Kaitiakitanga

Indigenous Governance Principles

Presentation at the Good Governance Conference, August 11 2018.

Governance is commonly understood by those with an Industrial orientation as the authority to control an entity, guiding it toward maximum productive output and therefore profit. An Indigenous perspective views governance as a responsibility to guard and nurture the resources available to an entity, ensuring that the resources and the environment in which they are found flourish. Everyone profits when a wholistic approach to production is core to the ethos of an entity. Informed by the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and Indigenous knowledge systems, in this article Jay Matenga argues that the highest priority for governors of an entity should be to actively partner with everyone involved in an organisation, to protect all resources and the ecosystems they are a part of, and participate in the process of community wellbeing as a priority outcome for a profit or not-for-profit entity.

Tihei mauri ora! It is the breath of life! In this paper, the breath of life comes to us from in the form of this whakataukī (proverb)… Manaaki whenua, manaaki tangata, haere whakamua (care for the land, care for the people, move forward).

Introduction

My identification as a Māori by virtue of my whakapapa, unbroken through my paternal line, positions me as an Indigenous person. While on my mother's side I have English, Welsh and Aboriginal Australian lineage, my paternal grandfather is full-blooded Māori and I can identify my genetic Māori heritage through him back at least 6 generations.

I was formed and educated in the world of my mother, which I will call the Industrial world because it has now infected more than just the Western hemisphere. Yet, my deepest understandings of reality are informed by the genetic influence of my father, the Indigenous world of tangata whenua Māori, the people of this land.

In this article, I will take you on a journey into a deeper understanding of governance from my experience of an Indigenous perspective. We will spend some time diving into the subconscious thinking of Māori and Indigenous people to help you understand the very foundations of our reality. Then we will emerge to see how that reality manifests in our workaday lives.

First, I will introduce you to the concept of indigeneity — looking at the definitions, values and some of the implicit realities of Indigenous-oriented people.

Then, I will contrast perspectives of governance between Indigenous and Industrial thinkers in contexts of increasing complexity. We'll see some limitations of deliberateness and advantages of dynamism. We'll look at governance using a navigational metaphor and then a provide a more concrete definition of governance.

I will show how priorities differ when it comes to how we Indigenous people view resources. Specifically, around issues of ownership, sustainability and connections.

In order to understand the rationale for an Indigenous perspective I want to take us deep into the mind of Māori and consider the implications of a concept like manaakitanga for how it helps us understand Indigenous Māori attitudes toward governance.

Te Tiriti o Waitangi (The Treaty of Waitangi) holds an important place in the bicultural relationships in Aotearoa New Zealand as it attempts to bring together the Indigenous (Māori) and the Industrial (Pākehā). I will briefly introduce the Articles of Te Tiriti and conclude by highlighting the three governance principles that are commonly drawn from Te Tiriti for application in today's world—in communities, politics, state services, healthcare, education, conservation, corporations and charities.

JayMatenga

Dr Jay Matenga is the author of "Mutuality of Belonging: Towards Harmonizing Culturally Diverse Missions Groups" and co-author of "Mission in Motion: Speaking Frankly of Mobilization". Jay is the Executive Officer for Missions Interlink NZ, serves as an Associate Director for the World Evangelical Alliance Mission Commission, and is Secretary of the International Council of Interserve.

Indigeneity

Definitions

First, we delve into the Indigenous world by exploring some definitions. In the broadest, dictionary sense of the word, to be indigenous usually means something like, 'native or original to a particular geography'.

In light of historic migration and current globalization, we could spend days exploring how long, or how many generations it takes before you could be considered a 'native' of any place, but that's the stuff of social psychology—of identity issues; and this is more of an organisational leadership article, so I will not explore the question further.

Thankfully, the United Nations has provided us with a baseline understanding of what it means to be indigenous in today's post-colonial reality. Indigenous people are those who:

1. Self- identify as an indigenous person at the individual level and are accepted by the indigenous community as their member (for example, via whakapapa for Māori).
2. Have historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies.
3. Maintain strong links to territories and surrounding natural resources.
4. Manifest distinct (tribal) social, economic or political systems.
5. Promote a distinct language, culture and beliefs.
6. Form non-dominant groups of society.
7. Resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities.

Here's what the UN has published concerning Indigenous people,

> Indigenous peoples are the holders of unique languages, knowledge systems and beliefs and possess invaluable knowledge of practices for the sustainable management of natural resources. They have a special relation to and use of their traditional land. Their ancestral land has a fundamental importance for their collective physical and cultural survival as peoples. Indigenous peoples hold their own diverse concepts of development, based on their traditional values, visions, needs and priorities.[1]

The United Nations estimates there are 370 million Indigenous people in the world, which make up about 5 percent of the world's population.[2]

Values

Indigenous people share many common value-systems quite distinct from the Industrialized world. Māori have a strongly wholistic perspective that makes it impossible to separate one set of values from another, but values that (ought to) guide Māori leaders have been identified by Māori authorities[3]. These values include…

Spirituality—Wairuatanga/mana/mauri/ora.
- Transcendence, Giftedness, Life-Force, Animation.

Identity—Whakapapa/turangawaewae.
- Origins, heritage, and standing place.

Relationships—Whānau/whanaunga/whangai.
- Family, group identity, foster/adoption.

Affection—Aroha/awhi/tautoko.
- Loving kindness, embrace, support.

Honour—Manaaki.
- Lift up or esteeming others.

Presence—Kanohi kitea.
- Being visible such that your face is seen and known.

Wisdom—Mohio, matauranga, māramatanga, ngakau.
- Knowledge, understanding, enlightenment, faith.

We'll return to a couple of these concepts as we proceed.

Reality

These values emerge out of the world that indigenous people live in—our reality. Indigenous people worldwide have a deep sense of connectedness to creation and those with whom they share a relationship. The Industrial world does not typically comprehend this. That world is informed by the West's deeply ingrained Greek view of the reality, which compartmentalizes and separates. Greek philosophy separated the world we can perceive with our five senses (the material world) from the world beyond our perception (the world of the spirit/s) which is relegated to the realm of speculation. For indigenous people though, the spiritual world is not the stuff of fantasy, it is the core of reality.

The modern mission movement went out from Europe in the late 18th century increasingly informed by the tenets of modernity and the emerging science of anthropology, which in itself was based on evolutionary theory. The concepts of pantheism and animism were created to explain what the Europeans could not understand in their encounters with indigenous people. It is time to recognise such constructs lack Biblical foundation and see reality with much more spiritual insight. This is the key to understanding indigenous governance principles. The whole of creation is an expression of a life force that the Bible declares is Christ, who holds all of creation together—cf. Colossians 1:15-20.

When you start to see creation as a connected, living entity, pulsating with the very glory and grace of God, you start to take our Genesis governance mandate of care for creation much more seriously.

The West is greatly outnumbered here. A spiritual force underlying all reality is described in many ways, like Qi (Chinese), Ki (Japanese), Prāna (Hindu), Vijñāna (Buddhist), Ruach/Spirit (Judeo-Christian), Barakah (Islam), Ntu (Bantu), Manitou (Algonquian), Ni (Lakota), Nilch'I (Navajo), Bio-Plasmic Energy (Euro-Russian), Mana (Melanesian), or for New Zealand Māori, we call it Mauri Ora.

These concepts describe the life animating force that connects everything and it is core to understanding the motivation and reverence behind indigenous attitudes toward governance.

Canadian filmmaker, James Cameron, captured a sense of this hyper-connected reality in the 2009 fantasy movie *Avatar*. In that movie, the forest paradise of the Indigenous inhabitants was shown to be thoroughly interconnected, represented by reactive luminescence, controlled by a single source (a Mother tree). Although the movie was CGI generated fantasy, for most Indigenous people this would be an accurate representation of the way they unconsciously understand how the world works in real life. The god-personalities of the unseen realm differ according to local beliefs (religion) but the 'technology' perceived in the connectedness of all creation is remarkably similar, even as it is markedly different to concepts of the world crafted by Western-influenced Industrials.

Governance

Having established something of the different nature of the Indigenous from the Industrial, let us see how this affects the issues of governance. The Industrial world has long functioned according to well-planned strategies and highly systematized processes. These worked well in simpler times when one view of the world (the European empirical perspective) dominated commerce. However, since World War II that scene has changed radically and increasing globalization is creating exponential complexity. New forms of governance and leadership are being developed and espoused, most sourced from Indigenous values and practices (although the sources are rarely acknowledged).

The Industrial world has only really started (post-1990) to realise that deliberate, fixed and linear planned strategies are inadequate for our increasingly complex, globalized and multi-cultural business realities.

Deliberateness

To illustrate the limitations of a deliberate strategy, a story is told of the sailing ship Orpheus entering the Manukau Harbour in Auckland on February 7th 1863…

The captain of the Orpheus had access to two charts to guide the journey; one from 1856, which was ratified but out-of-date, and the other, a revised pilotage guide from 1861, which showed that a middle sandbar had moved and grown considerably.

As the Orpheus entered Manukau Harbour on that clear and sunny day in 1863, she needed to navigate the series of dangerous sand bars.

Young Edward Wing, the 21-year-old signalman who was based on shore and guiding ships into the harbour that day, signalled to the vessel to keep to northward. But the captain insisted that the ratified but outdated chart be used.

Meanwhile, former quartermaster Frederick Butler, who had previously been to Manukau Harbour and saw the impending danger unfolding before them, tried to alert senior officers about their plight but his warning was ignored.

The vessel hit the sandbar and swung around to expose the port side to treacherous surf. The HMS Orpheus sank, and was the worst maritime disaster in New Zealand waters. Of the 259 crew, 189 of them, mostly young teenagers died.[4]

Dynamism

That is a tragic illustration of dysfunctional governance, or leadership from a very Western, Industrial perspective. Unfortunately, too many organisations today still operate by fixed three- to five-year strategic plans and their stakeholders get surprised when they suddenly discover that they're riding a pending shipwreck.

We no longer live in an Industrial era. We live in a globally connected and increasingly digital age requiring new metaphors to help govern organisations through ever-changing stormy waters. The business world seems to finally be looking to indigenous models to help them navigate their way forward in complexity.

For example, complexity theorist David J. Snowden has developed a method of decision-making for leaders facing overwhelming complexity that resonates very strongly with Indigenous principles. He called it the *Cynefin Framework*, which helps leaders understand the complexity in their external environment (past, connections, and current context) so they can more effectively determine how best to approach challenges. Drawn from a Welsh-Celtic perspective, his concept resonates very strongly with the Māori understanding of turangawaewae—your standing place, place of authority or belonging, derived from one's whakapapa (heritage). You could say, it is that place where you feel most Indigenous.[5]

Navigation

A more useful Indigenous metaphor, however, would be that of voyaging or journeying from one place to another. The idea of life as a journey provides the framework for a lot of Indigenous thinking. In order to handle the journey well you need to become a competent navigator—not one dependent on cartographic maps, fixed at one point in time, but one able to discern the signs and know how to appropriately respond. Being comfortable with fluid uncertainty is essential to governing well in complex environments.

In contrast to the deliberate plans of Industrials, for eons past the Indigenous have relied on dynamic, fluid, intuitive, iterative strategies that move with the data as it comes pouring in like the variable temperatures of changing currents along an ocean journey.

In Māori terms, governance is best understood by the image of a chief navigating the waka (canoe). It is synonymous with any leadership responsibility, where the waka is the organisation or group you are leading. Chellie Spiller has coined the term "wayfinding leadership" in this regard.

In the book, *Wayfinding Leadership*, Spiller notes that,

> Successful wayfinding (indigenous navigation) is the art of being able to figure enough things out–to have the intelligence to put all the information together to know where you are supposed to be. It's about knowing when something is not working and being willing to explore what other information is needed to make it work.[6]

Wayfinding Leadership is highly recommended as an academic source regarding leadership development that draws on and readily acknowledges indigenous metaphors such as navigating a waka.

If you have seen Disney's 2016 animated film *Moana*, you'll have some idea of the art required of the Wayfinder navigators of the Pacific. There is a humorous scene where the heroine asks the demi-god Maui to teach her how to sail. Maui briefly explains the role of a Wayfinder as one who determines where they are going by knowing where they have come from. The scene introduces well the concept that Spiller *et al* develop in *Wayfinding Leadership*.

The image of a waka navigator is as close an example of indigenous governance as you are likely to find—and it aligns well with the Greek and Latin concepts from which we get the English term "governance".

Definitions

The root of the English term "governance" is found in the Latin, *Gubernare*, drawn from the Greek, *Kybernan*—which means, to pilot a ship.

To govern, then, is to:

- steer, direct, rule, or guide. To take control of something.
- decide the priorities and constrain the direction of an entity.

Māori leaders in the colonial era created a term to express the English concept of governance as they understood it to be. They called it kāwanatanga, derived from the English word "governor". This foreign understanding of governance is a bit clumsy, however, because Māori are traditionally inclined toward a concept of kaitiakitanga, or guardianship, rather than governance in a Western sense. The root concept in the word is 'tiaki', which means to guard—keep, preserve, conserve, foster, protect, shelter; to keep watch over something that is not necessarily yours to own or control. And therein lies the difference.

Māori tohunga and Anglican priest, Māori Marsden said that guardianship (kaitiakitanga) and leadership (rangatiratanga) "are intimately linked."[7] So a leader is by default a guardian. The Wayfinder's primary concern ought to be the people and other resources who are with him/her on the journey. The destination and/or outcomes are secondary issues.

For Indigenous people everything is related, it is all connected. Furthermore, it is connected by relationships that are intimately spiritual. So, for a guardian/leader, maintaining relational harmony or balance becomes an overriding priority because harmony is integral to the wellbeing of, well, everything.

This understanding of reality actually lends itself well to organisational governance which, for the wellbeing of the entity, should require the strategic fostering of harmony in the complex relationships between (in the case of not-for-profits) the board/governors, management, stakeholders, donors, recipients of charity, communities and government policy compliance—all for mutual benefit, while monitoring accountability to ensure the community remains healthy.

Priorities

This leads us to look at how the Indigenous typically order their governance priorities. Balanced harmonious relationships take top priority. If a strategy is likely to negatively affect a group's relationships with one another, their community or their environment, the onus is on Indigenous leaders to make every effort to avoid that cost.

This stands in stark contrast to the Industrial priority which puts profit before people and places. With profit

as the highest priority decisions are made on the basis of efficiency and expedience—regardless of the damage or disharmony that is caused in the process. Hence, the horrid adage, 'It's not personal, it's just business'.

Ownership?

Another fundamental difference between Indigenous and Industrial governance lies with the concept of ownership.

Māori traditionally did not have a concept of ownership—everything belonged to everyone; at least, everyone with collective authority to dwell within their tribal boundaries. Exceptions to this general rule were a few personal items reserved for private use (*e.g.* garments, combs, weapons, tools).

Again, from Rev. Māori Marsden, "The resources of the earth did not belong to humans but rather, humans belonged to the earth. Humans merely had 'user-rights'".[8]

A capitalistic mode of production seizes and commodifies the land, its resources and people according to a value established in the marketplace. So, material economics becomes the highest governing priority for Industrials—and therefore profit tends to override spiritual, humanitarian and community wellbeing, unless the entity has a commitment to multiple bottom lines.

Moving on from the Industrial obsession with profit, these days socially responsible companies will develop three, if not four, bottom lines. A cynic could argue that profit remains the primary bottom line, or driving force, because it is the nature of the beast we call commerce, but the commonly espoused other bottom line priorities include: people, places (or planet), and more recently purpose (a spiritual, ethical, or culture-enhancing commitment).

These hybrid commitments are drawn directly out of Indigenous values systems and are increasingly resonant with the purchasing populations of the world today—which… makes it profitable to focus on.

Sustainability?

The traditional Industrial view of prioritizing consumption for profit is diametrically opposed to an Indigenous perspective which prioritizes sustainability—elevating wholistic wellbeing over capitalistic wealth. For the Indigenous, sustainability is not a self-centred concern. You may read definitions of sustainability that say something like,

> Meeting the needs of the present without compromising the ability for future generations to meet their own needs.[9]

This is self-centred. Such statements are often all about us—about maintaining our lifestyle and ensuring similar comfort for generations of us to come. Indigenous governance, on the other hand, is focused on a type of sustainability that is more concerned with nurturing, caring for the whole of creation with a certain reverence, a deep respect for the life in everything. Because it is all connected and related.

A Native American, Larry Merculieff illustrates this,

> When we go out and pick berries, we don't pick berries from a single location, and we don't take all the berries that are there. We don't use these scoopers that people use today. I've watched picking, scraping berries off bushes and destroying bushes in the process. When we pick flowers even, when we use the flowers for dyes, we pick every seventh flower so we're not picking them all from one place. And of course, we do it with a presence of mind, being present at the moment, but being aware of having an underlying sense of *reverence* for what we're doing and understanding the implications of what we're doing with this single plant, turns the entire ecology which the plant comes from.[10]

For the Indigenous, the whole of creation is intimately interconnected and interactive. Indigenous knowledge systems do not just think this, they embody it. It is not a cognitive thing, it is a deep profound connection, "whereby," Merculieff says, "the human body is in alignment and in harmony with the environment which we're in."[11]

Reverend Māori Marsden would add,

> Until we relearn the lesson that (humanity) is an integral part of the natural order and that (we have) obligations not only to society but also to (our) environment, so long will (we) abuse the earth. To realise that (we are children) of the Earth will help (us work) to restore and maintain the harmony and balance which successive generations of humankind have arrogantly disrupted.[12]

So, sustainability is more about the process of caring for life in the rhythms of life than it is about achieving a specific goal after which you can take your ease.

Similarly, governance is never accomplished. For the Indigenous leader, it is a lifestyle. Actually, more than that—it is one's life purpose.

Connectedness

This clash of worlds, between what I have called the Industrial and Indigenous, can be seen in disputes arising from different understandings of Te Tiriti o Waitangi (the Treaty of Waitangi, 1840), which I will explore in more detail below.

Before I do so, in order to understand the principles embedded in Te Tiriti, and how they relate to the effective governance of resources, we must dive a bit deeper into the thought-world of Māori. So, in typical Indigenous fashion, I will loop back over some territory we've already touched on and uncover a deeper understanding of resource governance from an Indigenous Māori perspective.

As I have shown, Indigenous people see all things connected via a vital life-force. There is little distinction between the spiritual and the material world. Life-force permeates all, and it needs to be carefully and respectfully handled.

Because of an ancient Greek philosophical influence, Industrials separate things from their being—material from spiritual—which allows them to manipulate the material world with a much clearer conscience than the Indigenous would be comfortable with. As an Indigenous person, I attribute that clear conscience to ignorance and although they say ignorance is bliss, it does not make it right.

Unfortunately, this is not the place to discuss issues of justice. Nevertheless, justice permeates the whole of this article when you take time to consider it. Here, the inequalities inherent in dominant Industrial concepts are exposed.

Manaaki

Mana

To better understand Indigenous governance principles, we need to peer inside Indigenous knowledge systems—what does our world look like? Let me take one concept and unpack it a bit more for you.

If you look up the word "mana" in anthropological texts you will read something like this:

> Mana is a supernatural force…. It is similar to life-force in many ways, but broader in scope. It is like a supernatural electricity that influences events in this world. It follows certain laws and those who know them can control it for their own benefit.
>
> Like electricity, mana can be dangerous to those who do not know how to handle it. A rock or tree full of mana can kill those who touch it. Consequently, where it is found, there are taboos that protect ordinary people by warning them of danger. On the other hand, religious practitioners such as magicians, witches, and shamans know how to control powerful forces without destroying themselves.[13]

While this explanation is somewhat sympathetic, and with due respect to the anthropologists who have spent years living among and studying Indigenous people, this is an Industrial interpretation. Life-force concepts have been interpreted by Industrial/secularists and (especially) Western Christians and missionaries as the stuff of infantile fantasy or immature and primitive thinking. But that is an imposed Graeco-Eurocentric paradigm. It is a construct and post-19th Century Industrials have adopted this prejudicial interpretation without question. The heart of it is evolutionary theory.

Industrials pride themselves in being anti-superstitious. They consider themselves "secular" and, the inference is that "secular" means "superior". But this is an illusion. Aotearoa New Zealand is reportedly one of the most secular nations in the world but the latest results from a longitudinal study of wellbeing in this country shows that a whopping 71% of our population believe in a life-force or spirit realm, with 48% believing in something they call God.[14]

Our human nature will not let the unseen realm be forgotten for long, the Industrial world has just forgotten how to understand it. The popular rise in super heroes and horror/fantasy today indicates a dissatisfaction with a purely material reality. There is a yearning for more, even as more in the West reject the spiritual heritage of orthodox Christianity that forged their nations. The fault for this should lay with theologians who embraced modernity, divorced faith from spirituality and left their churches with little more than a cognitive adherence to codified religion which emerges today as either a moralistic-therapeutic deism[15] or functional atheism[16].

For Māori, *mana* is <u>not</u> some sort of supernatural electricity, but it is a part of the life-force system—the God-breathed aspect of all creation. It is the essence of all life, which followers of Jesus can claim as the power of Christ himself from Paul's writing in Colossians.

To get a little more technical, *mauri* is the life-force essence of all things, *mauri ora* is the animation of things from the mauri life-force (to make alive), with *wairua* (spirit) being the spiritual connection from the Creator with creation.

Mauri is part of the physical terrestrial world and our physical person, whereas wairua is eternal and remains connected to the unseen, spiritual realm, both the terrestrial and celestial aspects of it.

Mana manifests the evidence of all these things at work through all that a person is and does in relationship with others.

So, mana is the evidence of what you can see about a person's mauri/ora and wairua, their life-force and spirit.

This sounds like the stuff of fantasy to atheistic and

secular Industrials, but it is merely a different way of articulating what all Western psychologists understand, at least to some degree. For example, mauri is the source of what psychology identifies as our personality preferences, strengths, natural talents and proclivities. Students of religion would recognise wairua as the source of our ability to commune with the spiritual realm, the source of certain spiritual giftedness beyond what we would consider 'natural'—like intuition, premonition, or a strong sense of vocation (a calling).

Mana is what you see when these things are activated and at work in a person's life. It is what psychologists would call our charisma—which theologians throughout the ages of the Church have understood as an individual's divine grace. The Industrial world knows these things exist, but secular human sciences have little idea why or where they come from.

For Māori, and no doubt many other Indigenous people, a person's mana is recognised by their community and ascribed to the person by the community—you cannot claim it for yourself. You can do things that negatively affect the community and lose mana and you can do positive things for the community and gain mana. The more mana you are recognised for, the higher standing you have in the community.

Mana is social currency and all Collectivist societies, especially those categorised as indigenous, elevate social currency over anything else. These are socially lubricant societies where relationships are everything. In contrast, the Individualist industrial West tends to be socially frictive with relationships viewed as means to ends as opposed to ends in themselves.

This brief excursion beneath the surface of Māori culture is to emphasize how critically important the unseen realm is to Māori. It informs our attitude to life and our responsibility to look after (govern/guard) all that we have been given.

Although it is convenient for Industrial-influenced Pākehā to do so, simply translating mana merely as 'honour' or 'respect' does a disservice to the concept. For Maori, if a person is recognised as having great mana, it is because their life-force, talent and giftedness is apparent and endorsed by the community. Furthermore, the benefits of having mana make you want to defend your mana to ensure it is not unfairly tainted. Traditionally, your very life could depend on it.

Manaakitanga

From the root concept of mana we get the word *manaaki*. *Aki* means to encourage, exhort or elevate. So mana/aki means to encourage the mana of another person—to esteem them as highly valued. Manaakitanga just means the concept of manaaki.

Manaaki envelopes concepts of loving kindness, mercy, honour, respect, hospitality, generosity, care and humility. It means holding other people and things in high regard, without expectation of reward, and helping them to feel like they belong and that their wellbeing is important.

I have personally experienced the principles of manaaki in China, Thailand, Central America, West and East Africa, Egypt, Turkey, Fiji, the Solomon Islands, and Porirua, Ruatoria, Gisborne, Foxton, Mangere… etc.

Manaaki is *aroha*, it is loving kindness in action. As I said, mana is social currency, and one of the easiest ways to earn mana is to extend mana to other people. This makes no sense to the Industrial world, which tends to be self-centred, zero-sum (win/lose), with a scarcity mentality prone to hoarding (greed). Of course, we must also account for fallen human nature and the propensity to abuse any system for selfish gain. Yet a relationship-enhancing orientation is deeply intuitive to most of the rest of the world (very generally speaking). This is similar to Chinese *Guanxi*, Japanese *Wa*, or Korean *Inhwa* for example.

In the global Christian mission community, a hot topic of exploration at the moment is the phenomenon of honour/shame in Collectivist (group-oriented) societies. What is being recognised is the manaaki-type concept. From my Indigenous perspective, however, I find the discussion sadly lacking in understanding of what we have been exploring here as the root of and need for honour and the social cost of shame (dishonour).

Te Tiriti

We emerge now out into the world of interpersonal and intercultural interactions. For the Industrial world, this is typically transactional, guided by contract—quid pro quo. 'I will do this for you, you will do this for me and we will achieve mutually beneficial outcomes' (in an ideal world).

This is how Industrialists interpret Te Tiriti o Waitangi. But the Tiriti is not a contract, it is a covenant. It is not an agreement to supply, but a commitment to an enduring, harmonious, reciprocal and mutually beneficial relationship.

Thus, we arrive at the historic intersection of two peoples. Migrants from an increasingly industrial West meet first inhabitants who are legitimately considered indigenous and see the world in wholistic, nurturing and honouring terms.

At this point it is appropriate to note that cultural ideals are not always cultural realities. My presentation of a

Māori perspective may seem overly glossed to non-Māori readers. But before you jump in your mind to the inter-tribal wars amongst Māori, think first of the revolutionary, civil and intra-continental wars of the West[17]. We are, ultimately, all descendants of the fall.

Within living memory of the American revolution and the heels of the Napoleonic wars, the British came a running to Aotearoa New Zealand on the coattails of the modern missionary movement—the first and only time in history that happened. Typically, missions follows commerce.

Established in 1840 between most Māori tribes and the British Crown, the Tiriti sought to bring law and order to New Zealand—primarily to keep the British subjects in check. Away from any restraining force, the Europeans coming to New Zealand were atrociously behaved. Russell, in the northern Bay of Islands, was known as the "Hell-Hole of the Pacific" for its debauchery. Think up the worst debauchery in the context of the Pirates of the Caribbean movies and you have pretty much imagined Russell in the 1830s.

To halt this excess and protect Māori from the damage this imported lawlessness was causing, as well as to mitigate the growing influence of the French in the region, the British authorities and certain Māori leaders, supported by English missionaries, developed the Tiriti to give the British Crown some authority to govern. But it was never intended to be a complete take over.

Articles

Just briefly, Te Tiriti consists of three Articles.

1. The first article gives the Crown (a 21-year-old Queen Victoria) the right to "govern" the land. But remember what I noted above about how Māori think of governance, as protective guardianship not controlling rulership. The English version of the Treaty speaks of "sovereignty", which might imply total control, but the Māori version of Te Tirity does not recognise an equivalent concept, certainly nothing that would suggest ownership or lordship over Māori, quite the contrary.
2. The second article protects Māori "possession" of their lands, estates, forests, fisheries and other property. But remember, Māori had little concept of ownership. What Māori understood from this second article is that their Indigenous rights would be protected. If they wished to sell some of their land they were free do so, but as it transpired, they were either pressured to do so (and some did so without proper authorisation from their tribe), or in some cases it was confiscated by the newly formed government desperate for cash.
3. The third article assures Māori of all the rights as full citizens of the British Empire. Again, protection/ guardianship (kaitiaki) of Māori culture and environment by an authorised leader (rangatahi) and established laws of protection would have been understood here.[18]

Covenant

It is a simple covenantal agreement. Three vows around which the marriage of two peoples: Māori and non-Māori, was established. There was an expectation of peace-making law and order and of harmonious development, but it all started to break down almost immediately after colonial settlement had begun.

The colonial settlers and their government did not merely break a contract when they forced Māori from their lands, they ripped reality apart. No amount of financial reparation can heal relationships that are so deeply damaged. Te Tiriti was a marriage commitment and within a 30-year period following the signing the relationship experienced a bitter divorce.

It took around 120 years before mediation began in earnest in the 1970s & 80s, and we are only just starting to see the relationship intended by Te Tiriti restored, but it is still in a fragile state because we are essentially trying to reconcile a cross-cultural marriage between an Industrial husband and an Indigenous wife (so to speak).

Bi-cultural

Part of the healing process is to recognise Aotearoa New Zealand as a bi-cultural nation, with Indigenous Māori as one party and all other people who settle here under the auspices of the New Zealand Government (appointed by the Crown) on the other. So, if you abide in Aotearoa New Zealand as a non-Māori you do so as part of the Pākehā side of the Treaty of Waitangi, under the authority of the British Crown's appointed Government. Although I am ethnically hybrid, I can claim the sovereignty that Māori reserved as their part of Te Tiriti—not by virtue of my upbringing or language, but because of my whakapapa (genealogical heritage).

Since the 1980s, the bicultural philosophy enshrined in Te Tiriti has permeated our society—our politics, civil service, education, science and research, commercial and charitable interests. Implied in this article is the belief that Aotearoa New Zealand is at the forefront of the world in being able to present new ways of leading organisations in the face of increasing complexity because of the indigenous perspectives that find their voice because of our bicultural commitments.

Experts who have analysed the essence of Te Tiriti of Waitangi has discerned three core principles in the Tiriti that inform the way we should organise and nurture corporate entities. These are governance principles of: Partnership (Article 1), Protection (Article 2), and Participation (Article 3).

Governance Principles

Each of those words, Partnership, Protection and Participation, are easily interpreted through an Industrial lens, but they mean something quite distinct through the eyes of Māori.

Partnership

As I have indicated, Industrials tend to think of relationships in contractual terms. So, for Industrials, partnership by default is an agreement between autonomous bodies/entities in order to achieve some common aim or objective. The assumption is, when the objective ends so the partnership dissolves. This is the thinking behind some in government who argue that Te Tiriti should be abolished once the settlements are complete. Should that perspective ever be presented to the public, it could result in major civil unrest. Te Tiriti is not a memorandum of understanding or a partnership agreement or a contract that can be terminated. It is an enduring covenant.

So, what does Partnership look like for Māori?

Whanaunga

I have recently completed my doctorate investigating Māori concepts of relationships compared to Industrial relationship assumptions. What I found was somewhat obvious to me, with a few unexpected surprises, but a metaphor of family guides all relationship expectations for Māori.

The Māori term for family is *whānau* and if you've lived in Aotearoa New Zealand for longer than a few months you will no doubt be familiar with this term. Unlike the Industrial 2.5 kids (or less), whānau for Māori is a broad term for extended family.

An even broader relationship term is *whanaunga*. As I discovered, whanaunga is not directly derived from the word whānau, but it is closely related. Whanaunga means to lean in toward others, like a mutually submissive relationship. Perhaps it is similar to the way some Asian cultures bow in respect to others. For Māori, however, it tends to be an egalitarian style of honouring, to put others before oneself in expectation of reciprocated respect.

Seen in the sense of whanaunga, partnership implies a much deeper and more enduring commitment to relationship. A commitment that holds people together through all kinds of trials because the relationship is the highest priority, not any predetermined common outcome. What is produced from the relationship is a by-product or bonus, rather than the primary aim.

In this sort of relationship everyone is a contributor and every contribution is valued even though it may be different from what is expected or immediately required to fulfil shared aims. Partnership fosters a certain unity in diversity and all involved have some input into the decision-making processes. Dwelling together in unity with equality is the highest ideal. Christians should compare that with John 17:21-23.

From a governance perspective, this shows the importance of consultation. For Industrials, this process can be seen as painfully slow, but for the Indigenous the process is much more important than the destination. As the often-quoted African proverb says, "if you want to go fast, go alone; but if you want to go far, go together". This is not about teamwork, it is about harmonious and mutually rewarding relationships. It is about tribalism—about family.

Again, it was an act of manaaki to welcome the newcomers into the family and extend rights to Queen Victoria, for her agents to act as kaitiaki guardians over her subjects. From this principle we learn that partnership requires grace, to allow each other to be who they are and to contribute the best of what they bring to the party without prejudice or restraint. In the mix we find unexpected blessing and resource—which is another expression of manaaki.

Protection

I have already introduced the idea of sustainability as a relatively recent governance priority and that Industrials have a different understanding of sustainability than the Indigenous. Sustainability would fall under the principle of protection, especially the protection of the environment.

However, protection with regard to bi-cultural governance under Te Tiriti is usually interpreted as protecting the culture of the Indigenous party. When I read about how businesses ought to go about this, I can't help but feel it is shamefully condescending. Nevertheless, it does provide Indigenous Māori with a basis for claiming some voice in the decision-making processes so that our cultural priorities are understood, appreciated and cared for.

Indigenous governance will not stand for mere lip service consultation. *Kaumatua*, Māori elders, learn to listen very deeply to what is being shared. They do not just hear words but also motivations and underlying meanings. They assess what they are hearing against other evidence they have gathered and other voices contributing to the discussion and they make decisions taking it all into account. To truly feel part of a governance process, Māori need to see how their voice has influenced outcomes and actions. Is Indigenous knowledge understood and appreciated? Does the strategy bear their influence? Do the outcomes indicate

mutual benefits?

As I have shown already, allowing Indigenous voices to be heard in the decision-making processes of governance can be very beneficial for organisations that take the time to listen and adopt Indigenous priorities and practices. It does not often lead to quick profits but the payoff over time will be well worth the effort and investment.

From this principle we learn that stakeholders, customers, or the recipients of charitable causes need a voice to speak into the ways we govern our organisations and carry out our activities. This is a good antidote for condescension that too easily infects our work like a contagious disease.

More information about distinctly Māori business aspirations can be found on the Te Puni Kōkiri website here: https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/. The onus is on business, charity and community leaders to protect the rights of Indigenous people to influence in this way.

Participation

What this all suggests is that a *Partnership* between Industrials and Indigenous, that *Protects* the rights of the Indigenous, will result in *Participation* by the Indigenous in the governance processes of the entity in question.

This all requires a willingness to share power. It is an issue of equality; both in the opportunities to participate and sharing in the beneficial outcomes or profits resulting from mutual participation.

Unfortunately, partnership is still most often expressed in the form of tokenism where some representation of the Indigenous perspective is made visible, without full authoritative engagement by the relevant Indigenous community. At worst, it can degenerate into appropriation, where cultural forms, like language (e.g. Māori names, artwork) are co-opted without any involvement or authorisation from Indigenous informants.

From this principle we learn that all stakeholders in a partnership relationship deserve to have an active role in bringing about shared aims, to help ensure that what is done is honouring of the cultures and resources of all the partners, with discernible influence on the entire organisational culture, its systems, activities and outcomes.

This will not be achieved without misunderstanding, tension or outright conflict. Organisations that desire Indigenous input into their governance strategies need to be prepared to be challenged, and prepared to stay at the table to work things through to resolution—but that will not happen quickly. It takes time to learn to appreciate other cultural perspectives and often it can only emerge by holding crucial conversations guided by a competent mediator or facilitator.

Conclusion

In this article, I have introduced the concepts of Indigeneity and Governance. I contrasted Indigenous perspectives against Industrial assumptions. I noted how priorities can differ because of the very different ways of viewing the world—and even though we use similar terminology, they can mean quite different things.

I briefly introduced the intention of Te Tiriti o Waitangi and touched on how each of the three articles were interpreted differently by each party.

On the basis of this covenant, we now live in a bi-cultural nation. This has implications for how corporate entities operate in Aotearoa New Zealand, and it is commonly understood that three core principles ought to apply in all organisational dealings: Partnership, Protection, Participation.
As you go out into the world to make your mark. You will do well to reflect on the value that Indigenous perspectives bring to the commercial and charitable worlds in an increasingly connected and complex age, and vow to protect the life-force in all things for the benefit of all creation for future generations.

Waiata

In the tradition of my forefathers I must conclude the written version of this oratory with a waiata (song). This one is well known, especially since it has been adopted recently by the New Zealand All Blacks as a rallying call.

It speaks of the Indigenous commitment to unity, to seeking knowledge and to living according to the values of loving all people…

Tūtira mai ngā iwi	Look this way together, people
Tātou tātou e	All of us, all of us.
Tūtira mai ngā iwi	Align together, people
Tātou tātou e	All of us, all of us.
Whaia te maramatanga	Seek after enlightenment
Me te aroha - e ngā iwi!	and love of others - everybody!
Kia tapatahi,	Think as one,
Kia kotahi rā.	Act as one.
Tātou tātou e	All of us
Tātou tātou e.	All of us.

The All Black supporters' version can be seen here: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VxorRtINRTc

For Further Reading on Māori Governance

In addition to the endnote citations, further helpful information can be found online…

Bowman, Emma. *The Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi Clause in the Mixed Ownership Model Legislation*. BLaws paper, Otago University, Faculty of Law, 2012. Available online here: www.otago.ac.nz/law/research/journals/otago041729.pdf

Joseph, Robert. *Contemporary Māori Governance: New Era or New Error?*. Presentation slides available online here: http://maorilawreview.co.nz/2014/12/indigenous-peoples-good-governance-human-rights-and-self-determination-in-the-second-decade-of-the-new-millennium-a-maori-perspective/

Katene, Selwyn. *Modelling Māori Leadership: What Makes for Good Leadership?*. MAI Review, Vol. 2, 2010. Available online here: http://www.lrhartley.com/seminars/katene.pdf

Māori Law Review. *Indigenous Peoples' Good Governance, Human Rights and Self-Determination in the Second Decade of the New Millenium – a Māori Perspective*. Available online here: http://maorilawreview.co.nz/2014/12/indigenous-peoples-good-governance-human-rights-and-self-determination-in-the-second-decade-of-the-new-millennium-a-maori-perspective/

Mead, Hirini Moko, et al. *Māori Leadership in Governance*. Hui Taumata Action. Victoria University of Wellington. Available online here: https://nfparticles.wikispaces.com/file/view/Maori+Leadership.pdf

Rainey Collins Lawyers. *Business and the Treaty of Waitangi*. Available online here: https://www.raineycollins.co.nz/files/businessthetow-unleasingeconomicpotential.pdf

Te Puni Kōkiri. *The Principles of the Treaty of Waitangi as Expressed by the Courts and the Waitangi Tribunal*. Available online here: https://www.tpk.govt.nz/documents/download/179/tpk-treatyprinciples-2001-en.pdf

Waitangi Tribunal. *The Treaty of Waitangi Principles*. Website: https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/treaty-of-waitangi/principles-of-the-treaty/.

ENDNOTES:

---

[1] UN Permanent Forum on *Indigenous Issues Factsheet*. Online here: http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/unpfii/documents/5session_factsheet1.pdf

[2] Secretariat of the Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (SPFII). 2004. *The Concept of Indigenous Peoples*. Workshop on data collection and disaggregation for Indigenous peoples. New York: Department of Economic and Social Affairs.

[3] For example, Mead, Hirini Moko. *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values*. Huia Publishers, Wellington, 2003. Marsden, Māori and Royal, Te Ahukaramu Charles, *The Woven Universe*. Estate of Rev Māori Marsden, Otaki, 2003. Along with a number of titles from Mason Durie and Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal, among others.

[4] Spiller, Chellie et al. *Wayfinding Leadership: Ground-breaking Wisdom for Developing Leaders*. Huia Publishers, Wellington. Kindle Loc. 967.

[5] Snowden, D.J. Boone, M.E. *A Leader's Framework for Decision Making* in Harvard Business Review, November 2007. See also New Zealand based, Jennifer Garvey Berger and Keith Johnston's *Simple Habits for Complex Times*, Stanford Business Books, Stanford CA, 2015.

[6] Spiller, C et al. Kindle Loc. 705.

[7] Marsden, M. *Kaitiakitanga: A Definitive Introduction to the Holistic World View of the Māori*. PDF, 1992. p20. Available online here: http://www.marinenz.org.nz/documents/Marsden_1992_Kaitiakitanga.pdf

[8] Marsden 1992, p15

[9] Brundtland GH. *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*. United Nations, New York. 1987.

[10] Merculieff, Larry. 2007. *Native Perspectives on Sustainability*. [Website]. Accessed July 28, 2016. http://www.nativeperspectives.net/, p3.

[11] Merculieff, Larry, p3.

[12] Marsden 1992, p17.

[13] Hiebert, P. et al, *Understanding Folk Religion*. Baker Books, Grand Rapids MI, 1999, p68.

[14] Bulbulia, Joseph. *Religion and the Good Life in NZ Study*. Humanities and Social Sciences Faculty, Victoria University, 2017.

[15] "Moralist Therapeutic Deism" is a term that Christian Smith created to describe the dominant faith perspective of US American teens in the early/mid-2000's. This is the generation known as Millennials. Smith, C. Denton M. L. *Soul Searching: The Religious and Spiritual Lives of American Teenagers*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.

[16] For example, Arthur Boers notes, "L. Roger Owens argues that much leadership literature promotes 'functional atheism': working from 'the unconscious assumption that if I don't make something good happen here it never will.' Relying on techniques and best practices, we may forego reliance on God; we act like atheists. We effectively deny God's existence or efficacy." Arthur Boers. *Servants and Fools: A Biblical Theology of Leadership*. Abingdon Press, Nashville TN, 2015. Kindle loc. 477.

[17] A comprehensive list of just the European wars around the time of the settlement of Aotearoa New Zealand can be found here: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_conflicts_in_Europe#19th_century

[18] For simplified source, refer: https://nzhistory.govt.nz/files/documents/treaty-kawharu-footnotes.pdf.