aotearoa* 27 (1): 6–11.

Maaka, R. C. A.
1994 The New Tribe: Conflicts and Continuities in the Social Organization of Urban Maori. *The Contemporary Pacific* 6 (2): 311–336.

Marsden, M.
1987 Orakei Marae. In Orakei, WAI 9, Doc. A34. Document file, Waitangi Tribunal Offices, Wellington.

Metge, J.
1964 *A New Maori Migration*. London School of Economics Monographs on Social Anthropology 27. London: Athlone Press, University of London.

New Zealand Government Gazette
1950 Wellington. No. 50, 19 August.

New Zealand Herald
1998 Auckland. 19 March.

Orakei
1987 WAI 9. Wellington: Brooker and Friend.

Pepe, M. T.
1976 Trials and Tribulations of John Waititi *Marae.* Maori studies essay, Hukatai Library, University of Auckland.

Rosenblatt, D.
1997 Ko Titirangi te Maunga: Urban *Marae* and the Construction of Maori Community in Auckland. Paper read at the 1997 annual meetings of the Association for Social Anthropology in Oceania, San Diego, 19–21 February.

Salmond, A.
1976 *Hui: A Study of Maori Ceremonial Gatherings*. Auckland: Reed Methuen.

Stafford, D. M.
1967 *Te Arawa*. Wellington: A. H. and A. W. Reed.
1988 *The New Century in Rotorua: A History of Events from 1900*. Rotorua: Ray Richards Publisher and Rotorua District Council.

Tapsell, P.
1997 The Flight of Pareraututu. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 106 (4): 323–374.
1998 *Taonga:* A Tribal Response to Museums. D.Phil. thesis, School of Museum Ethnography, Oxford University.

Tauroa, H.
1986 *Te Marae: A Guide to Customs and Protocol*. Auckland: Reed Methuen.

Tumahai, D., P. Maihi, and M. Marsden
1986 Letter to the Registrar. Waitangi Tribunal. Wellington. 18 August.

WAI (Waitangi Tribunal Claim File)
40: Tuhoe Waikaremoana Trust Board. Waitangi Tribunal Claim. Published report pending.
66: Ngati Whare Iwi Claims. Waitangi Tribunal Claim. Published report pending.
269: Ngati Tuwharetoa. Waitangi Tribunal Claim. Published report pending.
414: Te Whanau O Waipareira Claim File, 1994–1995. Waitangi Tribunal, Document Bank. Wellington.
524: Ngati Rangitihi. Waitangi Tribunal Claim. Published report pending.
791: Volcanic Interior Plateau Statement of Claim, 20 August 1999. Waitangi Tribunal. Wellington.

Walker, R. J.
1975 *Marae:* A Place to Stand. In *Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maoritanga*, edited by M. King, 15–27. Auckland: Longman Paul.
1979 *Bastion Point*. Auckland: n.p.
1980–1988 Maori Land 1980–1988: Bastion Point 1981–1988. File 2. Newspaper cuttings compiled by Ranginui Walker. Auckland University Library, Auckland.
1987 *Nga Tau Tohetohe—Years of Anger*. Auckland: Penguin Books.
1990 *Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle without End*. Auckland: Penguin.
1992 Maori People since 1950. In *Oxford History of New Zealand,* edited by W. H. Oliver and B. R. Williams, 498–519. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

Weiner, A.
1992 *Inalienable Objects.* Berkeley: University of California Press.