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Since the late nineteenth century the tourism industry has focused primarily on two things in selling holidays to New Zealand: the natural landscape and Māori culture. Māori have been involved in tourism for more than 150 years however their “identity” as tourist attractions rather than tourism managers has to some extent marginalised Māori from the control of their own cultural expression. Prior to the 1990s much of New Zealand’s off-shore tourism marketing represented Māori as the exotic “Other” manifest through what Edward Said (1978) has termed Orientalism - the discursive and textual production of colonial meanings whereby language becomes a medium through which a hierarchical structure of power between coloniser (Pākehā) and colonised (Māori) is perpetuated. Such images have constructed a homogenous identity of Māori culture. The impact of such demand driven international tourism marketing is reflected in the call by Māori tourism stakeholders to control the representation and meanings of their image, tribal identities and cultural difference. Amongst the key objectives stated in the New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010 is to ‘ensure Māori participate and are partners in the tourism sector and that Māori culture and identity is protected’. However, the notion of identity has been subject to a bicultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā that is at odds with Māori aspirations to autonomous development. If increased Māori capacity in the tourism sector is to be effectively managed and sustainable there is a need to recognise and promote the diversity of Māori culture. The industry’s notion of “Māori identity” must reflect the multiplicity of the “Māori subject”; the reality is that modern Māori negotiate a number of identities including tribal.

This thesis draws on postcolonial theory to critically examine the representation of Māori cultural tourism in New Zealand. I argue that tribal diversity offers a means by which Māori tourism practice and practitioners subvert the homogenous Other and re-inscribe new subjectivities and meanings in a tourism environment by utilising Bhabha’s (1994) concept of hybridity. The mixing that hybridity represents cannot fit within the bicultural framework of Māori Pākehā relations that works against the notion of culture as dynamic and changing. Research findings reveal that tribal differences create regionally diverse subcultures and representations of Māori and show a complex “inclusivity” of Māori.
tourism development working within a *third space* of equity, innovation, creativity and self-empowerment. This *third space* effectively re-negotiates biculturalism. These issues are discussed within a tourism context that reflects the wider politics of Māori Pākehā relations in New Zealand. Thus tourism might act as a medium for offering postcolonial counter-narratives that reclaim cultural power and political discourse in the wider domain of indigenous self-determination.
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# Glossary of te reo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ahi kā</td>
<td>keeping the fires of occupation burning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haka</td>
<td>dance; performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hangi</td>
<td>underground oven, meal produced in a hangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>family group; sub-tribe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hui</td>
<td>meeting or gathering, conference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iwi</td>
<td>tribe; large grouping of hapu sharing a common ancestor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaitiakitanga</td>
<td>guardianship, the practice of caring for special places or resources,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>including the mauri or spiritual nature of such places or resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumātua</td>
<td>elders of the iwi or hapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaupapa</td>
<td>plan, strategy, methods, principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kawa</td>
<td>protocol; correct way of doing things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kāwanatanga</td>
<td>governance, trusteeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kete</td>
<td>bag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kōrero</td>
<td>talk, speak, conversation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotahitanga</td>
<td>unity movement, unification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>respect, dignity, power, prestige, authority; mana has a variety of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meanings including the enduring power of the gods, the power of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>land, power of ancestors and the power of the individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana whenua</td>
<td>title, customary rights over land, sovereignty over land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manaakitanga</td>
<td>hospitality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manuhiri</td>
<td>visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>(n)native, or descendant of a native of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a)ordinary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māoritanga</td>
<td>Māori culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>local community and meeting grounds, open space in front of a wharenui (carved meeting house); all the buildings associated with a Māori community facility; spiritual and symbolic centre of tribal affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matauranga</td>
<td>knowledge, well-being</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mauri</td>
<td>life force, life essence; spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mihi</td>
<td>greeting (mihimihi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moana</td>
<td>sea, ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pā</td>
<td>occupation site or fortified village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>European (not Māori)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papatūānuku</td>
<td>Earth Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pounamu</td>
<td>greenstone; (nephrite jade); treasured stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōwhiri</td>
<td>songs of welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purakau</td>
<td>stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangatiratanga</td>
<td>sovereignty, authority in decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangi</td>
<td>heaven, sky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranginui</td>
<td>Sky Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reo</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rohe</td>
<td>geographical territory of an iwi or hapu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata whenua</td>
<td>people of the land, first occupants, Māori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taniwha</td>
<td>monster, powerful person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taonga</td>
<td>treasured possession, valued things, items of cultural significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tapu</td>
<td>Sacred. Tapu has many meanings; it is the power and influence of the gods; restricted; sacred; includes restrictions and prohibitions on places, people, special thing or resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Puni Kokiri</td>
<td>Ministry of Māori Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te reo</td>
<td>the Māori language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</td>
<td>The Treaty of Waitangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tikanga</td>
<td>appropriate way of doing things, customs; course, reason, meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tino rangatiratanga</td>
<td>full authority, chieftainship or supreme trusteeship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tupuna</td>
<td>ancestors; grandparent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tūrangawaewae</td>
<td>ancestral lands, ‘place to stand’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urupā</td>
<td>cemetery, burial ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wāhi tapu</td>
<td>sacred place, restricted place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiata</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wairua</td>
<td>spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waka</td>
<td>canoe, vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakairo</td>
<td>carving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakapapa</td>
<td>line of descent; genealogy; ancestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakatauki</td>
<td>proverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau</td>
<td>family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānaungatanga</td>
<td>kinship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whare</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whenua</td>
<td>land; placenta or afterbirth (symbolises Māori connection with the land)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sources: Karetu, T.S. 1984; Kawharu 1989; Moorfield, J. 1997; Williams, H.W. 1992)
**Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMTA</td>
<td>Aotearoa Māori Tourism Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMTF</td>
<td>Aotearoa Māori Tourism Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EN</td>
<td>Enterprise Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITOC</td>
<td>Inbound Tour Operators Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOT</td>
<td>Ministry of Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRTRO</td>
<td>Māori Regional Tourism Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTAG</td>
<td>Māori Tourism Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MTTF</td>
<td>Māori Tourism Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTO</td>
<td>National Tourism Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>Northland Tourism Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZ</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZMTC</td>
<td>New Zealand Māori Tourism Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTB</td>
<td>New Zealand Tourism Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTC</td>
<td>New Zealand Tourism Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTIF</td>
<td>New Zealand Tourism Industry Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTPD</td>
<td>New Zealand Tourism &amp; Publicity Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NZTS</td>
<td>New Zealand Tourism Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTO</td>
<td>Regional Tourism Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIANZ</td>
<td>Tourism Industry Association of New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMTA</td>
<td>The Māori Tourism Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNZ</td>
<td>Tourism New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPK</td>
<td>Te Puni Kōkiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSG</td>
<td>Tourism Strategy Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTMTA</td>
<td>Tai Tokerau Māori Tourism Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USP</td>
<td>unique selling point</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION

Māori are the indigenous peoples of Aotearoa\(^1\) New Zealand. The history of New Zealand is one of pre-colonial settlement by Polynesian Māori about 1000 years ago and subsequent colonisation by European settlers (Pākehā) in the nineteenth century. As such the relationship between Māori and the Crown has been one of colonised/coloniser couched in terms of biculturalism. Over time one of the most enduring aspects of this relationship has been the struggle by Māori to assert a greater degree of cultural, economic and political autonomy in New Zealand (Durie 1998). For Māori this assertion is inherently connected to their distinct tribal cultural identity, set against the challenges presented by a changing New Zealand national identity. In a broader international context this reflects the situation of many indigenous peoples who have been subject to the practice of colonisation.

This thesis addresses complexities surrounding Māori representation in a tourism context as one that reflects the wider socio-political environment of Māori/Crown colonial/postcolonial relations in New Zealand. For Māori, the issue of identity is inextricably tied to aims of self-determination and autonomy and is therefore a vital component of Māori (re)presentation. As such, the intention of this research is to examine how Māori tourism operators use cultural identity in ways that renegotiate biculturalism whilst also promoting the multiplicity that ‘makes up’ Māori tribal culture. Tourism is an arena whereby Māori have been participants as both ‘product’ and ‘producer’ for over 150 years and one in which they increasingly participate in collaborative and dynamic ways that enrich the cultural identity of all New Zealanders. Thus, the transformation of Māori culture is under review through contemporary processes of cultural production. However, such changes also create tensions within Māoridom that impact on both traditional and modern values of kin accountability as Māori become active players in a global world of capitalism and consumption.

\(^1\)Translated as ‘land of the long white cloud’ and the name often used by Māori for New Zealand. Aotearoa was the name of the canoe of the explorer Kupe in Māori mythology. Both names are commonly used as either Aotearoa New Zealand or New Zealand.
Background to Research

In its broadest sense this thesis examines the role that identity plays in the representation of indigenous tourism. This topic interest developed out of my GDipTour dissertation that examined the importance of authenticity to cultural tourism in Northwest Territories (NWT) Canada and subsequently my Masters thesis which examined image formation of tourism in NWT. Images in the NWT were strongly influenced by its natural landscape and used by tourism marketers to promote the region. A strong indigenous presence (50 per cent of the population were First Nations) in the region added a cultural dimension to tourism that I found was often not recognised by tourists until they arrived in the NWT (Amoamo 2003). However, indigenous culture was also inextricably connected to landscape and although a secondary motivation for travellers to the NWT I argued that travellers to the region may also discover a level of cultural authenticity they had not anticipated.

Like Māori, indigenous peoples in the NWT maintain a spiritual and physical link with the landscape. The boundary between material and spiritual realms is easily crossed in Aboriginal knowledge systems and impacts on the environment. For example, industrial development and exploitation of natural resources by non indigenous peoples directly infringes on their well-being (Castellano 2004). These are also issues that correspond with environmental values between Māori and Pākehā in New Zealand, not least of which have become part of Treaty² land claims between The Crown and Māori. Local First Nations people involved in NWT tourism voiced concern over similar issues as Māori regarding the control, commodification, collaboration and ownership of their cultural tourism products. Tourism was often viewed as a positive step for economical wellbeing and transition from traditional subsistence lifestyles but needed to work within a framework that protected aboriginal peoples land-based way of life. Tourism thus played a dual role toward maintaining cultural identity for northern peoples, acting as an agent of change as well as an agent of preservation (Notzke 1999).

---

² Treaty of Waitangi signed in 1840 between Māori and the British Crown
My Canadian research influenced the present study of Māori tourism with regard to issues of imagery and representation of indigenous peoples in postcolonial contexts. Both Canada and New Zealand are settler societies and as such share several features in common (Havemann 1999; Maaka and Fleras 2005). Tensions are still evident in the political and cultural makeup of both countries. As original occupants Canada’s First Nations peoples and New Zealand Māori assert their collective and inherent rights to self-determination of jurisdictions pertaining to land, identity and political voice (Fleras 1999). As such, these assertions are inherently political and often problematic in their challenge to the State/Crown framework for coexistence not least of which in New Zealand relates to the sharing of public power by the Crown and Māori. The terms of that sharing were not clearly specified or agreed by the Treaty of Waitangi (Palmer 2008).

New Zealand tourism was often admired by Canadian tourism operators I spoke with; in their opinion Māori culture was a well established part of New Zealand’s tourism image. This made me question the reality of these perceptions against the reality of the current situation. How well were Māori represented in terms of equality and control of their image? How did their ‘image’ contribute to New Zealand’s international touristic image? Did these images represent Māori in the present - or in the past; as ‘exotic’ and ‘Other’? Was this representation indicative of Māori culture as they conceptualise it? As a person of Māori descent how did I conceptualise Māori tourism? Was it representative of how I felt as being Māori? These questions underlie the motivation for writing this thesis. I realised that I was guilty of perceiving Māori tourism as predominantly ‘poi and haka’, ‘hangi’ and ‘hongi’, identifying with well-known images such as Māori ‘warrior’, Māori ‘maiden’, the fierce ‘wero’ (or challenge) and viewing cultural performances of Māori dressed in traditional ‘costumes’ as the normal ‘face’ of New Zealand tourism marketing. I knew these images had been promoted to international tourists (and New Zealanders) for a very long time but I also knew that Māori culture was more diverse than what visitors saw ‘on the surface’. In my view there was a need to deconstruct these images –

---

3 Dance, performance
4 Cooking method in underground oven
5 Māori greeting by touching of noses
to pull apart the cultural layers that underlay such imagery. What were the values and meanings *from* a Māori perspective that lay behind this representation? Who represented and who didn’t? Whose identities were exposed – and how?

Images play an increasingly important role in visitor perception and decision-making (Wang 2000) but also involve a process of discourse that is underpinned by issues of power. Value dimensions within cultures – common beliefs, attitudes, customs, meanings, and consumer behaviour influence the manner which people view images of a destination. Therefore, tourism operators are in a position of power to reflect plurality of meaning in the marketing process and play a significant role in establishing identities. Māori work within these power structures in ways that ensure Māori tourism is fully integrated within the national and global tourism environment but also in ways that promote autonomous self-determination and sustainability for Māori. I felt it timely to investigate the construction of Māori identity within a tourism environment predominantly governed by Eurocentric ideologies and non indigenous peoples (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002; Ryan 1997, 2000) but one that was under constant challenge and renegotiation by modern Māori.

**Research and Indigenous Peoples**

Despite changes in the way qualitative research has developed in the social sciences Goodson and Phillimore (2004) note that the researcher’s voice as ‘expert’ still dominates the text. It is therefore important that my approach to this research does not impose researcher-determined criteria over research participants. There are still examples in more recent ethnographic accounts of tourism literature whereby little change in the researcher’s voice as ‘expert’ dominates the text and remains depersonalised. Examples cited are Ryan and Crott’s (1997) work on the impact of tourism on Māori culture, Smith’s (1998) ethnographic account on war and tourism, and Doorne, Ateljevic and Bai’s (2003) research on identity and tourism in China. Research findings are written from an objective perspective, interpreted accounts are often represented as generalised
facts, while findings are offered as a single truth. In these texts the ‘authentic’ voice of those researched remains largely invisible (Goodson and Phillimore 2004: 10).

Although researchers in tourism are addressing a much wider range of topics and therein lays the opportunity for various interpretive styles to be used, the privileging of the researcher voice over those researched is still problematic. Bishop (2005) has stated that much qualitative research has also maintained a colonising discourse of the ‘Other’ by seeking to hide the researcher/writer under a veil of neutrality or objectivity. But there are positive sides to qualitative research that I would stress are relevant to my research. My justification in using a qualitative approach is threefold. Qualitative inquiry embeds the study in rich contexts of history, society and culture (Cohen 2004; Jamal and Hollinshead 2001). This is particularly relevant to viewing Māori as a colonised people and their temporal relationship with Pākehā in the development of the nation that is Aotearoa New Zealand. Secondly, it resituates the people whom we study in their life-worlds. This is critical in appreciating the different epistemologies and ontologies that Māori hold within their worldview and cultural beliefs. Particular attention to the social locations they (Māori) occupy is inherent in this objective. Third, it regards those who we study as reflexive, meaning-making, and intentional actors. We must understand the values of those studied in order to take a holistic and collaborative approach to what is being studied (Oliveira 2005).

All research, by its very nature, is political (McKinley Brayboy and Deyhle 2000) and crossing boundaries from academia to the real lives of people is not a seamless path. As a qualitative researcher and a person of Māori descent I realise this path at times may be fraught with tensions and misunderstandings. Webber (2009: 2) reminds us we have to consider how, in describing what we see in an ‘objective way’, we are already locked into frameworks of cultural understandings which can inevitably be critically assessed in terms of their political contours and interests. My hope is to extend the boundaries of qualitative research in understanding issues such as representation and identity by situating the broader indigenous agenda in the research domain. Tuhiwai Smith (2005: 85) describes this domain as ‘tricky’ because it is complicated and changeable and can
play tricks on researchers. In the current climate relationships between methodology, ethics, institutional demands, and the communities it involves are becoming increasingly complex. Open and honest communication builds a level of trust between the researcher and research participants (Bishop 1996, 2005; Carr 2004; Tuhiwai Smith 2003). The preservation of mana (status) in this process is critical for both parties.

My research is undertaken in a collaborative way and views both parties as contributors to the production of knowledge; the interaction between them being a key site for both research and understanding (Goodson and Phillimore 2004). The holistic worldview of Māori culture necessitates a methodology associated with the paradigms of the interpretive sciences, critical theory and adherence to Māori research principles. Such a holistic approach looks at the larger picture, and begins with a search for understanding of the whole in order to understand the social settings and relationships within systems or cultures (Bruner 1994). It is concerned with the personal, face-to-face, and immediate. Choices regarding interpretive practices are not set in concrete or necessarily made in advance; they depend on the questions asked and the context of these settings.

This brings to attention the dual position of the researcher as “insider/outsider” and the cultural ramifications of these relationships when research involves indigenous peoples. What does our embeddedness mean for our research? How does my “Māoriness” influence the process of this research? In what ways will my own identity change through this process? Do I expect the outsider vs. insider position will lead to more valid research data and how do I define insider/outsider positions? What will be the disparities between my theories and worldview and the real lives of those I study and the outcome of such interaction?

**Insider/Outsider**

Within the context of writing this thesis I consider myself as both insider/outsider, but with an emphasis of being in a “marginal position”. This position is one that is neither
completely outsider nor completely insider. Hammersley and Atkinson have described this as “poised between familiarity and strangeness” and as “living simultaneously in two worlds, that of participation and that of research” (1996: 112). As such, it could be called a *third space*. I view myself as a researcher who is *both* Māori and an academic but I do not view my position as a ‘Māori researcher’, therefore I do not view this thesis as a ‘Māori thesis’. By that I mean it is not embedded with a sense of “Māoritanga” derived from being brought up as Māori. Nonetheless, I do not feel any ‘less’ Māori by saying this, in fact, by saying this reinforces my sense of being Māori.

My comment highlights the complexities of identity construction and one which McIntosh (2005 in Webber 2009) comments ‘that to be Māori is to be part of a collective but heterogeneous identity, one that is enduring but ever in a state of flux’. Historically, Māori identity has been a contested concept (Meredith 1998), and has been as much about determining rights and privileges, as it has about drawing clearly defined boundaries about who can, and cannot, claim this identity (Webber 2009: 2). These comments coincide with the aims of my research to examine the diversity of Māori tribal culture and refute the tendency within New Zealand society to represent Māori as a ‘homogenous’ group. Tourism has been guilty of such practice by not fully recognising the diversity of the Māori tourism experience that occurs between cultures as a result of contact and the clash of difference.

The insider position I have claimed is fraught with some complexities. I identify as Māori, support Māori viewpoints, am connected to whenua (land) in both tangible and intangible ways. That is, I have Māori land assets inherited from my father and am aware of the significance this has in relation to my whakapapa\(^6\). But I am located away from these areas - those of my iwi (tribe) Whakatohea, and kin groups Ngati Ruatakena and Ngati Patumoana in the township of Opotiki situated in the North Island region of Bay of
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\(^6\) “Whakapapa” is to place in layers, lay one upon another. Hence the term whakapapa is used to describe both the recitation in proper order of genealogies, and also to name the genealogies. The visualisation is of building layer by layer upon the past towards the present, and on into the future. The whakapapa include not just the genealogies but the many spiritual, mythological and human stories that flesh out the genealogical backbone (see Walker 1992, 2004).
Plenty. Being born in this area gives me a sense of belonging or tūrangawaewae however, I was not brought up in this Māori community, but with my Pākehā mother in the south of New Zealand. Indeed, being brought up in a Pākehā environment for much of my life whilst claiming my ‘Māori identity’ has meant feeling you belong to two cultures, and indeed leads me to ask the question ‘do I view myself as a cultural hybrid?’

Whānau presence is still strong in Opotiki, although like many Māori, kin are widely dispersed – with the majority in urban centres. My connections with my kin group are not close albeit they are an important part of my own cultural identity. This in no way negates a feeling of ‘contribution’ to my kin group by undertaking this research. Indeed, at a personal level I feel this research brings me closer to them. By example, this path has brought me back into contact with two uncles who have highly regarded academic backgrounds in Māori studies. Their support and mandate for this research is important to me. In particular, time spent with one uncle early in my research journey reinforced my sense of ‘belonging’ to this kin group and that I should never feel ‘outside’ of it. I appreciate and understand more fully now that sense of belonging and kinship when I recall brief periods of my childhood on the family marae. As someone raised in ‘two worlds’ so to speak, it is the Māori one that may at times feel ‘alien’ but never removed from my own personal identity and that of being a New Zealander.

The ‘outsider’ position I claim is one of working within an academic university environment. Hall comments that ‘in terms of research, what we do, one also cannot ignore the personal...the personal subjectivities of our experiences are vital to our choice of research paths’ (2004: 149). Therefore my position in this research is twofold. The outsider position follows the path of my life/work choices which places me within an academic environment that has been implicated in the production of Western knowledge and practices that have privileged Western ways of knowing over those of Māori knowledge systems (Tuhiwai Smith 2003). However my involvement in this environment has provided opportunities to participate in other research projects in relation to Māori
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7 Sacred open meeting area generally in front of the wharenui (communal meeting house). In Māori terms a marae is a tūrangawaewae a “place to stand”, not just a physical space but also a liminal space where the past and the present meet (Rangihau 1975; Walker 1975).
self-determination and whereby Māori have challenged and continue to challenge such institutional practice; the results being collaborative and mutually beneficial in their intent. Thus the need for cross-cultural and cross-disciplinary dialogue where multiple ways of knowing and being are emphasised make an important contribution to re-negotiating bicultural relations. Māori have much to contribute to the academic context and whereby evolving Māori-centred methodologies enrich research output and create new ‘journeys’ in learning. This comment raises the issue of kaupapa research and the boundaries that frame ‘ethical’ research and indigenous peoples.

Ethical Issues: Research Kaupapa

Ethics refers to rules of conduct that express and reinforce important social and cultural values of a society. The rules may be formal and written, spoken, or simply understood by groups who subscribe to them (Castellano 2004: 99).

It has often been taken for granted that indigenous peoples are ‘natural objects’ of research (Tuhiwai Smith 2003). Tuhiwai Smith emphasises that the decolonisation of research methods is ‘about centring our concepts and worldviews and then coming to know and understand theory and research from our own perspectives and for our own purposes’ (2003: 39). Fundamental to the exercise of self determination is the right of peoples to construct knowledge in accordance with their definitions of what is real and what is valuable. Creating and sharing knowledge that authentically represents who you are and how you understand the world is also integral to a people’s identity. According to Castellano (2004: 98) research acquired a bad name among Aboriginal peoples because the purposes and meanings associated with its practice by academics and government agents were usually alien to the people themselves and the outcomes were often misguided and harmful. Indeed, research under the control of outsiders of Aboriginal communities has been instrumental in rationalising colonialist perceptions of Aboriginal incapacity and the need for paternalistic control (Castellano 2004: 103).
Ethical issues have been raised in reaction to the advances of science and technology that have been framed within Western constructs. The integrity and validity of research cannot be assured by western methodologies alone and must be tempered by methodologies that are compatible with Aboriginal methods of investigation and validation. The call for better working relationships between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples has seen the emergence of ‘codes of conduct’ and ‘ethical guidelines’ as part of the organisational framework of many businesses, organisations and institutions such as universities. Scular, Aberdeen and Dyer (1999:59) also state the need for an ‘ethic of responsibility’ when research involves indigenous peoples. In their research of ecotourism and the Aboriginal Djabugay of Australia they argued that sensitivity and responsiveness to contingency are vital ingredients in the research design in order to accommodate the needs of the researched. The need for breadth and depth of information must be balanced, and the methods integrated to increase the authenticity, validity and utility of the data generated (Berno 1996: 393).

Webber (2009) however has raised tensions within this research/ethical domain. Her critique is with a tertiary institution which seems very ‘intent on making exotic what I do by insisting on the use of an essentialised and prescriptive Māori research methodology’. Thus, the problem lies in the ‘critical disjunctures between Māori determined standards of ethical, reciprocal and beneficial research practice and Western institutional frameworks that aim to standardise, guide and enforce their version of rigorous Māori research practice’ (Webber 2009: 3). Does ‘exoticising’ the research perpetuate the notion of the Other we might ask? If so, we could claim that colonial discourse is still at work.

Webber also acknowledges difficulty ‘as a Māori researcher’ in a time when the academy is driven by a research output paradigm. In undertaking my thesis I was subject to similar University processes within a ‘set’ framework of protocol. To conduct any research for a degree within the Department of Tourism, University of Otago, researchers are required to lodge an application for ethics clearance. Category B ethical approval was granted for my research and was a requirement of ethical clearance for research
involving interviews and to obtain informed consent from every respondent when conducting interviews. This required completion of The Ethics Review Sheet, an information letter, and a consent form for participant involvement. It is also a requirement at the University of Otago for completion of a Research Consultation with Māori application form when research involves Māori participants. The University has a commitment to partnership with Māori consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi under its ‘Research Consultation with Māori Policy’. The purpose of this policy is to:

provide the framework for an appropriate and mandated consultation process with Māori for research. It ensures an effective and efficient mechanism for managing the consultation process while acknowledging the needs and aspirations of Ngāi Tahu for Māori development and benefit as expressed in Ngāi Tahu Vision 2025.


Thus, the Facilitator Research Māori, Research Division of Otago University, assisted my application under these guidelines. Although my area of research was in different rohe and involved non Ngai Tahu research participants, I viewed this as a process of representation whereby Māori “inclusivity” was demonstrated; albeit without some feeling of ‘ownership’ belonging elsewhere.

Tuhiwai Smith (2003: 119) comments that in the ‘New Zealand context ethics for Māori communities extend far beyond issues of individual consent and confidentiality’. Respect for, and protection of the rights, interests and sensitivities of the people being studied are also important to the research process. It is useful to consider the analogy between ethical codes of conduct and the Māori worldview of kaitiakitanga (guardianship). To underscore the significance of their relationships with the environment and humanity, indigenous peoples consistently use the term respect. Respect is a reciprocal, shared, constantly interchanging principle that is expressed through all aspects of social conduct (Tuhiwai Smith 2003:120). Through respect the place of everyone and everything is kept
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8 South Island and local iwi
9 Tribal boundary
in balance and harmony. The denial of these principles reflects the denial of the right to self-determination.

These comments lead discussion to research kaupapa. Research kaupapa is inherently Māori in terms of definition and reference and emerged from within the wider ethnic revitalisation movement that developed in New Zealand following the rapid Māori urbanisation of the post-World War II period. More recently in the 1980s and 1990s it has featured the revitalisation of Māori cultural aspirations, preferences and practices as a philosophical and productive educational stance and resistance to the hegemony of the dominant (Western) discourse (Bishop 1996). Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal (2002) describes it as advocating and articulating a ‘space’ in which Māori are able to deconstruct orthodoxies pertaining to power, knowledge and their articulation in contemporary society, particularly as these relate to Māori. Kaupapa literally translated means ‘guiding principle’ (Marsden 2003). Hingangaroa Smith (2000) views this approach as a way of structuring assumptions, values, concepts, orientations, and priorities in research and one that challenges the prevailing ideologies of cultural superiority that pervades our social, economic, political and educational institutions. For Bishop it ‘presupposes positions that are committed to a critical analysis of the existing unequal power relations within the wider New Zealand society that were created with the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi’ (2005: 114).

Kaupapa Māori therefore deconstructs the power-knowledge structures that have positioned Māori as ‘Other’ through the production of grand narratives in order that Māori can control and define their own knowledge. Pihama (1993: 65) reiterates this by stating:

Intrinsic to Kaupapa Māori theory is an analysis of existing power structures and societal inequalities. Kaupapa Māori theory therefore aligns with critical theory in the act of exposing underlying assumptions that serve to conceal the power relations that exist in society and the ways in which dominant groups construct concepts of ‘common sense’ and ‘facts’ to provide ad hoc justification for the maintenance of inequalities and continued oppression of Māori people.
My research draws on a number of philosophical premises that kaupapa adheres to. As an approach that sets out to make a positive difference for Māori, that incorporates a model of social change or transformation, and that privileges Māori knowledge and ways of being, I can say ‘yes, my research fits that criteria’. By taking a position that challenges norms and assumptions, kaupapa Māori research involves a concept of the possibility and desirability of change (Moewaka Barnes 2000); hence it aligns with the notion that the Māori subject is ever-changing. It is aligned not only with topics of importance to Māori that address their economic development, but also their well being as a people, as identified with Māori. Māori tourism relates to this context in its economic imperative to progress Māori social, cultural and economic development.

My study shares aspects of kaupapa Māori practice in its objective to offer a co-joint construction of narrative (i.e. sharing stories and information given by Māori tourism operators). However, Webber (2009) notes we need to critique these narratives, research protocols and methodologies in order that emerging researchers see multiple ways of operating as valid. I recognise kaupapa Māori as a discursive practice that draws forth the cultural aspirations, understandings, and practices of Māori people. It is an important concept that underlies issues of control of Māori tourism by Māori and its emphasis of devolving ‘power and control in the research exercise’ (Bishop 1996). Coupled with qualitative research my approach to Kaupapa Māori seeks to create spaces for dialogue across difference, to analyse and make senses of complex and shifting experiences, identities, and realities (Tuhiwai Smith 2003). Thus, it responds to epistemic challenges and the significance of retaining one’s cultural identity within the dynamics of globalisation. Since there is a commitment to report back to the community concerned (i.e. Māori tourism), the research presented here is not viewed as an end in itself, but as part of an ongoing partnership. It is thus relevant to discuss my research objectives and how this thesis fits within the realm of ‘Māori Tourism’.
Research Objectives

Ryan (2000) identifies indigenous peoples, their role within tourism, the nature of their culture as a tourism product, and the associated issues of authorisation as one of the growth topics within tourism research literature. My thesis draws on postcolonial theory to critically examine the representation of Māori cultural tourism in New Zealand. It aims to identify points of difference that might assist development of Māori tourism whilst highlighting how such differences challenge the legacies of colonialism in tourism.

One of the key insights of postcolonial scholarship is the attention it draws to the homogenisation of the Other (Said 1978). Tourism has been described as the quintessential business of ‘difference projection’ and the interpretive vehicle of ‘othering’ par excellence and by which its activities tend ethnocentrically to essentialise people, places and pasts (Hollinshead 1998: 121). The purpose of my research therefore is to challenge tourism’s propensity to represent the ‘Other’ as a singular, intact, and well-bounded culture by applying Bhabha’s (1994) concept of hybridity to show a complex inclusivity of Māori culture that is multi-layered and diverse. Postcolonial theory sets out to deconstruct binary thinking hence my research explores how Māori subvert the colonial ‘Othering’ binary by revealing the multiplicity of Māori tribal identity in tourism practice. This not only promotes regional distinctiveness of Māori tourism product, and thus offers visitors a new perspective of Māori culture, but also acts as a counter-narrative that resists previously embedded colonial relationships between Māori and Pākehā. I argue that contemporary re-presentation of Māori tourism is working in creative third spaces (Bhabha 1994) that re-negotiate the boundaries of bicultural relations in New Zealand and that reveal the ‘cut’n’mix’ of hybrid cultural identities. As such, hybridity offers tourism researchers a tool to explore multiple subject positions and rethink our assumptions about culture and identity within tourism representation.

Despite increased attention over the past decade to issues of Māori tourism there has been a lack of research examining the influence of Māori tribal identity; how this is valued, managed and represented in the tourism environment and its effects on product development. Studies of contemporary Māori tourism practice have neglected the
complex nature of ‘multiple’ identities that make up representation of Māori culture and the resulting disjuncture between cultures as a result of contact and the clash of ‘difference’. Thus, examining this multiplicity may reveal new subjectivities that re-inscribe new meanings and representation of indigenous culture as Other. Third spaces signify a new frame of reference and process of signification and as a result may ‘initiate new signs of identity and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation’ (Bhabha 1994: 1).

Previous research on Māori tourism has explored issues of defining Māori tourism product (AMTF 1996; Ingram 1997; Keelan 1999; Tahana et al. 2000; Walsh 1996; Zygadlo et al. 2001), market perspectives and tourist appreciation of Māori culture (McIntosh 2004; McIntosh and Ryan 2007), authenticity (Ryan and Higgins 2006; Taylor 2001), constitutional rites (Ryan 1997, 2002), heritage tourism (Keelan 1999; Warren and Taylor 2001) attraction based identity (McIntosh, Hinch and Ingram 2002), Māori cultural performance and tourism (Tahana and Oppermann 1998), visitor perception of Māori cultural landscape values (Carr 2004; 2008) and Māori involvement in tourism (Cukier and de Haas 1998; Hall 1996; Ryan 1999). A lack of research into the perceptions and attitudes of Māori toward tourism development and use of cultural images was noted by Ingram (1997) however to date little progress has occurred that examines changes affecting the current re-presentation of Māori tourism from an operator perspective. I am therefore interested in determining what role tribal identity plays in this process as Māori increasingly become collaborative players in the New Zealand tourism industry in promoting their tourism ‘image’ to a global audience.

Since the implementation of the New Zealand Tourism Strategy (NZTS) 2010 in 2001 the diversification of the Māori tourism product has been supported by government policy and the existence of organisations that enable Māori to be actively involved in the management of tourism within New Zealand (Carr 2007). Amongst the key objectives stated in the NZTS is to “ensure Māori participate and are partners in the tourism sector and that Māori culture and identity is protected” (TNZ 2001:6). Such rhetoric is plausible if Māori are given equal status in this development process and that the concept
of “identity” be recognised as a dynamic construct that incorporates the multiplicity of modern Māori.

The Māori Tourism Advisory Group (MTAG) provided input to the Strategy’s inception and the New Zealand Māori Tourism Council (NZMTC) formed in 2004 has contributed to the Mid Term Strategy Update to 2015. However, differences between Māori and Pākehā cultural values and paucity of Māori representation at national level in the past have been problematic in progressing discourse for Māori. Whilst this has recently changed with the formation of the NZMTC and the establishment of formal relationships with a number of national bodies relevant to the tourism industry it is apparent that the discourse of local, regional and national Māoridom is a critical component in developing strategic direction of Māori tourism. The philosophy of the NZMTC is structured in such a way that places Māori tourism operators at the ‘top’ of a hierarchical scale of development. This emphasises the importance of “grass-roots” Māori tourism in defining and developing sustainable Māori tourism product. Thus my objective is to focus research at this “grass-roots” level.

In order to counter the homogenous image of Māori that has persisted in national tourism promotion for well over a century it is important to recognise the diversity of Māori culture within the regions of New Zealand and how this influences product development and visitor experience. Regional diversity reflects different views about cultural integrity and the effects of commercialising culture in order to meet host demands and be sustainable. Concerns by Māori over the use of their image as a marketing tool for so long were voiced in a benchmark document The Māori Tourism Taskforce Report (MTTF) in 1987. The Report stated:
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10 Cultural integrity is a problematic concept within the conventional agenda of intellectual property law and thus, western epistemology. Indigenous claims to cultural integrity are sought as a means of protecting and fostering indigenous cultural tradition and growth. These interests include exclusive, collective, cultural or spiritual aspects which continue to challenge conventional legal understanding. For a comprehensive reading on this topic see ‘Authorship and the Dreaming’: Indigenous Cultural and Intellectual Property Law by Kathleen Brand (nd).
The Task Force is also concerned with the danger of simplifying the Māori experience and therefore its delivery. This means that the promoters of a specifically Māori tourist experience need to bear firmly in mind that Māori culture is tribal. This means that it will vary from tribe to tribe and this diversity needs to be positively encouraged. At all costs any attempt to homogenise Māori culture in the name of tourist consistency must be resisted. The great danger is the creation of a well-beaten Māori trail that has culled out any tribal diversity. (MTTF Report 1987:47)

Over twenty years on little has changed. Recent research (McIntosh 2004; McIntosh and Ryan 2007; Wilson et al. 2006) reveals that current marketing does not include the many different aspects of Māori culture in New Zealand including Pākehā, Tangata Pasifika and Asian and that traditional images still dominate the perceptions that international visitors have. This is potentially due to the nature of the existing tourism product. More contemporary aspects of Māori culture are currently not obvious to tourists or promoted in a way that reaches the visitor market before arrival in New Zealand. Although tourists are interested in contemporary Māori culture there is a paradox in that tourists ‘wish to experience Māori culture in recognisable ways, which often means engaging with the traditional marketed aspects of culture rather than with contemporary culture’ (Wilson et al. 2006: 5). The representation of this experience is however renegotiated if mandated by Māori and from a Māori perspective. The stereotypical and somewhat homogenous identity created by a century of national tourism promotion belies the fact that Māori are tribal and regionally diverse people. Thus, tribal identity becomes an inherent component of how Māori tourism operators represent their culture in contemporary ways and show complex identities including hybridity.

Such discussion must also include examining the role of Māori tourism personnel employed in organisations such as Tourism New Zealand (TNZ) and the Ministry of Tourism (MOT). These representatives work to promote and develop strategies for Māori tourism within organisations that have historically represented the political linkages between tourism discourses and technologies of power inherent in colonial structures (Mellinger 1994). Such ideologies are reflected in the progressive perpetuation of Western ideology embedded in the power structures of global production and
consumption (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002: 650). However, such personnel are also part of a changing global cultural economy whereby issues of identity and cultural context are mediated by the “cultural brokers” of tourism. Thus, they cater to (and are themselves part of) the ‘newly adventurous and invigorated multiple identities of New Zealand that reflect the context of consumer societies’ (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002: 600).

Māori culture is collectively distinctive but is also a dynamic, living culture with contemporary expression derived from but not prescribed by traditional culture. It develops within changing socio-political contexts (Hall 1996; Ryan 1997; Walker 2004) and is diverse in its tribal and thereby it’s regional nature. The current demand from Māori in tourism for more contemporary representation of their image means deciding which symbols and markers of ‘traditional’ Māori culture (customs, stories, proverbs, beliefs, etc) they engage in (Aotearoa Māori Tourism Federation (AMTF) 1995; MTTF 1987; McIntosh 2004; NZMTC 2006; Ryan 2002). This is a cultural selection process that is the first step of identity construction. The second step involves the adaptation of those systems and practices to the new environment and therefore a process of reinterpretation and meaning. Clifford (1988) has commented that ‘traditional’ cultures become syncretised as part of an inevitable, ongoing process of global interconnectedness. In his view this moves through three processes: one is the disappearance of certain orders of difference, the second is a process of translating orders of difference, and the third is the creation of new orders of difference. Thus, Clifford sees the ‘new global order’ as challenging tradition and traditional ways of viewing culture and subjects and mixing new and often vibrant syncretized and hybrid amalgamations (Strongman 1996).

These tensions also highlight Urry’s (1990) concept of the tourism ‘gaze’ as an instrument of control both towards tourists and the places they visit because tourists are directed to ‘gaze’ on particular sites (through promotion of images/representations). This gaze has consequences for the peoples and places that are gazed upon (Erb 2005) and is part of the wider consumptive ideologies developed First World nations have adopted. Tourists, by virtue of their ability to gaze effectively reaffirm the cultural dominance of
consumption (Chaney 2002; Selwyn 1996; Urry 1990). However, the concept of the gaze is not ‘one way’. As both “objects” and “subjects” of the tourism gaze Māori culture has undergone significant changes that challenge the “white gaze” in tourism practice (Hollinshead 1992). Locals are also involved in directing the tourist gaze, thus socialising tourists to local traditions and manners in informal face-to-face interaction and thus practice social control (Cheong and Miller 2000: 82). Māori are not ‘passive victims’ in the subject-object relationship and are active participants in constructing their own identities. In fact, and as will be discussed in following Chapters Māori use stereotypical images of ‘exotic’, ‘traditional’, and ‘timeless’ themselves in the field of tourism for their own discursive purposes not least of which involves the process of power. This entrepreneurial energy is reflected in how Māori access and use their resources in ways that show a hybrid identity but is also problematic in its complex, ambivalent, contradictory mode of representation (Childs and Williams 1997).

Ryan (1997) has commented that the “Māori gaze” consists of three worldviews. This includes a world of their own culture which provides a traditional sense of identity, a postmodern world of western dominated business practice and consumerism, and a world of interaction between these two cultures. He says, ‘To begin to understand Māori involvement in tourism requires an understanding of concepts and applications of liminality and differences of culture’ (1997: 259). This aligns with Bhabha’s view that postcoloniality always involves the ‘liminal’ negotiation of cultural identity across differences of race, class, gender and cultural traditions (Rizvi, Lingard and Lavia 2000).

This discussion brings to the fore the crux of my research which is guided by the following research question:

_How do Māori tourism operators negotiate the representation of their image, tribal identities, and cultural difference within the socio-political context of New Zealand tourism. In what ways does this renegotiate notions of the ‘Other’ as inscribed by (colonial) tourism practice and ascribe notions of Māori self-determination and autonomy?_
This question challenges colonial discourse by acknowledging Māori tourism’s ability to create new forms of cultural meaning and production. This approach requires analysis of the socio-political framework that underlies past representation and informs the current (re)presentation of Māori culture. National and regional development of Māori tourism is now defined by multiple Māori voices. Thus, the emergence of Māori regional tourism organisations and a national tourism body demonstrate how Māori are increasingly taking control of the development and representation of their cultural product. The notion of hybridity is discussed as a means of disrupting binaries such as ‘authentic/ inauthentic’ and ‘traditional/modern’ as applied to Māori culture in tourism and through which a new discourse of ‘inclusivity’ reinserts the position of Other.

My thesis therefore has two main objectives. Firstly, to examine the temporal terrain of tourism discourse that has contributed to constructing Māori as Other within a master narrative of colonialism. Secondly, to explore ways in which contemporary Māori tourism operators re-present culture by operating within a third space of equity, innovation, creativity and self-empowerment. This objective also has wider implications to issues of sustainability for indigenous tourism and to what degree indigenous peoples engage in tourism, and on what terms. The outcome of these objectives seeks to show the willingness of Māori to be so culturally malleable within postcolonial contexts (ie hybridity, both and, third spaces) and the role of tourism in constructing hybrid cultural identities that re-inscribe the dualism of colonised and coloniser. As a consequence the notion of a ‘bicultural’ New Zealand is renegotiated as an inclusive term in a broader sense and one that gives attention to process rather than outcome.

To address the research question I will analyse the representation of Māori tourism in relation to concepts of identity, image, power and discourse. These issues inherently connect tourism and postcolonial theory by critiquing cultural forms which mediate, challenge or reflect upon relations of domination and subordination (Moore-Gilbert 1997: 12). These relations have their roots in the history of European colonialism, therefore the need to help previously marginalised groups towards new representations of themselves
reveals culture as uncertain, ambivalent, and open to new possibilities of alterity. This may reveal that in order to negate colonially imposed identities there may be a need to recognise alternative forms of identity such as iwi identity, pan-tribal, or hybridity. The production of new politically resonant definitions of peoples, places and pasts, via the act of promotion is therefore linked with tourism process.

As stated my research focuses on what I term “grass-roots” Māori tourism, that is it is concerned with the ‘top’ of the hierarchichal structure which underpins the philosophy of the NZMTC. We can therefore examine in what ways tourism is constitutive for the contemporary Māori identity and in what ways it constitutes an arena for cultural renewal and identity negotiations. The increased number of Māori tourism operations in the past decade indicate the willingness of Māori to become active players in the wider social and economical infrastructure of New Zealand society. This also expands opportunities for Māori to present culture in dynamic ways that reflect the ‘lived reality’ of modern Māori. The need to attract a wider visitor market for indigenous tourism (Ryan and McIntosh 2007) creates opportunity to develop a diversified range of cultural product that differs from ‘mainstream’ but can also integrate mainstream if it chooses. Interacting with Māori ‘in the regions’ in ways that showcase the plurality of Māori culture may offer visitors a more educational and meaningful experience whilst also sustaining autonomous cultural expression.

My findings are informed by qualitative research methods. Analysis of historical tourism promotion literature identified a static and stereotypical representation of Māori. This did not portray the many ‘differences’ within Māori culture that derive from tribal characteristics of Māori social development from pre-colonial times and did not take into account the spatial and temporal dimensions of cultural change. I undertook case study analysis of 11 Māori tourism operators in order to show the rich regional distinctions and multiple subjectivities of Māori culture. Analysis of four site visits/guided tours of major Māori tourism attractions from an observational perspective is also included to support the case study data. In addition 12 interviews with Māori tourism personnel and stakeholders who represent the linkages between local (grass-roots), regional and national
Māori tourism structures are also included to assess how these linkages impact on the overall ‘inclusivity’ of Māori tourism. They also provide a broader perspective of the spectrum of socio-political relations within New Zealand’s tourism environment.

Furthermore the outcome from this research adds to the discourse of Māori decolonisation and autonomy. The concept of autonomy is inherently related to the principles of the Treaty and engages Māori and Pākehā as equal whilst invoking the validity of differences (Maaka and Fleras 2005). The term can also be used to describe the independence of Māori groups primarily responsible to their members, as opposed to the Crown (Gover and Baird 2002). As will be discussed in Chapter One the relationship between the Crown and Māori as parties to the Treaty of Waitangi is inherently connected with identity issues raised by the increasing diversification of the Māori Treaty partner (Gover and Baird 2002). Māori continue to adapt and develop new expressions of collectivity, of which tourism plays an important part. By exploring how individual Māori tourism operators express themselves and their cultural identity may indeed assist those tourism agencies that market iconic images of the other. As Hollinshead (1998: 150) states it will also:

Provide a better understanding of how indigenous people represent themselves and what such representations say about the desire of colonised populations to recapture lost, pre-colonial traditions, and/or to sustain the kinds of mixed, emergent identities that arose under the postcolonial moment, and/or to otherwise forge new, emerging, cultural and ‘natural’ spaces (Hollinshead 1998: 150).

Terms Used in this Thesis

Throughout this thesis, reference is made to various terms and concepts related to Māori culture. A glossary of common terms and words is produced at the beginning of the thesis. The use of footnotes for expanded explanations has been used throughout the thesis to help the reader with immediate clarification. A macron has been used to signify the length of the Māori vowel in some words within the thesis. Another notable feature of
Māori language is that some words such as iwi, whakapapa or hapu\(^{11}\) do not differ between the singular and plural. Many of the Māori terms used are value laden and may have multiple meanings (Carr 2004). Of note the terms ‘Māori’, ‘iwi’, and ‘Tangata Whenua’ are used interchangeably in New Zealand although differ from the specific meanings in a Māori context. The term ‘Tangata Whenua’ is a common expression used by many Māori and denotes local people and is often used in combination with the actual iwi or hapu name of the area. For example, the local Tangata Whenua of Rotorua is Te Arawa. The term translates to ‘people or children of the land’ and as such is intimately connected to Māori epistemology. As will be discussed in following Chapters the politics surrounding ‘tribal’ and ‘non-tribal’ entities within Māoridom are themselves complex and fraught with tensions. For the purpose of this thesis I will use the term ‘Māori’ when discussing Māori people in general. Iwi and urban non-tribal authorities are commonly referred to as ethnic groupings although fall within the label of kin group when talking of iwi, hapu or whānau. I will refer to specific iwi/hapu names in relevant contexts but as an overall term for discussing Māori tribal groupings I will consistently use the term kin-group.

The term ‘indigenous’ is commonly used in academic texts to describe people of original habitation of a landscape or endemic or native to a destination region (Butler and Hinch 2007). As such, they may represent a majority or minority group. The term is meant to be inclusive and global in its application and is consistent with the terminology currently used by such bodies as the United Nations (UN). Collectively it is a term that enables indigenous peoples to express their concerns in the international arena. International law does not provide for an agreed definition and some indigenous peoples argue that no definition is needed (Stoll and von Hahn 2004). The fact that the UN has not formally adopted a definition for the term ‘indigenous peoples’ highlight the ambiguities and complexities that surround the term. However there are shared commonalities. A working definition put forward by UN’s special Rapporteur Jose Martinez Cobo (1986) includes the following criteria:
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\(^{11}\) Sub-tribe
1. a historical continuity with pre-invasion and pre-colonial societies
2. occupation of ancestral lands or at least of part of them
3. common ancestry with the original occupants of the lands
4. they consider themselves distinct from other sectors of the societies now prevailing in their territories
5. they form at present non-dominant sectors of society
6. are determined to preserve, develop and transmit to future generations their ancestral territories, and their ethnic identity, as the basis of their continued existence as peoples, in accordance with their own cultural patterns, social institutions and legal systems


But fundamental different world views do exist between indigenous and non indigenous peoples and struggles for cultural expression often conflict as both parties live and thrive as peoples and nations. Maintaining and expressing distinctive world views whilst contributing to a larger national federation is, in the language of the UN’s Working Group on Indigenous Populations, the pursuit of self determination.

Indigenous peoples have the right to self determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development. (United Nations, Economic and Social Council, Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples 1994)

When applied to academia Ryan and Huyton (2002) comment on the complex and often contested use of the term ‘indigenous’. Māori academic Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2003:6) states that ‘indigenous’ is problematic in that it appears to collectivise many distinct populations whose experiences under imperialism have been vastly different. Given these tensions, my use of the word ‘indigenous’ and ‘indigeneity’ is multi-dimensional. It recognises the commonalities shared and recognised by the peoples themselves, and also the paradox around the necessity of ‘naming’ and thus essentialism. At this point it is important to highlight that the term “essentialism” is also a complex concept with diverse
meanings. Essentialism is the assumption that groups, categories or classes of objects have one or several defining features exclusive to all members of that category (Ashcroft et al. 2000). Thus the primary feature of essentialism is one of categorisation. Bell (2004: 31) notes that the broadest definition of essentialism suggests that all identities are, by definition, essentialist and any attempt to define the human self or human groups is an exercise in essentialism. Indeed, indigenous peoples themselves have been complicit in this naming process but the reality is that many indigenous peoples have multiple identities which are connected to complex tribal structures (Joseph 2007; Meredith 1998). Spivak (1984-5) argues for a “strategic essentialism” as necessary to express the effects of colonial and neo-colonial oppression. Her argument suggests that in different periods the employment of essentialist ideas may be a necessary part of the process by which the colonised achieve a renewed sense of value and integrity of their pre-colonial cultures, and through which the newly emergent postcolonial nation asserts itself (Ashcroft et al. 2000).

We cannot define without assuming the existence of distinctive and often exclusive characteristics and that to escape essentialism means doing away with categories and definitions. Logically, this would not be possible. My referrals to essentialism therefore draw on different orientations of the term in order to discuss how practices such as colonialism have created discourses of the Other. In contrast, we can say that the term ‘non-indigenous’ is also binary in its classification. This term serves to describe people as not having the continual history of occupying land prior to colonisation and could be the colonisers or descendants of colonising settlers (Carr 2004). In New Zealand the term ‘Pākehā’ is commonly used to refer to non-indigenous people. Pākehā are generally associated with Western societies and value systems. The multi-cultural nature of New Zealand society is influenced by close proximity to Asia and the Pacific and non-indigenous New Zealanders may belong to non-European cultural groups although are not generally referred to as ‘Pākehā’.

Throughout the thesis I also refer repeatedly to colonialism, colonisation and the relationship between Māori and Pākehā being that of colonised and colonisers. Whilst
my discussion is located in a postcolonial framework, reference to colonialism serves to mark the ongoing presence and effects of colonial practices and relations (Bell 2004). I do not intend to perpetuate colonial rhetoric by this use; rather my discussion intends to interrogate colonial discourse. New Zealand is a colonised country and as such, issues that surround the impacts of colonisation are topical and relevant in mainstream discourse. It is important to note that meaning is produced through the process of representation by which members of a culture use language, broadly defined as any system which deploys signs, any signifying system (Hall 1997: 61). Meanings consequently will always change, from one culture or period to another.

This leads me to the term ‘postcolonial’ or ‘postcolonialism’. The form of the word I will use throughout this thesis is as a single word: i.e. postcolonial/ism. I follow McLeod’s (2000) lead in this choice of spelling as it concerns the different meanings of ‘postcolonial’ and ‘postcolonial’. The hyphenated term seems more appropriate to denote a particular historical period or epoch, like those suggested by phrases such as ‘after colonialism’ (McLeod 2000: 5). I do not want to contain the term to strict historical periodisation, although it remains firmly bound up with historical experiences, but rather refer to its disparate forms of representation, reading practices and values (McLeod 2000: 5). These circulate across barriers and thus are more aligned with concepts such as hybridity.

One final reference with regard to ‘naming’ relates to the place name Aotearoa. Aotearoa is a widely known and accepted Māori name for New Zealand and is used by both Māori and non-Māori. It is becoming increasingly widespread in the bilingual names of national organisations. The use of Aotearoa to refer to the whole of New Zealand is a postcolonial construct. In pre-colonial times, Māori did not have a commonly-used name for the whole New Zealand archipelago. The name for the North Island was Te Ika-a-Maui (the fish of Maui), the name for the South Island was drawn from its jade deposits Te Wai Pounamu, and Stewart Island was known as Rakiura, Maui’s anchor (King 2004). These distinctions reflect the cultural and spiritual connection Māori have with the landscape which forms part of their creation myth. Thus, the land is viewed as a ‘living
landscape’ in Māori epistemology and reinforces the notion of plurality and regional difference. For consistency I will use the term New Zealand throughout the thesis except where reference is made specifically to the name Aotearoa New Zealand in the context discussed.

Structure of the Thesis
This Introduction has introduced the reader to the socio-political position of Māori Crown relations in New Zealand and outlined the background for the motivation of this research. The research aims and objectives have been discussed in the wider context of Māori tourism research and my research question frames the central argument of the thesis within a conceptual framework of postcolonial theory. The notion of diversity is raised as a key determinant of Māori regional tourism development but also contributes to a national ‘inclusivity’ of Māori discourse. As such, diversity introduces the notion of hybrid cultural identities as a means to counter the homogenous image of Māori created by over a century of Western-dominated national tourism promotion.

Chapter One discusses Māori Pākehā relations within the context of New Zealand’s colonial heritage and introduces the reader to taha Māori. This discussion is concerned with deconstructing the discursive practices of colonial ideology that have defined Māori as Other. Central to this discussion is the role of the Treaty and the ongoing social, political and economical implications of its existence in contemporary New Zealand society. Chapter Two outlines the theoretical stance of the thesis in relation to culture and tourism. Issues and implications raised in this context include cultural conflict, authenticity, hybridity and difference, and the relationship between tourism and postcolonialism.

Chapter Three promotes ‘choices’ over ‘constraints’ for Māori economic and tourism development and moves discussion into the realm of postcolonial critique. Demand of
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Māori cultural tourism is juxtaposed against strategic government policies and reports that ‘promote’ more proactive and collaborative relationships between Māori and the Crown and the emergence of regional and national bodies for Māori tourism. This chapter also includes data from interviews with various tourism stakeholders. Chapter Four presents the research methodology, research design and methods whilst Chapters Five and Six discuss results from qualitative interviews with the 11 case study operators and includes data from additional site visits. Chapter Seven summarises key findings of the research in relation to the conceptual framework of the thesis and makes suggestions for future research of Māori tourism.
CHAPTER ONE

Colonial Discourse: Constructing the Māori Other

Introduction

The effects of colonisation on New Zealand culture is a widely discussed topic in many disciplines including anthropology, sociology, politics, history and literature (see Blythe 1994; Durie 1998; Gibbons 1986; Goldsmith 2002; Havemann 1999; Jackson 2004; Maaka and Fleras 2005; Tuhiwai Smith 2003; Walker 1999, 2004). Smith states ‘a constant reworking of our understandings of the impact of imperialism and colonialism is an important aspect of indigenous cultural politics and forms the basis of an indigenous language of critique’ (2003: 23-24). Thus, in post-settler nations such as New Zealand cultural politics are an inherent part of nationhood, legitimacy and identity. In the twenty-first century issues such as land rights, representation and self-determination remain contentious between Māori and Pākehā relations. They are also issues that increasingly inform postcolonial discourse.

The aim of this chapter is to discuss Māori and Pākehā relations within the context of New Zealand’s colonial heritage. The development of tourism is inherently connected with the colonial, political and social system of the country over the past 150 years. As a political structure that emerged in 1901 the national tourism body in New Zealand has reflected a fundamentally corporate economic ideology that has often been in conflict with values held by Māori. These discursive formations are part of what is termed colonial discourse, a medium through which conceptions of ‘truth’, ‘order’, and ‘reality’ become established (Hall and Tucker 2004) and that has constituted the Other as separate from but inherent to the policies and structures that create the colonial ‘subject’ (Balandier 1974). But over time Māori have both adapted and adopted strategies that demonstrate their ability to negotiate two cultures and thus, colonial discourse (Bell
I would argue this rejects the totalising image of Māori as Other and disrupts binaries of ‘us and them’ that underpinned colonialism; this moves in favour of a more pluralistic and inclusive framework of postcolonial relations. It is therefore not possible to discuss New Zealand as postcolonial without reference to its colonial past.

A distinguishing feature of the workings of colonialism and postcolonialism in New Zealand is that the colonisers never left (Bell 2004). In order to discuss the main contours of the relationship between Māori and Pākehā and the lands that they have occupied in New Zealand, it is necessary to ‘read the past, as without this, the circumstances of the present cannot be understood’ (Pawson 1999: 26). Similarly, Awatere (1984: 9) comments ‘looking to the past we must accept that histories are shaped by the memories of the people who make them – and such memories are constructed in very different ways’. A historical perspective is thus relevant to ‘a critique of how we, as the Other, have been represented or excluded from various accounts … indigenous peoples want to tell our own stories, write our own version, in our own ways, for our own purposes’ (Tuhiwai Smith 2003: 28). But the construction of Māori identity is also positioned within a global milieu of multiculturalism, one in which they may construct their own kaupapa outside the grand narrative, but this discourse is also influenced and informed by global relations. Traditional reality for most indigenous peoples can no longer be defined around an integrated whole within a shared framework (Maaka and Fleras 2005: 19); it is increasingly hybrid in character and nature. Contemporary reality for Māori is shaped by the past and the present and subject to continual renewal and reform from both within and without the culture.

The following section, although lengthy, is designed to impart a sense of Taha Māori – Māori identity from a historical and contemporary perspective. It is important that the reader gains an appreciation of Māori pre-colonial heritage and the beliefs and values that underpin Māori culture today. These are shaped and continue to be shaped by a cultural evolution driven by a number of factors originating with changing climate, technologies,
and locations of habitation for early Polynesian settlers (Clydesdale 2007). The material and spiritual culture of Māori changed with their arrival in a new land. When Māori arrived in Aotearoa New Zealand, probably in the thirteenth century, a new stage of cultural evolution began (King 2003); their Polynesian culture had to adapt to a new set of memes and routines. Adopted memes and routines continue to shape contemporary social and economic behaviour and define identity. As such, inherited cultural legacies are transformed through temporal and spatial processes that create both barriers and opportunities for kin groups.

1.1 Nga Tangata Whenua: Who are Māori

Sometime prior to 800AD, New Zealand was discovered and settled by Polynesian people who travelled on epic journeys from the group of islands known today as East Polynesia (Irwin 2006). Mythical explorers Maui, Kiwa, Kupe and Ngahue reached out to all corners of the Pacific (Rotorua Museum 2007; Walker 1990) and the voyages of these great explorers are recounted in Māori oral traditions (Orbell 1985, 1999; Roberts et al. 2004). Systematic migration and colonisation then took place over a number of generations until approximately the fourteenth century. Contact with their Polynesian homelands (Hawaiiki) ceased as the people settled into the new environment and found uses for the rich natural resources (Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal 2006). They developed into numerous territorial and tribal groups (iwi) under common ancestors (Walker 1990). Tribes were the key social, economic and political units of Māoridom (Durie 2000) and were represented in two forms: the hapu or sub-tribe and the iwi. Each iwi had its own history, myths, proverbs, dialect, customs and practices, and therefore, its own cultural identity (Sullivan 1995; Walker 2004). Political autonomy lay with the hapu, the dominant and functional form of social organisation. Iwi were the important macro-political entity, a conceptual overarching identity that could be used to bind related hapu
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13 Dawkins (1976) developed thoughts on cultural evolution inspired by Darwinian theories. He suggested that memes perform the same role in cultures that genes perform for biological organisms. They are replicators of previous patterns. Memes refer to cultural modes of thought passed from mind to mind. They include ideas, beliefs, assumptions, values, interpretive schema and know-how (Clydesdale 2007: 50).
as the occasion warranted (Maaka and Fleras 2005). Although iwi share a degree of common cultural traditions they also chose to accentuate differences through geographical territories, customs and histories by constructing cultural boundaries on a tribal basis (O’Regan 2001). Underlying both forms was the central unit of whānau or family (Metge 1995; Walker 2004).

Walker (1989) defines Māori cultural identity in a tripartite sequence of myth, tradition and history – linking gods, ancestors and living people through genealogical descent (whakapapa). There are three main myth complexes in Māori mythology, the creation myth (Ranginui, the sky father, and Papatūānuku, the earth mother), the Maui cycle (adventures of the demi-god Maui, who fished up the land and brought many benefits into the world for humankind), and the Tawhaki cycle (the model of an aristocratic and heroic figure) (Walker 2002). The myths were transmitted orally in the form of a prose narrative with the notion of an evolutionary sequence conveyed by the storyteller linking gods, legendary heroes and ancestors together in a genealogical sequence of descent.

Within these oral histories a series of myths and legends accounted for the existence of New Zealand, their existence as men and women, and for the origin of the natural elements (King 1997; 2004). Thus, the genealogical recital served two purposes, firstly it provided an account of the evolution of the universe and secondly, it linked in the narrator, thus validating his right as a living descendant and authority to speak on the myths. As an oral culture Māori used various techniques to communicate information and knowledge including waiata (songs), whakatauki (proverbs), and purakau (folklore). Visual art forms such as carving and weaving also expressed a form of oral tradition and cultural identity through association with myths and legends. The duality of the spoken word for Māori can be regarded as ‘symbols of thought’ (Haami 2004) and represented an important form of cultural expression. As such Māori identity can be described as a social concept based on descent from the aboriginal inhabitants of Aotearoa who regarded themselves as ‘Tangata Whenua’ and defines their status as ‘people of the land’ with self-determining rights as first occupants of the land (Walker 1989).
For Māori, the world was ordered and understood by whakapapa (Te Maire Tau 2001). Whakapapa gave Māori a tangible relationship to all things, living and inanimate expressed through the concept of mauri. Mauri is the binding force between the physical and spiritual aspects and considered to be the essence or life force to all living things (Morgan 2004). Since everything in the world was alive, and all living things were related, there was no distinction of the kind found in Western thought between nature and culture: the natural world and human society were inseparable (Haami 2004; Orbell 1999; Roberts et al. 2004). Māori therefore share similarities with other indigenous cultures such as Native American tribes in explaining why things are the way they are in nature; the creation of specific animals, plants, and physical features in the landscape. What we learn from these beliefs and myths is that Māori had a holistic world view, through the personification of natural phenomenon and a concept of time as “historic present”. Māori cannot impose a chronological order upon these myths as being ‘in the past’ as they also stand ‘directly before us in the present’; thus the Māori perception of the past is not the same as that held by Pākehā (Te Maire Tau 2001: 63). Descent is commonly traced back to Papatūānuku and frames the epistemological belief in the land as ‘mother’ (Meyer 2006). Thus, creation myths are the layers of whakapapa and hence, whakapapa is the skeletal structure to Māori epistemology referred to as matauranga Māori (Te Maire Tau 2001). However Māori episteme was challenged with the arrival of Pākehā and a new set of value systems. As such, tensions are created amongst different concepts Māori have in relation to Pākehā.

Whakapapa was directly related to land and an important determinant in customary land tenure and therefore use rights to tribal resources. Māori assigned geographic/physical aspects of the land – mountains, rivers, lakes, and hills along with a common predominant ancestor and articulated these in oratory – via the use of pepeha\textsuperscript{14} as symbols of tribal identity (O’Regan 2001; Walker 1989). This represented a statement of ‘collective identity’. Pepeha can operate at two levels: iwi (regional) or the hapu (local). Often one pepeha is common to the whole iwi and serves to unite the respective hapu;

\textsuperscript{14} Oral description of identity as attached to specific land formations/resources
then each hapu may have their own specific pepeha that speaks of their particular rohe (tribal boundary) and identity. An example of these two levels might be:

**Kai Tahu pepeha (tribal)**

| Ko Aoraki taku mauka | Aoraki is my mountain |
| Ko Waitaki taku awa | Waitaki is my river |
| Ko Tahupotiki te tupuna | Tahupotiki is the ancestor |
| Ko Kai Tahu taku iwi | Kai Tahu is my tribe |

**Maeraki pepeha (local)**

| Ko Poutaiki taku mauka | Poutaiki is my mountain |
| Ko Waihemo taku awa | Waihemo is my river |
| Ko Matiaha Tiramorehu te takata | Matiaha Tiramorehu is the man |
| Ko Kati Rakiamo te hapu | Kati Rakiamo is the hapu |

Source: O’Regan (2001)

Behind this encapsulation of identity are extensive whakapapa that include cosmological beliefs as well as ancestral links; and the histories of exploration, land claim, occupation, and rights to cultivations, fishing grounds, and forest resources (Whaanga 2005). The first question asked of strangers was not who they were but where they were from. This was an inquiry about both place of habitation and identity (King 1999). Despite the fact that much of Māori land was confiscated in the colonising era of the nineteenth century and Māori were alienated from tribal areas, the spiritual and psychological attachment survived the colonisation experience and remains a significant symbol of tribal identity today. The bonds of kinship amongst Māori are thus inherently linked to land and resources and as such raise important cultural implications when these are used for non traditional commercial ends.

The arrival of Europeans had adverse affects on traditional Māori society. Walker (1989: 41) has stated that a combination of colonisation, government legislation, land wars and land confiscation disenfranchised Māori society and that ‘Māori land constitutes the main basis of the cultural identity of the Māori people’. Recent debate has argued the
emphas**is placed on ‘land loss’ as an explanation for Māori economic failings is contestable, stating this ‘frees the culture from fault and places blame elsewhere’ inhibiting other barriers to growth (Clydesdale 2007: 66). There is salience in this point and one that will be addressed in forthcoming chapters in terms of placing contemporary Māori tourism development within the realm of creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship. Political broadcaster Chris Laidlaw has commented that ‘Māori have always been ready and able to reach out and absorb elements of other cultures…in the nineteenth century they began to cherry-pick from Pākehā with considerable skill’ (2005: 5).

Trade, commerce and entrepreneurship became integral features of Māori Pākehā relations as traditional society moved from one of exchange to a moneyed system. Some entrepreneurial tribes even invested in ships to carry their goods to the European and Australian markets (Clydesdale 2007). The adoption of new technologies and changes in production, consumption and resources also had major consequences on ‘traditional’ lifeways with the decline of art forms, the loss of influence held by Chiefs and Tohunga and a passing away of the communal kinship approach to economic development (Tapsell and Woods 2008) and system of working. However Māori grasped many of the new technologies introduced by settlers interpreting these within the Māori frame of reference and cultural need. For instance, early missionaries’ attempts to ‘convert’ Māori beliefs did not replace the existing Māori deities. The Christian God was added as a new and more powerful one (Clydesdale 2007). Māori capacity for adapting and including new cultural traits has continued over time and demonstrates the fluidity of cultural change and new interpretations. Māori adaptation to their new environment in pre-colonial times was largely based on changes in geographical and biological resources and over time Māori learned the best way to use each resource and develop new techniques. These became embedded in the belief system (Firth 1972) and understanding of the environment and also incorporated the existence and practices of gods (Clydesdale 2007). The utilisation of resources was also associated with the concept of tapu (sacred or
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15 A tohunga is an expert practitioner of any skill or art, religious or otherwise. Tohunga may include expert priests, healers, navigators, carvers, builders, teachers and advisors.
prohibited). The lore of tapu ensured respect for resources and by association the concept of kaitiakianga (guardianship) and ethic of utu (reciprocity) over the land. Economic life and culture were intertwined with social, aesthetic and religious beliefs which became the components of Māori custom, tradition and mythology (Clydesdale 2007: 52).

One domain that has undergone much transformation but remains the focal point of identity for many Māori is the marae. As an institution that has persisted from pre-European Māori society it has survived the effect of colonisation albeit not without Māori having to make necessary changes. The roots of marae culture lie in ancient Polynesia and appear to have evolved out of the manifestation of genealogically connecting stars to sea pathways; particular ancestors to particular islands and whereby new journeys of exploration were launched (Tapsell and Woods 2008). For Māori, the marae evolved to become symbolic manifestations of kin economic, social and political well-being to surrounding estates and waterways. The marae ‘proper’ consists of an open space of ground in front of an ancestral meeting house, and in traditional times the marae and meeting house together made up the focal point of every permanently inhabited village (Walker 1975).

The traditional marae and its meeting house are essentially the property of a kin-group (hapu or iwi). Its importance lay in its multi-use, serving as a recreational, political and social venue, and where tangihanga (mourning ceremony; funeral) were held. Many marae fell into disrepair in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century as a result of poor economic and social conditions Māori faced from colonisation as they increasingly became alienated from their estates. The Māori Councils Act of 1900 brought about much change in the design of meeting houses to meet improved hygienic standards and the promotion and revival of Māori carving in the 1920s by Sir Apirana Ngata culminated in the building of many fine modern meeting houses throughout the country (Walker 1975). The vast revitalisation of marae over the last 25 years has ensured the survival of Māori conceptualisations – the Māori way of doing things expressed as ‘kaupapa Māori’ (Bishop 2005; Durie 2002; Tuhiwai Smith 2005). Walker (1975) describes the marae not only as ‘intimately bound up with the identity of the Māori as a people’ but that it is one
institution where any Māori has tūrangawaewae in relation to the dominant Pākehā in our society. Thus, marae have been pivotal in the representation of Māori culture both for Māori and by Māori to others. Its importance also lies in its role as forum in the ancient ritual of encounter between host and visitor and is still practiced today. Visiting marae as a tourist attraction is becoming increasingly popular with overseas visitors whereby they will be ‘welcomed’ on to the marae by the home kin who ancestrally connect themselves to particular landscapes and resources in contradistinction to those visiting (Tapsell and Woods 2008) thus connecting local ‘identity’ with specific taonga.

The term ‘Māori’ is a political and social construct with its own historicity (Meredith 1998). The application of the term as a category can be traced to the first European contact in the 1700’s; prior to the European arrival there was no race of people called ‘Māori’ (King 2004; Meredith 1998). Māori found the need to prescribe new social boundaries when faced with the reality of people very different from themselves. There was no concept of a Māori identity in the sense of cultural or even national similarities (Durie 1998). The term is still commonly used in contemporary New Zealand discourse and incorporates notions of a distinctive ethnicity and culture. Ethnicity is a form of social categorisation that classifies people into identifiable groups on the basis of cultural differences (O’Regan 2001). Māori recognised a common ethnic identity with many shared cultural traits - Europeans were defined in terms of their differences, physically and culturally, and Māori categorised themselves as ‘normal’. Hence, the meaning of ‘Māori’ corresponds with the meaning of ‘normal, usual or ordinary’ in Māori language (King 2004; Williams 1992).

Although Māori may have identified themselves as ‘Other’ from European settlers any acknowledgement of similarity amongst Māori was only in comparison to Pākehā. Tribal autonomy still took precedence over any view of a unified ethnic collective. Often these groups maintained multiple identities that were fluid, complex and adaptable to the political, social and geographical conditions of a particular moment (Meredith 1998: 3). Therefore two different identities emerged: ‘Māori identity’ in the broader sense of affiliation that served a boundary between Māori and Pākehā; and ‘Iwi identity’ which
represented the local, more personal identity, constructing boundaries vis-a-vis ‘Others’ (Walker 1989). Such identities were not singular, fixed or a historical. This point underpins the importance of recognising the multiplicity of Māori culture that creates both tension and potential for Māori aspirations of self-determination. However the signifier “Māori” is subject to much public debate in its application as a homogenous identification of ‘who’ and what is deemed to be “Māori” and thus, linked to much contemporary discussion over issues such as land claims and resource allocation.

Barcham (1998) has stated that Māori are a tribal culture although no longer a ‘purely tribal people’. As discussed tribes can be seen as a related group of people whose defining principle of identity and organisation is based on descent from a common ancestor and as the key social, economic and political units of Māoridom (Durie 2000; Tassell 2004). Although opinions differ, the salience of an iwi-based identity is widely endorsed through its connection to whakapapa as determining criteria of ‘Māoriness’. Mahuika (1998: 216) has stated that ‘the role of iwi cannot be undermined; historical injustices were inflicted on iwi and it is iwi who are entitled to Treaty settlement restitution’. However, the traditional organisational basis of Māori as a tribal society today differs with over 80 per cent of Māori living in urban areas and nearly 70 per cent outside their tribal areas (Walker 2004). The creation of a Māori urban Diaspora has raised tensions in relation to cultural identity based less on tribal identity and more on commonality of historical experience and current geographical residence (Meredith 1998). At least 50 per cent of Māori have no active link with their iwi at all (Durie 1998) and around 25 per cent of the population of Māori descent do not even know what their tribal affiliation is. Therefore, the Māori subject in any ‘collective’ sense is multi-varied and creates a whole new dimension of “Māori” cultural politics within Māoridom and between Māori and the Crown. As Tapsell (2002a) comments unlike their ancestors, today’s Māori who are born and raised in urban centres appear to view tribal marae as distant places to which they feel varying elements of disconnection. Thus, traditional customary leadership practice between elders and younger generations is subject to changing influences of contemporary life outside the Māori domain.
The common expression Māori use to refer to themselves today is still Tangata Whenua and as such Māori are officially recognised as the indigenous people of New Zealand (Statistics New Zealand 2006). The recognition of Māori as Tangata Whenua is central to Māori political aspirations and self determination but has also been the source of much contention between the Crown and Māori since colonisation begun in the nineteenth century (Mulgan 1989; Williams 1989). Today Māori are described as a people of complexity and contradiction (Maaka and Fleras 2005). They are highly integrated into modern New Zealand society (Carr 2004) and represent about 16 per cent of New Zealand’s total population. At the time of the 2006 Census, there were 565,329 people who identified with the Māori ethnic group and 643,977 who identified being of Māori descent (Statistics New Zealand 2006). They are a relatively youthful population with two thirds of the population below thirty years of age; however the dynamics of Māori society are still governed by tribal elders (Kaumātua).

Changes are evident however as generational disparities emerge and global, inter-cultural, and accultural influences interact/intersect with traditional Māori beliefs and values. Despite significant social and economic advances during the twentieth century Māori tend to cluster in the lower percentiles in most health and education statistics and in labour-force participation, as well as featuring disproportionately highly in criminal and imprisonment statistics (Durie 2000, 2003; Durie et al. 2002); the impacts of colonisation still resonate in ‘modern’ Māoridom. With such bleak statistical facts the potential to consider tourism as a means to economic betterment can clearly be raised. Although many Māori are still marginalised in economic terms in comparison to the settler population, some are also involved in a diverse range of business, service and trade organisations. Several major iwi have substantial financial resources due to compensation paid by the government in settlement of past land grievances and operate multi-million dollar ventures.

In 1995 Tainui were the first tribe to receive full and final settlement for past injustices from the Crown and awarded $170million. Their investments ranged from property management, fishing for domestic and export markets, to speculative and high risk
choices such as a rugby league team and holiday resorts and hotels in Australia (Cooper 2000; Van Meijl 2003). However, lack of broad based skills in formal management and financial areas for the tribe created vulnerability and a loss of $40million within five years. In comparison the South Island tribe Ngai Tahu also received a package from the Crown of $170million and recruited key staff and established a governance framework that reflected a Western corporate approach to management. Ngai Tahu recognised that the autonomous and independent traditional tribal structures were not suited to a modern economy that necessitated high levels of specialisation and outside advice and have taken a collaborative approach to business management. As such we could argue that Ngai Tahu have operated in a third space of hybridity; the tribe has diversified assets and made several successful investments including tourism. There is a need therefore to identify and foster those values that constitute a ‘hybrid’ Māori identity and examine how this may add to building Māori tourism capacity.

To reiterate then - Māori are not a homogenous group and the concept of ‘who is Māori’ is fraught with ambiguity and paradox. As colonised people Māori are highly diverse in their cultural makeup and are no different to other groupings in that the shifting nature of identity means that individual Māori can and do represent themselves differently throughout the course of their lives. It is thus important to remember that the “Māori” subject is characterised by multiple affiliations (Meredith 1998, O’Regan 2001); consequently, the term “Māori” and the concept of “Māoriness” are problematic in their application as homogenous identifiers (Meredith 1998). Treating Māori as one entity creates a form of essentialisation of Māori culture and overlooks the importance of iwi and hapu, pan-tribal and non-tribal, and the complex mix of hybrid identities. Lye (1998) argues such essentialisation is often a form of nostalgia deriving more from the thought of colonisers than of the colonised, serving to unify his culture while mystifying that of others. However Māori have and do use this form of representation to promote and elevate particular socio-political issues and thus practice Spivak’s (1984) strategic essentialism.
What these differing perspectives highlight is the complex nature of identity construction encased within Māori aspirations toward self-determination and the wider issues of biculturalism in New Zealand’s political, social and cultural makeup (O’Sullivan 2007; Sharp 1995; Spoonley 1995; Ritchie 1992). According to Meredith (1998) the blanket term ‘Māori’ and ‘Māoritanga’ have defined Māori people within a western epistemological framework that has served government politics of expediency and pragmatism in their attempts to deal with one voice but reminds us that we need to also be cautious of totalising concepts such as ‘Māoritanga’ and the ‘Māori way’, particularly where such totalisation and essentialisation seeks to separate Māori as Other. These homogenous concepts may be superseded by the (re)presentation of Māori culture within a Māori-centric paradigm (McIntosh et al. 2004) however, Māori-centric cannot negate a global view in which it is inextricably linked with the wider issues of indigeneity. This would also run the risk of further essentialism whereby Māori-centric is reduced to an essential idea of what it means to be an ‘authentic Māori’.

Discussion in this section has raised a number of issues in relation to Māori identity and poses both challenge and potential for Māori tourism. It is my position in this thesis to explore the concept of identity as positional rather than essentialist (Hall and du Gay 1996). In this respect identities are never unified but increasingly fragmented and operate across different, often intersecting discourses, practices and positions (Bell 2004). By discussing the tensions surrounding ‘who are Māori’ reiterates that multiple layers exist within the construction of the “Māori” subject. That is, we should take a relational approach to identity because identity is inherently relational (Meredith 1998). Otherness is implicated in whichever way we constitute ‘Māori’ – for example, ‘we are ‘Māori’ in relation to those who are ‘non-Māori’, we are ‘urban Māori’ in relation to those who are ‘tribal Māori’ etc (Meredith 1998). Relational politics argues to overcome simplified dualisms such as these oppositions and replace the ‘or’ with ‘and’. In this way, there is an implicit notion of a dynamic and productive cultural relational politics of possibility – one that moves beyond a ‘politics of polarity’ (Bhabha 1994) and thus, concepts such as biculturalism.
This also has implications for using terms such as ‘authentic’ when discussing Māori culture as “pure” or “timeless” which ultimately ‘fixes’ Māori in a static and unchanging mould. The impact of colonisation must be weighed against the forces of globalisation in which Māori increasingly interact and participate. Instead this produces a hybridised cultural subject that generates social transformation around collaboration and compromise (Meredith 1998). The “Māori subject” then is postcolonial in the sense that it is under the scrutiny of a critical consciousness; one which recognises complex differentiations within cultural relations. The ‘post’ designates engagement with issues such as agency, subjectivity and the essentialising forces of colonialism and in that respect issues of power and inequality must also be interrogated and deconstructed in favour of more inclusionary inter-cultural politics of hybridity, relationships and possibility (Meredith 1998). The ‘inter’ privileges the criss-crossing and over-lapping of hybridity, the in-betweeness of cultures. According to Bhabha (1994) it is at the ‘cutting edge of translation and negotiation of cultures’. Hence, it is relevant to move discussion into the context of Māori identity and tourism and how the ‘positioning’ of identity as will be discussed in latter case studies is juxtaposed against such concepts.

1.2 Māori Identity and Tourism

Māori culture has played an important part of New Zealand’s international tourism image since the mid nineteenth century. The national tourism body has consistently focused on promoting the country’s spectacular scenery and landscape resources alongside its ‘unique’ Māori culture (McClure 2004; Taylor 1998; Tourism New Zealand 2001, 2005, 2006) to build a global identity. Over the past decade Tourism New Zealand’s marketing campaign ‘100% PURE’ has successfully linked New Zealand’s landscape with global consumer motivations to experience pristine, untouched natural phenomena (TNZ 2005; 2006). Inclusive to this marketing strategy is the role of Māori as New Zealand’s indigenous people and by association connate its ‘natural’ and ‘pure’ inhabitants. Similarly, native peoples in countries such as Australia, Canada and North America are also promoted as cultural ‘markers’ helping differentiate one destination from another.
As a result the identity of Māori has been somewhat shaped by stereotypical images that have tended to fix Māori culture in a temporal zone of ‘traditionalised’ and representative of pre-colonial times (Ryan 1999; Taylor 1998). This has impacted on the potential to promote a contemporary and dynamic culture that has evolved within the wider social and political environment of New Zealand. As such the discourses that surround tourism representation are an inherent part of this identity feature and can be viewed as structural components of the tourism development process (Tuulentie 2006).

Māori culture contributes to New Zealand’s identity in offering a ‘point of difference’ one which both Māori and Pākehā promote. This raises the paradoxical issue of ‘who’ represents and the discursive frameworks within which representation is manifest. Previous imagery of Māori have been grounded in a political relationship between those ‘in power’ versus those who are not. Potential tourists are directed towards particular interpretations at the expense of others and thus ‘reality’ is contested via unequal relationships of power. Morgan and Pritchard (1999) state:

> Text is written, photographs are taken, people and places are represented ... The discourse of tourism promotion does not merely reflect ‘reality’, instead relations of power contextualise and structure the representation of particular people and places at particular times so that what we are presented with is representation of ... life, authored, and partial (1999: 38).

Tourism marketing aims to present the unfamiliar to the tourist and to achieve this, the unfamiliar is encoded with certain meanings promoted and others discarded (Morgan and Pritchard 1999). The selective use of these images is an example of the power behind the ‘cultural brokers’ of tourism and how meanings are related to imagery. But the relationship between tourism and the identity construction of an ethnic group is not a unilateral process – they are both social actors. Morgan and Pritchard note that ‘these images and icons are however, not merely or exclusively innocent expressions of a country’s identity. Instead, they are the culmination of historical, social, economic and
political processes’ (1999: 146). That is, they reflect a mix of cultural interaction and exchange that has involved processes such as colonisation and its subsequent effects.

The touristic representation of Māori culture as representative of New Zealand culture was largely manifest through aspects of symbolism. According to Ashcroft et al. (2000) the tendency to employ generic signifiers for cultures that may have many variations within them may override the real differences that exist within such cultures. The use of Māori cultural symbolism such as the ‘hongi’ or ‘haka’ in tourism advertising has been criticised for signifying a ‘generalised, authentic ‘Māoriness’, detached from any specific tribal traditions’ (Bell 2004) and one which neglects the plurality of the Māori subject. However identity ‘markers’ are important components of both host and visitor perceptions and expectations. As Ryan (1999, 2000) has noted the development of colourful vibrant song and dance routines with distinctive Māori ‘costume’ became easily identifiable and saleable as a tourism product. Although it may be argued such representation sees Māori culture as belonging to the past rather than the present (Metge 1976) they also represent the past ‘in the present’ if we relate this to the concept of whakapapa and Māori epistemology. Tradition can thus be ‘re-invented’ performatively in the face of a multiplicity of alternative practices, mores and identities (Havemann 1997) and the co-existence of the old with the new.

As both products and producers of tourism, Māori have a dichotomous relationship in the host-guest experience. The stereotypical and homogenous identity that has been created by a century of national tourism promotion belies the fact that Māori are tribal and regionally diverse people thus, Māori ‘identity’ within tourism may be regionally specific or nationally specific; identity is confirmed by self-representation, ownership and control of development (Butler and Hinch 2007; Durie 1998; McIntosh et al. 2002). Given the tribal makeup of Māori and the predominance of a ‘collective’ Māori image as promoted by the national tourism organisation, what are the current concerns of Māori operators in relation to representing their culture as a tourism product? What role does identity play in this process? Does this reveal postcolonial and/or hybrid identities and does this disrupt dualisms such as modern/traditional, authentic/inauthentic? I see the dilemma in
denoting terms ‘traditional’ or ‘modern’ to Māori. In one respect it is the ‘traditional’ aspects of Māori culture that have primarily been promoted by both Māori and Pākehā stakeholders. The current demand from Māori for more contemporary representation of their image means deciding which symbols and markers of ‘traditional’ Māori culture (e.g. customs, stories, proverbs, beliefs, etc) they engage in (AMTF 1996; MTTF 1987; McIntosh 2004; Ryan 2002) and who initiates engagement. This is a cultural selection process that is the first step of identity construction. The second step involves the adaptation of those systems and practices to the new environment and therefore a process of reinterpretation and meaning. Hence, negotiation involves a process of hybridization.

According to O’Regan (2001) the development of identity involves the construction of a self-image that draw’s from one’s past experiences, one’s roles and relationships, beliefs and world view. Hence, it is important to examine the concept of identity as it relates to Māori Pākehā relations operating within a bicultural framework in order to critique this relationship within a tourism environment and shift the boundaries of engagement so to speak. It is equally important to recognise the fluidity of the concept and the varying degrees in which people ascribe identity. O’Regan (2001:85) has stated that ‘identity can be ascribed in two ways: either it can be self-ascribed, with that choice supported and accepted by members of that group, or it can be ascribed to you by others. Often there is a conflict between the two’.

The former resonates with the practice of Māori kin accountability. Viken (2006) comments that the postmodern individual is obliged to create a personal identity that is distinct and flexible. It also involves a strong narrative component; it is through constructing and mediating stories about oneself that a person’s identity emerges, both for the individual and for others. In particular, ontological narratives – narratives about personal experiences from family, kinship and local community are often an intrinsic part of indigenous identity (Viken 2006). Case study analysis will compare how Māori tourism operators contribute to this discourse of ‘indigeneity’ and how this effects the process of identity construction. Ascription by others in regard to indigenous people is often manifest through the ‘Othering’ process whereby they are treated not as individuals,
but as a category. This is evident in the homogenous identity ascribed to Māori via past national tourism promotion and how Māori currently ascribe their tribal identity within tourism as active agents of change.

The desire of indigenous peoples to protect their cultural identity whilst also being active participants in an increasingly inter-connected world raises a number of issues for the management of cultural tourism not least of which involves sustainability. For me, the intention to explore how Māori tourism practitioners re-negotiate their image, tribal identities and cultural difference means focusing on the process of identification as a significant object of research and outcome. This may reveal complex, complementary and contradictory processes that contribute new insights to cultural tourism production.

1.3 Situating Colonialism

Colonialism was, in part, an image of imperialism ... in this image lies images of the Other, stark contrasts and subtle nuances, of the ways in which indigenous communities were perceived and dealt with, which make the stories of colonialism part of the grander narrative

(Tuhiwai Smith 2003: 23)

Colonialism is an elusive concept to define, but one which scholars of various disciplines have written about. This is possibly because the breadth of colonial studies incorporates the political, legal, economic, cultural and social phenomenon. What most definitions do concur with is that issues of ‘dominance’, ‘control’, ‘power’ and ‘knowledge’ are central to any discussion of colonial practice (Ashcroft et al. 2000). A key feature of critically examining colonialism is the role representation plays in installing and perpetuating notions of European superiority over non-European peoples and cultures and its effect on issues such as self identity of the colonised. (Fanon 1967; Goldie 1995; Maxwell 1999; Mellinger 1994; Palmer 1994). In practice, colonialism expected indigenous peoples to ‘give way’, to ‘die out’ or to assimilate into the colonising culture (Bell 2004). The legitimacy of colonialism lies in its argument of the “civilising mission” which suggested
that a temporary period of political dependence or tutelage was necessary in order for “uncivilised” societies to advance to the point where they were capable of sustaining liberal institutions and self-government.

What is apparent in any debate about colonialism is the importance of discourse as a controlling practice and draws on Foucault’s (1980; 1989) notion of discourse as a ‘system of statements’, within which the world comes into being. Colonial discourse is thus a system of statements that can be made about colonies and colonial peoples, about colonising powers and about the relationship between these two. The discourse of colonialism to some extent affects how the colonised come to see themselves (Hall 1996). In turn, postcolonial agents may also use images and representations produced by the colonisers of the colonised, re-inscribing and ‘de-scribing’ the discourses of the coloniser (Marschall 2004) and which bring to the fore discussion around mimicry and ambivalence in the postcolonial condition (Bhabha 1994; Hollinshead 1998).

Therefore, both terms ‘colonial’ and ‘postcolonial’ operate within a power-knowledge arena and both terms are inherently complex. Importantly, we need to recognise the temporal disjuncture between the two terms – the ‘post’ does not delineate time ‘after’ colonialism but engages with the ongoing influence of former imperial powers in postcolonial states. Although that is not directly applicable to the New Zealand context therein remain colonial legacies and ideologies within its societal structures. Particularly apt for indigenous tourism is that postcolonial criticism allows the analysis of cultural forms which mediate, challenge or reflect upon ... relations of domination and subordination (Moore-Gilbert 1997: 12). These relations have their roots in the history of modern European colonisation and imperialism, and thus cannot be ignored when discussing relations between Māori and Pākehā, and the emergence of the nation New Zealand.
1.4 Colonial New Zealand: Constructing the Māori Other

At the time of early contact between Māori and Pākehā each culture sought their own benefits from the relationship that would inevitably become a dominant feature of New Zealand’s colonial development (Belich 2001; Best 1924; Levine 1997; Walker 2004). For Pākehā, early contact with Māori was all about an economic and social mission (Gibbons 2002; Pawson 1999; Walker 2004). Early traders sought to understand Māori culture in order to exploit natural resources and to reach the Māori market (Tahi 1995). At the same time missionaries pursued their ideological aspirations of turning ‘pagans’ in to civilised subjects, whilst anthropologists documented and recorded cultural traits for posterity (Bell 1990; King 1996, 2003). While many Māori accepted Christianity they also adhered to Māori worldviews, thus integrating both into a new system of meaning (Drake 2005; King 1975; Walker 1987).

As a majority population, Māori sought to understand Pākehā culture and language for a variety of reasons, but primarily to take advantage of specific economic, political and social opportunities, with the primary aim of gaining advantage over other Māori but also to secure dominance over Pākehā (Clydesdale 2007; Walker 2004). It became obvious to Māori with the onset of colonisation and increasing numbers of settlers arriving in New Zealand that the need to understand Pākehā culture would enable them to negotiate ways of living together (Tahi 1995). Over time Māori continued to ‘negotiate’ with Pākehā in order to ensure survival, but also to optimize opportunities for Māori in a society and economy that was clearly dominated by the majority Pākehā culture (Bell 2004; O’Sullivan 2007; Ritchie 1992; Sharp 1995; Vasil 1993, 2000). Europeans noted that Māori ‘demonstrated a rare capacity for civilisation’ (Sorenson 1981: 169) as they adapted and adopted with ease European ways. The colonising period of the mid 1800’s impacted on many aspects of Māori culture not least was increased pressure by Pākehā for land. Thus, land became the focus of economic and political confrontation (Clydesdale 2007).

Such confrontation also brought racial disharmony. Settlers intent on gaining land from Māori resented obstacles such as the communal system of land tenure and ownership that
Māori society adhered to. Conflict also brought with it derogatory discourse such as referring to Māori as “niggers” (Clydesdale 2007). As a hallmark of colonial discourse the representational practice of racialising the Other is structured on a set of binary oppositions (Maxwell 1999; Spencer 2006). As colonisation in New Zealand progressed, primitivist representations of Māori were increasingly combined with more truly racial thinking underpinned by a general belief in the superiority of European civilisation (Bell 2004: 45). Racial stereotypes however changed with historical context – for example Māori as warlike warrior/cannibals (due to the military threat of 1860s), or as a ‘dying race’ in the late 1890s (due to poverty, disease and war) to one of the ‘quintessential Māori’ (Taylor 1998; Wall 1997).

The contradiction of such racial distinction is that racism argues that biology determined culture, on the other hand, the logic of the “civilising mission” was that the culture of the ‘savages’ could be replaced by a ‘higher’ (pseudo) European one (Bell 2004: 124). Te Awekotuku (1991) advances this reason for a fascination of the Other – that Māori re-affirmed the notion of European supremacy as a civilised people (Ryan 1999). The classification of the Māori ‘race’ has been constructed within a western hierarchical system that positioned ‘Polynesian’ Māori at a higher level due to its business acumen, intelligence and stature (Wall 1997: 41). Traditional indigenous societies such as Māori were considered somehow ‘purer’ than the resulting colonial hybrid (Sutton Beets 2000). Ironically indigenous people were expected to assimilate but this was also viewed as leading to their moral decline (Bell 2004). Thus, the ‘true’ indigenous (read Māori) becomes relegated to a representation of ‘inauthentic’.

As such, Māori became subject to a process of textual Othering whereby certain discursive formats develop over time that accrue truth-value. This reinforces particular stereotypical images and ways of thinking (Fleras and Spoonley 1999) reflecting Edward Said’s (1985) concept of Orientalism whereby indigenous peoples are represented in relation to the dominant group. Said’s theory of Orientalism argues that the non-European world was ‘produced’ through a discourse that privileged the ‘West’ over the ‘Rest’. The body of knowledge which was produced in the nineteenth century by
scholars, travel writers, poets, novelists and government institutions represented the Orient as a repository of Western knowledge, rather than as a society and culture functioning on its own terms (Mills 2004). Māori as such, were described in terms of the way they differed from Pākehā, were often denigrated and represented negatively as Other in order to produce a positive, civilised image of British society (Te Awekotuku 1991). According to Said (1989) colonised people are dehumanised by generalisations made about them within colonial texts, resulting in a homogenisation of cultures as opposed to a portrayal of a community of individuals with regional tribal identities. Taylor (1998) has also linked such practice with representing colonised cultures on a different time-scale to colonisers, ‘fixing’ them as such in time and as unchanging. Fabian (1983) has stated ‘there is no knowledge of the other which is not also a temporal, historical, a political act’. Such discursive practices construct identities and meaning and act within power/knowledge relationships between those subjected to such classification and those promoting it.

It is a truism that to visitors to a new land – certainly to settlers – the original inhabitants were profoundly Other (Gidley 1994). In simple terms the ‘Other’ is not self but exists as a metaphysical concept rather than as a genuine entity (Ashcroft et al. 2000; Spencer 2006). In speaking of the colonised subject as ‘other’ we create binary separation of the coloniser and colonised. The settlers may have had to struggle physically (e.g. Māori Land Wars of 1860s) with the indigenous people for possession of the land, and in the process these original inhabitants (i.e. Māori) were or became that which the settlers had to define themselves against (Gidley 1994). Spencer (2006: 248) comments the concept of Other ‘recognises the contingent nature of self identity as formed in relation to other alien subjectivities’. But European settlers were not homogenous and struggled with their own identity to create a new nation. Within this grouping hierarchical constructs created very powerful settler interests which came to dominate the politics of the colony. As political power shifted from indigenous to settler inhabitants the emergence of a dominant discourse becomes part of the social fabric of the new nation (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002). Consequently, over time Māori became marginalised from much of New Zealand political, social and economical development.
According to Ashcroft et al. (1995, 2002) one of the main features of imperial oppression is control over language and text. Mills (2004: 103) has commented that colonial power enables the production of knowledge, and it also maps out powerful positions from which to speak. Tourism imagery is thus implicated in colonial practice. Romanticized images of Māori were increasingly used in travel and tourism brochures, depicting Māori as exotic and racially pure specimens who cavorted in an idyllic and timeless landscape (Bell 1990; Blythe 1994; Edwards 1989; Fleras and Spoonley 1999; Taylor 1998). The New Zealand landscape was claimed, named and possessed by the settler colony (Gibbons 1986, 2002; Tuhiwai Smith 2003; Ward and Hayward 1999). This included gathering indigenous knowledge (Hingangaroa Smith 2000; Johnston 2000; Meyer 2006; Pritchard and Morgan 2005; Stoll and van Hahn 2004) that was inextricably tied to the landscape and tribal histories. Pākehā sought to acquire the stories within the landscape as a form of ‘displacing’ Māori from primary rights (Gibbons 2002).

This has been reiterated by Tapsell and Woods (2008) who comment that in the late 1840s, the third Governor, Sir George Grey, collected all the myths and stories of the Māori, in particular the adventures of Maui in order to disrupt Māori social organisation, especially that between rangatira and potiki (younger Māori). This was achieved by manipulating and ‘reversing’ power structures within Māoridom that impacted on wresting control of tribal estates from rangatira. But ultimately all kin suffered at the expense of colonial expansion and exploitation of once Māori-controlled resources (Kawharu, 1977, 2000; Walker 1990) by Pākehā and the Crown. The real presence of Māori in colonial New Zealand was representative of a mythologised or decorative cultural identity. Images of Māori could be presented as savages existing at a primitive stage of social development; yet they could be presented as romantic beings, as noble, as ignoble, as relics of antiquity, as exotic curiosities, as hostile, friendly, as members of a dying race, as ethnographical specimens, as marketable commodities, or as objects of desire or display (Bell 1990). Thus, ambivalence often characterised European representations: in both positive and negative ways. As Stafford and Williams note the
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‘exaltation of the primitive denies Māori a stake in modernity’ (2006: 20). This worked against the idea of cultural difference which was open to modification and change.

Said has claimed that anthropological representations bear as much (or more) on the representer’s world as on who or what is represented (1989: 224). The transmittal of a print culture stored, circulated, recycled and reinforced Western formulations of knowledge about New Zealand, absorbing and appropriating the indigenous knowledge forms – recording and processing diversity, naturalising novelty and difference (Wevers 2002:11). Such publications illustrate Foucault’s (1980) notion of a ‘system of statements’ that constructs subjectivity and determines how experiences and identities are categorised. Bell states ‘the settler ‘brings the native into existence’ within colonial and racial systems of representation. Thus the settler talks a lot about the indigene … what the indigene has to say about the settler is less heard in the public domain’ (2004:5-6).

The colonising processes New Zealand underwent are not dissimilar to many other countries during the same historical period whereby indigenous peoples were subject to similar practices. Colonialism was in part, an image of the future nation it would become. In this image lie images of the Other, stark contrasts and nuances, of the way indigenous communities were perceived and dealt with (Tuhiwai Smith 2003). This makes the stories of colonialism part of the grander narrative that imposed specific knowledges, disciplines and values upon Māori. As a consequence, colonial discourse organises social existence and social reproduction within colonial relationships; it is a construction of colonised subjects as much as the coloniser (Ashcroft et al. 2000). Such textualising strategies in effect discursively ‘produced’ New Zealand as a land of natural wonders, scenic beauty, with a unique indigenous people (McClure 2004; Taylor 1998; TNZ 2001). Gibbons has stated that ‘Māori themselves and their cultures were textualised by Pākehā, so that the colonists could ‘know’ the people they were displacing’ (2002: 13) suggesting that the construction by Pākehā of a New Zealand national identity was not a sign that the colonisation process was over, but an important part of the ongoing (and still uncompleted) processes of colonisation (2003: 39). ‘The Māori’ was textually invented – represented as picturesque, quaint, largely ahistorical, and, through
printed materials, manageable. Thus, the representation of Māori became commodified – cast as Other in their own country.

### 1.5 Early Māori Tourism Development

Tourism in New Zealand was inextricably linked with the processes of colonisation and the need to promote the country to European settlers. Textual images of Māori were juxtaposed with the economical and political climate of the country’s early development. Thus, one of ‘progress’ was dually created – by the proprietorial drive of settlement fundamental to the colonial enterprise (Stafford and Williams 2006) and governed by European ideologies that incorporated Māori as the exotic Other whilst simultaneously assimilating them into Western culture. According to Paterson (2006) the notion that humanity was continuously advancing in terms of civilisation (and that Europeans, particularly the British, were in the vanguard of this advance) meant that Māori should share in this progress – not so much from an altruistic motive but one of necessity. If Māori did not progress, they would ‘die out’ as a race (Stafford and Williams 2006).

Māori have been involved in tourism development since the first ‘tourists’ visited such internationally known sites as the Pink and White Terraces near Rotorua in the North Island of New Zealand in 1838 (Edwards 1996; McClure 2004; Ingram 1997; TNZ 2003). These geothermal sites were quickly recognised for their potential as tourist and health resorts and the government’s motivation to create European style health ‘resorts’ boosted tourism development in the region (McClure 2004). Politicians and businessmen seized on the idea of exploiting New Zealand’s thermal resources. In 1880 the government tried to purchase land at Rotorua from the kin group Ngāti Whakaue. They would not sell without testing the market, but did gift 20 hectares of land to the Crown ([www.teara.govt.nz](http://www.teara.govt.nz)). However, under the Thermal-Springs Districts Act 1881, an area could be declared a thermal springs district where only the government could purchase land. This codified the government’s intention to legislate on the principles of reserving thermal districts ‘for the use of the nation’ (Barnett 1997). Private ventures – including
those run by Māori – were encouraged, but public interests took priority (www.teara.govt.nz). As a result the government obtained 2000 hectares around Lake Rotorua including all the best springs. Rotorua was declared a township and its development as a health resort and tourist centre began.

Although the balance of power and authority moved irrevocably away from the local iwi Te Arawa towards the Crown (Diamond 2007) and they faced many changes during the time, Te Arawa adapted quickly to the needs of tourism demand. The Māori cultural component became an important element in the product mix of providing tour guiding to the geothermal areas, accommodation and entertainment, transportation, and arts and crafts. Rotorua soon established a reputation for offering tourists a taste of Māori culture (McClure 2004). Māori were peripheral to concentrated European tourism development but played an important role in maintaining the comfortable social and cultural distance that colonial and imperial entertainment required (Blythe 1988; Edwards 1989). Although Māori owned and operated key tourist attractions during the 1880s and 1890s they were still ‘Other’ to the visitors and settlers arriving in increasing numbers (Barnett 1997; Ingram 1997; McClure 2004). Both Pākehā and Māori were involved in servicing tourists to the thermal ‘geyserland’ area but it was Māori who took tourists by canoe to the Terraces, guiding them as natural inhabitants of the area, and performing haka for evening entertainment. Development of the tourist industry in these early stages was a natural extension of the Māori concept of maanakitanga (hospitality). Barnett (2001: 85) has noted:

Initially, tourists’ accommodation needs and guiding requirements were adequately met by Māori businesses – the first hotels and guiding operations in the district (Rotorua) were either wholly or partly owned and operated by Māori. But gradually they were displaced by the Pākehā, and Māori land alienation in the area began to accelerate.

Guiding tourists from the 1800’s Māori women have held sway in the role of providing ‘hospitable reception of visitors’ and have played a vital role in the development of Rotorua tourism (Ryan 1999). By the 1870s certain colourful and strong personalities
emerged, and guiding as a female occupation was established. Guiding became a lucrative and enjoyable mode of employment for many of the women from the local tribe Tuhourangi (Te Awekotuku 1981). Famous female guides included Maggie (Makereti) Papakura, who with her mentor Sophia Hinerangi, was chosen to guide the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall at Whakarewarewa on their royal visit to New Zealand in 1901. Her mixed heritage (Māori and Pākehā) descended from a chiefly line of kin group Ngati Wahiao, and her swift intelligence made her popular with visitors. Makereti became a popular subject for commercial photographers and images of her, like the souvenir plate (Figure 1.1) featuring her and her sister Bella, spread throughout New Zealand and overseas making her an international media celebrity (Diamond 2007; Te Awekotuku 1991). In 1911 Makereti took a four-strong Te Arawa concert party to England where they performed at the Crystal Palace (www.teara.govt.nz). Music presented to non-Māori in such concert parties was often informed with western musical practices creating a cultural ‘fusion’.

Figure 1.1 Guides Makereti and Bella
Source: National Library of New Zealand (2009)

There were various reasons why tour guiding became an almost exclusive female profession particularly in the late nineteenth century. It was a part time occupation and seasonal, whilst many Māori men were occupied in full employment in the nearby
Volcanic Plateau forestry project. Tourism was accelerating and women were suited to the role of guiding for both tangible and intangible reasons. One being that guiding could have been another expression of a much more ancient and traditional female practice, such as the *puhi* and the *kai arahi*. These functions included entertainment of visitors, and a pleasing display of feminine skills in dance, chant, and food presentation (Te Awekotuku 1991: 81). According to Te Awekotuku there was also the belief that:

‘Women are much better guides than men. They are more caring, and more attractive to the tourists. And it is like being a hostess in your own home – and it is our home. So for us, it is a very easy and natural thing to do’.

As such these entrepreneurial women sometimes represented a dual image through representation of both Māori and English heritage (Diamond 2007) and along with later guides such as Guide Rangi (Maggie’s daughter-in-law), whose importance was not only due to their guiding, but to their role in popularising Māori culture as displayed through song and dance, and through their organizing performances not only in the Rotorua region but also overseas (Ryan 1999) represented a changing hybrid characteristic of Māori cultural identity. Talking of “Guide Bella”, Taylor (1998: 23) comments ‘As a mediator between worlds she is hybridised as both “native” and richly “European”, exemplary of what was often described as “the Māori of the Transition Period”’. Te Awekotuku (1981:257) describes Guide Bella as someone who was:

Very keenly aware of herself as cultural broker – as someone between two worlds, choosing to mediate one world to the other, through her own involvement in Pākehā type specialised economics and employment.

Te Awekotuku comments ‘tourism imposed itself upon the Māori view, and women became not only the mediators but the main players for the Māori side’ (1981:280). Such images served to counter the idealised preconceptions that tourists brought with them of an indigenous people who were bound to nature, an integral part of an exotic landscape. Tourists were increasingly going in search of that “authentic” native which had by now become a familiar pictorial image, only to find the imag(in)ed ideal undermined (Taylor 1998).
The textualising strategies of *Orientalism* were disrupted and countered by the entrepreneurial attitude of the Māori, charging entry to sights and expecting payment for guiding and entertainment (McClure 2004). As a mode of colonial discourse we can hereby ascribe Bhabha’s concept of mimicry. Mimicry relies on resemblance, on the colonised becoming like the coloniser but always remaining different. However, the disturbing effects of mimicry can also create a ‘menace’ according to Bhabha (1994) – produced by (or forced upon) the colonised as the coloniser sees traces of himself in the colonised: as sameness slides into otherness. Behind the voyeuristic image of the guide lies the disseminating power of Māori in colonial tourism and their powerful position as prime attractions and land holders in Rotorua’s burgeoning tourism industry (Galbraith 1992: 12). Whilst changes to this situation occurred over the following century, Māori have still retained a strong presence in the development of tourism in the Rotorua region.

Such discussion raises questions about the postcolonial critique of Othering via the concept of gender in which identities are constrained and oppressed, and selectively represented. Authors such as Spivak (1987) use this argument to describe how women in many societies have been relegated to the position of Other, marginalised and, in a metaphorical sense, ‘colonised’ (Spivak 1987). Sexual imagery used in the tourism marketing of postcolonial destinations such as the South Pacific tends to be a continuation of the Western representations of a sensual, sexually available and subservient female ‘Oriental’ (Hall 2001; Opperman and McKinley 1997; Sutton Beets 2000). Te Awekotuku states of the ‘Pacific’ woman that ‘she represents the pleasurable contradiction of exotic sensuality and sunlit innocence; a relentless lure’ (1991: 91). Unwittingly, many Māori women were photographed doing what came naturally – hosting visitors to their home region. Images of Māori women were often seen in tandem with ownership of land (and thus native women) and in particular images of Māori women positioned against backdrops of native bush, waterfalls, mountain scenery, or placed beside carvings or the gateway to a Pa17 (signifying the culture of the past) reiterated allusions to possession of (Māori) land by settlers (Hoskins 2006; Sutton Beets
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Many of these images were ‘constructed’ by the photographer and often used for the lucrative postcard trade. The earliest images of these date from the studios of the American Photographic Company working in the late 1860s and 1870s, and subsequently the Burton Brothers of Dunedin. Many of these images are ambiguous in nature. One example highlighted by Te Awekotuku is the ‘cooking pool scene’ where women dressed in highly elaborate and ceremonial costumes suspend a basket of raw food into a steaming pool. No one, not even the models she says ‘pause to reflect on how they are play-acting at ethnic cooking, clad in the extremely rich and splendid garb used only on exalted tribal occasions’ (1991: 91-92). Although this hints at a sense of naivety there is recognition that Māori were prepared to ‘exploit’ tradition for commercial ends.

Hall (1996) has commented that it is ironic that images of attractive wahine (Māori female) in traditional dress kneeling beside boiling mud pools, or participating in poi (traditional dance), are still retained in promotional literature (Figure 1.2). Such images have been called degrading and racist (Hall, Mitchell and Keelan 1993). Many of the images were to be viewed by interests shaped by a Western penchalance that ‘romanticised’ and ‘eroticised’ the female/Māori form. The forms of knowledge produced about the ‘object’ of study established their own categories of ‘truth’ and contributed to the discourse of Orientalism. Their images became stock fare of the lucrative postcard boom of the early twentieth century (Alemany-Galway 1997; Bell 1990; Bell 2004; Main 1976, 1990; Ryan 2000, 2002; Sutton Beets 2000) thus reinforcing the textual construction of colonial discourse (Said 1978).
Ryan has commented that ‘for every postcard of the Māori warrior, there is also one of the Māori maiden’ (2002: 965). From an analysis of over 200 postcards Ryan and Knox (1998) concluded that earlier images of Māori (from 1890s), while stereotypical were more diverse, stating that the ‘stereotypical image’ of Māori is a more recent development (1950s onwards) and current themes are more focused on a smaller number of images generally featuring the concert party (poi dancers), the haka (war dance), and the wero, or ritual challenge with its rolling eyes, grimacing face and tongue poking (Figure 1.3). We might contribute this change to the paradoxical notion that by the mid twentieth century Māori themselves conceptualised their culture via such images as being ‘representative’ of what tourists expected to see, and what tourism product had become
conditioned to providing. This was policed by the discourse of tourism as ‘acceptable’ representations and conforming to established paradigms in a circuit of mutual reinforcement (Childs and Williams 1997: 104). A process of stereotyping reinforced by the National Tourism Board and other promotional literature reflects tourism’s emphasis on that which is unique about New Zealand (Ryan 1997) and a desire to selling culture ‘on demand’. Scherer (2004: 47) has stated the stereotypical images of Māori warriors have been ‘effectively contained because they exist as representations in commercial discourse that are gazed upon yet never physically encountered, existing only as images in the trophy cabinet of colonialism and global capitalism’. Thus images of Māori “warrior” and “maiden” can be viewed as a ‘metaphorical mirror’ – a dichotomy of savagery/civility and past/present.

![Image of Māori warriors and hākā performers](image)

**Figure 1.3 Postcards 2005 (author’s own)**

O’Connor (2004) has noted that using stereotypical images of indigenous peoples, just as early colonists did to appropriate a new national identity, works in a similar way of fixing a destination’s ‘brand’ identity. Because such stereotypical images have been presented to tourists in travel brochures and advertising before arrival in New Zealand, they are what visitors expect to see once here. However, postcards also portray ambiguity in their representation of indigenous peoples (Edwards 1996; Mellinger 1994). Purchasers of postcards have little knowledge of what constitutes an ‘authentic’ representation of
Māori, and the use of artefacts (many of which are also taonga) associated with Māori culture are problematic in their implication of neutrality. This is influenced by the photographer who attempts to create ‘meaning’ for the possible purchaser and therefore subject to discursive power over those who are photographed. In particular travel photographs seek to tell a story not of a ‘common humanity but of fundamental economic, political and cultural differences…us and them are often in contrast’ (Morgan and Pritchard 1999). Ryan (1997: 261) also comments:

From a postmodernist view of deconstructing the text of the postcard, what is being signified is the making safe of the primitive into an image of entertainment; what is denied is the concept of Māori in the twentieth, much less the twenty-first century, as peoples of the contemporary era.

What is relevant to a post-colonial interpretation is that such stereotyping is all about power, the power of one to label or define another (Morgan and Pritchard 1999). The perpetuation of ‘traditional’ images of Māori culture was used as stock trade of tourism promotional publicity. Tourism was part of the discursive process that ‘created’ a colonial image of New Zealand; tourism served as a political agent to introduce, promote, and reinforce colonisation. We might analyse such representation by Said’s view of representation as carrying two important sets of meanings: one political, the other aesthetic and whereby in each case there is a process of substitution. Orientalism is a convergence of the two, where the textual or aesthetic representation’s substitution of its reality for that of the Orient provides the legitimation for the British substitution of themselves for indigenous rulers, representing the colonised peoples by speaking and acting on their behalf. A representation is thus implicated, intertwined, embedded, interwoven with a great many other things besides ‘truth’, which is itself a representation (Said 1978: 272-3).

The extent of government control and investment in tourism as discussed in the Rotorua region shows tourism as structured around western political and social systems that have created unequal representation for Māori (Bargh 2007; Tuhiwai Smith 2003; Vasil 2003).
Rotorua has managed to maintain a measure of Māori control and leadership in its tourism development and in particular women have played an essential and decisive role in the shaping of Te Arawa tourism through their role in guiding (Te Awekotuku 1981: 285). But overall, there has been an underlying resentment from many Māori about their failure to gain appropriate economic and employment returns from tourism (Hall 1996: 157) and the use of the Māori image as a tourism marketing tool. Māori became stereotyped into guides, carvers and entertainers, ‘providing background colour and uniqueness to the national tourism product’ (Barnett 1997). The paradox of this temporal development has been the altered role of Māori as tourism ‘producers’ in the nineteenth century to tourism ‘product’ during most of the twentieth century. Māori identity as tourist ‘attractions’ rather than tourism ‘managers’ contributed to some extent of marginalising Māori from the control and development of their own cultural expression (Hall 1994). But Māori were not ‘passive’ players in the tourism market by their willingness to accommodate to and run tourism ventures for tourists. Authors such as Te Awekotuku and James Belich have argued that Te Arawa ‘became willing partners in a co-operative venture’ however, it highlighted a determination by the Crown to control Māori entrepreneurial practices rather than encourage them (McClure 2004). Although Māori benefited from tourism during the late nineteenth century by the early twentieth century their financial involvement in tourism development was almost non-existent and Pākehā were not slow to continue exploiting the Māori image as a marketing tool to promote tourism (Barber 1992; MTTF 1987).

During most of the twentieth century indigenous images were treated as the common property of post-settler nations, freely available for use as symbols in the construction of nationhood (Sissons 2005: 8). This has wider implications in relation to indigenous tourism and the politics of indigeneity. Imagery is just one example of appropriation of indigenous cultures as a form of colonial discourse. What arises from such ‘colonising practices’ is a re-appropriation by the colonised of not only ‘images’, but wider concerns over issues such as land rights and indigenous self determination, authenticity, education, cultural integrity and well-being. These concerns have their roots in colonial struggles but are undertaken in a post-colonial context that recognises change and adaptation are
part of a global world. In re-articulating their futures, indigenous peoples transcend notions of a homogenous world by virtue of diversity. Thus, indigenous peoples appropriate global resources for their own culturally specific ends (Sissons 2005: 13). Within this process the concept of postcolonialism emerges in the way previously marginalised (who have become empowered to ‘speak’) re-present culture to assert a new (decolonised) identity (Hall and Tucker 2004) and by which postcolonial discourse becomes a means by which colonised people re-assert and re-negotiate their position.

1.6 Māori and the Treaty of Waitangi

Māori have faced many obstacles in asserting their rights as Tangata Whenua since colonisation began. One of the primary means of redress for Māori is instilled in the Treaty of Waitangi. In multicultural settler nations like New Zealand, the discourse of treaties stands out as a distinguishing feature of the discursive relationship between indigenous peoples and colonial settlers. The treaty-making process implicitly recognises the sovereignty of indigenous nations; specific treaty documents explicitly vow that imperial or settler governments will uphold that sovereignty (Allen 2002). Because historic treaties recognise indigenous nations as sovereign, they continue to offer strong legal and moral bases from which indigenous minority peoples can argue for land and resources rights as well as articulate cultural and identity politics (Allen 2002). However, as Allen comments, ‘The dominant power in New Zealand disavowed the discourse of the Treaty almost as soon as the ink was dry’ (2002:18). It is therefore necessary to enlarge on the Treaty’s foundation in order that the reader fully appreciates the complex, often contentious bicultural Treaty relations between Māori and the Crown, its relevance to Māori tourism development and the post colonial discourse that underlies its legitimacy and/or longevity.

Te Tiriti O Waitangi was first signed at Waitangi, Northland on 6th February 1840 between Ngapuhi/Northern tribal leaders and the Crown before nine further copies were taken by various deputised agents throughout the country, collecting a total of 512
signatories (Orange 2004). New Zealand’s first Governor, Lt General Hobson, was to ratify the Treaty of Waitangi later that year by which it proposed to set in place a workable structure for a gradual, even gentle, colonial process between settler and Māori (Kawharu 1989; Williams 1989). Yet it may be said the main purpose of the Treaty was as a framework with which to effectively manage and manipulate a creeping, inevitable colonial process (Te Awekotuku 1991).

For both Māori and Pākehā, The Treaty is a contentious document, yet remains a cornerstone of New Zealand’s constitution and its history (Orange 2004). Although widely regarded as the constitutional framework for New Zealand society, the Treaty is neither constitutional law nor constitutionally entrenched (Joseph 2007; McHugh 1989; O’Sullivan 2007). This constitutional instability is problematic in contemporary relations between Māori and the Crown, not least of which is the underlying commitment of the Treaty to protect the interest of Māori as a minority people. As Palmer points out:

New Zealand’s formal constitutional arrangements and our informal constitutional culture rely ultimately on the sovereign power of a representative Parliament where the majority rules, pragmatically and politically. This is what is behind the conventional legal status of the Treaty of Waitangi that it only has legal force if and when Parliament says it does (2008: 3).

For the purposes of the Treaty, the British recognised those Māori who signed it as representing the whole of Māoridom as a nation. There are two versions of the Treaty – one English and one Māori; thus there are two interpretations based on two different worldviews (Sorrenson 1989). Most of the chiefs signed the Māori version. There are basic differences between the English and the Māori versions, since the Māori version is not a literal translation of the English Treaty. However, under the terms of international law, which governs the signing of agreements between nations, only the Māori version has any legitimacy. This is important, because the differences in the translation are crucial to understanding why many Māori today feel the Treaty has not been honoured (Williams 1989)
Differences between the interpretation of the English and Māori texts highlight the paradoxes of consensus in a bicultural society and at times works more to hinder than resolve issues between Māori and the Crown (Maaka and Fleras 2005). Palmer (2008) relates uncertainty about the meaning of the Treaty exists because the Treaty clearly related to the sharing of public power by the Crown and Māori, but the terms of that sharing were not clearly specified or agreed. There appears however to have been agreement by those who signed that there should be some ongoing relationship between the British Crown and Māori hapu and Rangatira concerning the exercise of public power, but the nature of that relationship was left to be determined pragmatically, on an ongoing basis (Palmer 2008: 2). Consequently, from 1840 onwards to the present, Māori have been negotiating that relationship (Paterson 2006: 199). There is an obligation on both the Crown and Māori to consult with each other, act in good faith, and compromise where appropriate. Thus we might view the Treaty as a negotiated boundary that has constitutional validity albeit of a relational nature.

Māori rights to land and resources have been increasingly asserted through the Treaty of Waitangi (Allen 2002; Kolig 2004; Liu and McClure 1999; Sullivan 1995; Walker 2004). Within a few years of signing the Treaty, competition for land, different cultural clashes and disappointed hopes on the Māori side resulted in localised clashes between some Māori and the settler government. By 1860 the monopoly of local and state power resided with the European settlers, many of whom dismissed the Treaty as having no legal significance. In 1877 one Judge referred to it as “a simple nullity” (Waitangi National Trust 2005: 19). In contrast however, Māori continued to treasure the Treaty, continually striving to bring the Treaty and Treaty breaches to the notice of government. The loss of land by confiscations and legal process can be attributed to a loss of cultural identity for Māori at that time. As discussed in the previous section examples such as the Thermal District Springs Act 1881 illustrate the power of the settler government and its legislative programme to usurp Māori land and therefore destabilise society. Kawharu (1977: 296) reiterates this point:
The Treaty inaugurated an era of systematic colonisation. Colonisation brought an immediate demand for Māori land for settlement, and administrative structures and political policies were required to bring about satisfaction – predominantly for the Pākehā settler.

Land was also taken by the Crown for public purposes (e.g. roading, scenery preservation purposes – especially along the shores of the various lakes) and forests and military purposes. Some 15,000 acres, mainly near Rotorua became involved in the land development schemes with further land alienated to satisfy survey liens and for payment of rates (www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz). Te Arawa had long asserted that their ownership of the Rotorua lakes was assured to them under the Treaty of Waitangi, however the Native Land Bill of 1909 meant the Crown could proclaim lake beds to be Crown land. After an eight year battle Te Arawa agreed to acknowledge the Crown’s ownership of the lakes in return for the Crown granting Te Arawa fishing rights on the lakes (www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz). In 1907, the Stout-Ngata commission reported that, of the 629,760 acres within Rotorua County (which it noted belonged to Te Arawa and connected hapu), 358,512 acres (or over half) had been purchased by the Crown (www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz). The majority of the ‘Rotorua district’ had been alienated by 1908 and Te Arawa’s small remaining estates was further whittled away by Crown acquisitions under the Public Works and Scenery Preservation Acts of 1903 and 1910 (O’Malley 1995). Petitions by Māori to the Crown persisted through most of the twentieth century. Issues over the Rotorua lakes remain unresolved today.

Similar examples of land loss occurred elsewhere in New Zealand. Prior to 1840 Ngai Tahu held rights over much of Te Wai Pounamu (the South Island) but between 1844 and 1864 the government had purchased more than 34 million acres paying a fraction of their worth and failing to deliver promised benefits of the purchases (The Ngai Tahu Claim www.treaty2u.govt.nz). Ngāi Tahu rangatira saw the initial sales contracts as ‘mutually beneficial agreements’ between equals but by 1849 they had begun to realise that the
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agreements lacked the mutual benefits they had expected from the Crown. Over the next 150 years, Ngāi Tahu continued to raise the issues of their claim with the government.

My own kin group Whakatohea were not immune from such processes. The confiscation of tribal land in the Opotiki region was attributed to the tribe’s part in the hanging of missionary Carl Volkner in 1865. Whakatohea rangatira Mokomoko was one of the accused and tried and hanged by the Crown. The punitive expedition mounted by the government resulted in deaths by those defending their lands and homes; dwellings were destroyed and the iwi’s means of commerce, shipping, was burnt at the moorings (Ashton 2006) The government then confiscated 490,000 acres from the iwi and banished the so-called “rebels” to the 20,000 acres of Opape ‘Native Reserve’. The subsequent economic, cultural and developmental devastation suffered by the iwi is not the only example of the effects of colonialism. Although Mokomoko was officially pardoned by the Crown in 1992 the loss of land cannot be corrected. The words of one of my own kin sum up these feelings:

Yes, Mokomoko has been pardoned. Cleared of any trace of wrongdoing. But there’s no chance that the other part of that wrongful punishment – the loss of 490,000 acres – can ever be fully undone. “We cannot get our land back”, says Te Riaki Amoamo. “Only the land occupied by the State Owned Enterprises. You cannot upset the other landholders. There are farmers on much of that land today ... That’s the March of Western Civilisation” (Ashton 2006)

Such (past) actions and comments from kin make me reflect on my own identity of ‘being Māori’. Although feelings of ‘distance’ from my association with kin and the effects of colonialism on our past is ‘tangibly’ resonant, there is an underlying intangible feeling of kin association and attachment to these feelings. The ‘lands’ of which my uncle Te Riaki Amoamo talks about are those which I remember from childhood and which resonate with my own identity albeit removed from the tangible ‘day to day’ life I lead.
The Treaty is a brief and simple document consisting of a preamble, three short articles, and a peroration (Sharp 2002). Its literal terms are often difficult to apply to contemporary circumstances. Generally, it is the principles of the Treaty that are relied on, rather than the direct text (Ingram 1997). But for Māori, the spoken word was highly valued therefore the main contentions between the two versions are the meanings that words construe. For example, in the English text Article One the chiefs ‘cede to Her Majesty the Queen of England absolutely and without reservation all the rights and powers of sovereignty over their respective territories’. However in the Māori version the use of the word ‘kāwanatanga’ or governance replaced that of ‘sovereignty’ therefore many Māori believed they gave up the government over their land but retained the right to manage their own affairs. The problem with the term ‘sovereignty’ is that no direct translation in the context of Māori society existed as rangatira held the autonomy and authority, ‘rangatiratanga’ over their own domains, there was no supreme ruler of the whole country. There could be no possibility of the Māori signatories having any understanding of government in the sense of ‘sovereignty’: ie, any understanding on the basis of experience or cultural precedent (www.waitangi-tribunal.govt.nz).

Article Two in the English text extensively acknowledges Māori property and ownership rights. Yet in the Māori text the term ‘tino rangatiratanga’ (full authority; chieftainship or supreme trusteeship) was used in promising to uphold the authority that tribes had always had over their tribal possessions. These included such resources as their lands, forests and fisheries – and were translated in the Māori version to ‘taonga’ – prized possessions. Thus, the meanings of words for Māori conveyed symbolic references associated with authority and mana (Orange 2004). This interpretation is vital to an understanding of Māori attitudes towards the ‘consumables’ of tourism because it enables Māori to claim not only ethical but also constitutional ownership over not only their art and designs, but also those items placed in museums (Ryan 1997).

Many Māori regard their cultural heritage and environmental resources as taonga including dimensions of a tribal group’s estate, material and non-material, heirlooms and sacred spaces, ancestral lore and whakapapa (Durie 1998; Hall 1996). Durie has also
noted that the idea of taonga includes the notion of “guardianship”. The central place of taonga in the Māori version of the Treaty as both a tangible and intangible element and its wide array of meanings has guaranteed controversy over its legal definition and become a site of conflict between Māori and Pākehā, between Māori and Māori, and between individuals or groups and New Zealand institutions. Specific taonga have become embroiled in controversies over who should control natural resources, their use in academic research, their placement in museums, and in their marketing for tourism (Corsane 2005; Hall 1996; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998).

Article Two also provided for land sales to be effected through the Crown giving the Crown the right of pre-emption in land sales. As can be seen from previous discussion this is contestable in the Rotorua region post Treaty as the treatment to tribes such as Te Arawa illustrates. Article Three of the Treaty emphasises equality as Māori are promised the rights to full citizenship.

The principles of the Treaty are still evolving. In 1975 the Labour Government ushered in the Treaty of Waitangi Act, establishing the Waitangi Tribunal, a commission of inquiry authorised to interpret, research and report to central government on alleged Treaty grievances with retrospective jurisdiction from 1985 (Palmer 2008; Walker 2004). The Treaty’s Epilogue is relevant here as it confirms that signatories acknowledge they have entered into the full spirit of the Treaty; an important aspect for the Tribunal who must determine Treaty principles rather than the meaning of its strict terms when reviewing claims. For instance with regard to land sales in Article Two The Waitangi Tribunal concluded that the purpose of this provision was not just to regulate settlement but to ensure that each tribe retained sufficient land for its own purposes and needs.

The Tribunal has been instrumental in settling several claim grievances for iwi. Recommendations made by the Waitangi Tribunal include legal recognition of Māori tribal sovereignty, land ownership, and rightful usage of natural resources (Zeppel 1998). Claims are wide ranging in scope and complexity and include lands, forests, fisheries, taonga such as pounamu (greenstone) and Māori artefacts. Tourism related claims have
also been made in the Rotorua region involving control of tourism in the valley and include Ngai Tahu’s Whale Watch venture in the South Island. Settlement may involve a range of solutions such as monetary redress, return of disputed resources and restructuring of trusts and leases. But the Tribunal’s jurisdiction is, effectively, largely recommendatory and it does not possess the institutional strength of the general courts to engage with executive government which can, and has, simply rejected its recommendations (Palmer 2008).

The establishment of the Treaty of Waitangi Act problematises the issue of Māori identity because the Act defined modern iwi as the legitimate descendants of Māori society in 1840. Walker (2004) argues this measure was the watershed between the nation’s past, founded on the back of British imperialism, and post colonial era. The diversity of Māori collectives in recent years raises tension in relation to Crown policies directed to the tribes as Treaty partners or to Māori as individual members that fails to recognise a Treaty status for non-traditional Māori collectives (Gover and Baird 2002). This ‘naming’ (and somewhat colonial) exercise by which the Crown unilaterally prescribed criteria around ‘who is iwi’ is problematic in a pluralistic and complex society wherein Māori collectives comprise a spectrum of iwi, hapu, urban groups, Māori service providers, tribal and non-tribal claimant groups, and pan-Māori organisations (Gover and Baird 2002: 39).

Today Māori groups crystalise around areas of commonality extending far beyond the traditional criteria of whakapapa and territory and continue to adapt and develop new expressions of collectivity, including tourism. We might therefore view these new forms more as ‘boutique autonomy’ matched to particular needs and aspirations of group members (Gover and Baird 2002). Thus, autonomy, which involves control and power becomes fractured and increasingly difficult to define on a ‘collective’ basis. Such a range of organisations do not represent all Māori on all issues. The proliferation of such non-traditional collectives is largely due to Crown policies of devolution in the period 1984 to 1990 whereby public sector reforms resulted in the establishment of private sector and community-based organisations to take over policy and service delivery
functions previously managed by government. Many Māori responded to these changes and saw opportunities for the development of ‘Māori solutions to Māori problems’ thus enhancing tino rangatiratanga at the local level (Durie 1998).

The flip side of this are opposing views by Pākehā and highlight the difficulty in developing collaborative processes between Māori and Pākehā. Laidlaw has noted, ‘The majority in New Zealand feel decidedly nervous about the notion of two societies within one nation. They want everyone to be the same’ (1999: 159). A highly politicized example of this was reiterated by the National Party leader Dr Don Brash in the famous “One Nation” speech at Orewa in 2004. This speech was made whilst on his political campaign for support in the coming general election later that year. The underlying theme of Brash’s speech to the Orewa Rotary Club was the apparent “threat” that the Treaty of Waitangi settlement process represented for the future of the country. Brash argued that the Treaty of Waitangi was an archaic relic of the past, and on that basis should possess no more than a symbolic role in New Zealand society, rejecting notions of the Crown’s “partnership” with iwi, hapu and urban Māori communities (Vinding y Sill Stidsen 2005). It is worthwhile including a section of Brash’s speech to demonstrate the tenuous and contentious nature of this “partnership”:

We intend to remove divisive race-based features from legislation. The “principles of the Treaty” – never clearly defined yet ever expanding – are the thin-end of a wedge leading to a racially divided state and we want no part of that. There can be no basis for special privileges for any race, no basis for government funding based on race, no basis for introducing Māori words in local authority elections, and no obligation for local governments to consult Māori in preference to other New Zealanders. We will remove the anachronism of the Māori seats in Parliament ... Having done all that, we really will be one people – as Hobson declared us to be in 1840

Source: Vinding y Sille Stidsen (2005: 229)

Walker (2004: 393) has described it as a speech that:

was a carefully crafted catalogue of generalities appealing to anti-Māori sentiment ... devoid of historical analysis or even facts, Brash’s speech was a sophisticated playing of the political ‘race card’ ... defined as racist because of his use of power as a political leader for ‘racially oppressive purposes’.
Colonisation of indigenous peoples has included the ruling power of definition, and such speeches reveal a ‘one law for all’ mentality that removes liberal democracy’s ability to account for difference (O’Sullivan 2007). Thus government establishes itself as protector of a ‘nationhood’ which Māori may join – but not on their own terms. O’Sullivan (2007) also notes this is contrary to Māori aspirations of self-determination whereby they are accepted as having their own independent sources rather than being shaped for the convenience of the political majority. This is also akin to assimilation and reinforces the unequal limitations of a bicultural society. This definitive date (1840) in the history of New Zealand suggests that Pākehā New Zealanders have had some difficulty tolerating a strong Māori cultural presence alongside Eurocentric values and beliefs (Durie 1998).

The relevance of the Treaty assumes a central position and underlies understandings between Māori and the Crown and the way in which pathways for Māori development (in all sectors) are negotiated (Durie et al. 2002). Article Two of the Treaty has been interpreted to mean, among other things, that the Crown has a responsibility for Māori economic development. It can be seen as guaranteeing ownership, control and management of Māori resources to create and accumulate wealth (Ingram 1997). Ryan (1997) argues that in the Māori view there is an important relationship between constitutional rights and the rites of tourism and culture, and hence for some, the development of tourism is not solely an economically motivated act but also one charged with political and cultural significance.

It is important to view the Treaty as twofold in its temporal significance. Although a ‘historical’ document of 169 years it is viewed by many Māori as a forward looking document. That is, Māori place great significance on its representation now as a determinant of Māori development and the future of Māori social, economic and political well-being. The principles of the Treaty of Waitangi are central to Māori participation in tourism and the current New Zealand tourism industry has recognised and accepted the principles of the Treaty as a catalyst for growth in tourism and the representation of
Māori. The principles of ‘partnership’, ‘participation’, and ‘protection’ are inherent in the Treaty’s premise and all three are critical to Māori tourism development. Tourism New Zealand’s Three Year Strategic Plan 2003-2006 and Statement of Intent for the period to 2008 incorporated the following with regard to the delivery of specific outputs facilitating Māori Tourism Development:

1. **Partnership** – developing Tourism New Zealand’s strategic partnerships with Tangata Whenua

2. **Protection** – protecting the integrity and authenticity of our environment, culture and heritage and the way in which this is presented

3. **Participation** – facilitating participation by Tangata Whenua in the development, promotion and implementation of strategies for tourism

Source: TNZ (2003: 8)

In relation to the Crown the NZMTC states in their 2008/2009 Statement of Intent that:

The Council’s operation is supportive of the Crown in meeting its reciprocal obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi to enable Māori to participate in the development of the tourism industry and to actively redress past wrongs by the Crown so that Māori can effectively participate in the economic development of New Zealand (2008: 3).

Therefore, tourism development, the Treaty and Māori have an integral relationship. The success for Māori to be an *integral* part of this relationship requires that Māori have *control* and *input* into development of their own product. This not only fosters strong relationships between Māori and Pākehā, but also ensures that cultural integrity is maintained. Ensuring the current New Zealand tourism strategies are heeded goes some way to affirming Māori rights under the Treaty of Waitangi (Keelan 1993). Thus, in a wider context the issue of ‘autonomy’ is illustrated as one that describes the independence of Māori groups who are primarily responsible to their members as
opposed to the Crown (Gover and Baird 2002). This also highlights the diversities and
different ways the complex issue of identity is managed within the realm of Māoridom.

1.7 Summary
Central to contemporary change for Māori is the fact that Māori expression is managed
through multiple channels and that traditional tribal structures have altered. For instance,
Urban Māori authorities (UMA) have emerged as a viable expression of identity for
many Māori and emphasise the complexity of the identity debate. But underlying these
complexities are fundamental principles such as tikanga and whakapapa that determine
the structures and processes in which Māori participate with the Crown and others.
Pertaining to the kin group Mahuika states ‘whakapapa is the heart’, it is the determinant
of all mana rights to land, to marae, to membership of a whānau, hapu, and, collectively
the iwi, whakapapa determines kinship roles and responsibilities to other kin, as well as
ones place and status within society’ (Sharp 2002: 20). This of course raises conflict with
‘urban iwi’ albeit from an alternative frame of identity construction, and who also
advocate their entitlement to proceeds of Treaty claims administered through iwi. Iwi-
centred development and enterprise is much more visible in contemporary New Zealand
and creates a need for not only iwi-based narratives rather than generalised narratives
‘about Māori’ but also to include other forms of Māori social organisation. The evolving
nature of Māori culture, identity, and affiliation is one that incorporates an “inclusivity”
of past, present and future and is by nature, multi-layered. This reaffirms the continuing
relevance of traditional indigenous mechanisms and values while allowing for their
adaptation and revision (Gover and Baird 2002).

It could be argued that the construction of the Māori Other was based upon ideas of
evolution and progress of the colonising hegemonic system that developed as a result of
colonisation in New Zealand. Western notions of Self-Other have reflected the power
structures inherent in such ideologies (Bruner 1991; Galani-Moutafi 2000; Ricoeur 1992;
Strang 2005), but have also served to enforce a dependence on Māori as a tourist
commodity within New Zealand’s wider economic environment. The image of the Māori Other was used to demonstrate a variety of socio-political processes of nation building from the late nineteenth century until the late twentieth and as such had both positive and negative effects on constructing Māori as Other. But Māori have also recognised and exploited their own image in ways that mirror colonial practice. We might ask should a tribe such as Te Arawa exploit the tourist potential of its mythologies? Are these mythologies an economic asset, a taonga, to be protected or both (Clydesdale 2007)? What are the implications of such practice – for colonised and colonisers? Does identity become as a matter of course situational and contextual? Cultural protection is deeply embedded within historical legacies, but culture itself is not static. There are risks in romanticising the culture of old and preservation of culture may inhibit cultural change.

The contemporary voice of Māori tourism is seeking difference and diversity within its representation, re-appropriating local resources for their own culturally specific ends. What continues to be critical to this representation is the link between land and identity and how Māori subjectivity is articulated in everyday life. Pawson has stated that the concept of ‘articulation’ can take a variety of forms (1999: 43); it can be expressed in words, it can describe the process of linking together, and it can denote the ways in which something is ‘projected’ into the wider world. One example of Māori expressing their (regional) subjectivity is by choosing to name themselves through the use of kin group affiliation, as opposed to the generic term Māori. This reflects pre-colonial structures whereby identities were tied to a specific group or groups that link people to their ancestry and to the territory of their ancestors. Therefore, landscapes are critical indicators of cultural identity.

Most initiatives in Māori tourism have been taken by individuals and hapu rather than by iwi, or Māori Trust Boards who are recognised by government as responsible for Treaty settlements (Ryan 1997). For Māori culture there are risks of ‘dilution’ of tribal structures and the traditional mores embedded within the culture. The relationship between tourism and Māori in New Zealand is a complex one. As discussed in this Chapter Māori culture has evolved through socio-political and ethical processes within
which Māori and non-Māori continue to negotiate based on a bicultural partnership formulated by the Treaty in 1840. Māori have adapted through pre-colonial, colonial, and now post colonial times which demonstrate their malleable instincts to cultural change. Māori culture carries with it significant economic advantages – especially in the realm of tourism whereby Māori symbols, myths, arts and crafts, and natural traits of hospitality and guiding can be capitalised on. In a contemporary context we need to examine the effects of Māori as cultural hybrids and as both tourist attractions and tourism managers in the twenty-first century and how such identities impact on the processes of cultural production for indigenous peoples. The following chapters intend to tease out these issues through the lens of postcolonial discourse.
CHAPTER TWO

Culture and Tourism: Issues and Implications

Introduction

Tourism engages trans-national mobility, migration and globalisation (Hall and Tucker 2004; Hollinshead 2004). As a consequence tourism shapes representation of cultures and identities. The view that people and things on the move are agents of cultural creation is juxtaposed with the view that culture is constituted in localised populations and communities (Clifford 1992; Friedman 2002). Cultural difference is accentuated by the notion of the world becoming smaller and has itself changed form from that of ‘national’ differences, as in familiar discussions of national character or identity, to issues of gender and identity politics, ethnic or religious movements, minority rights and indigenous peoples (Pieterse 2004: 41-42). Thus, terms such as ‘trans-local’, ‘trans-cultural’, and ‘trans-national’ focus on extensions beyond borders (Friedman 2002) and describe social realities that nation states are increasingly culturally mixed or plural. Representation of a nation state, or indeed, cultures within a national state as homogenous simply ignores the heterogeneities that exist and contests the understanding that growing global interconnectedness leads toward increasing cultural standardisation and concepts such as “McDonaldization”.

What can be argued from such discussion is that a process of cultural mixing or hybridization is occurring across locations and identities. Globalisation or the trend of growing worldwide interconnectedness has been accompanied by several clashing notions of cultural difference (Pieterse 2004). As a new paradigm the concept of hybridity embraces blending of cultures and multiple identities within a nation state and thus ‘opens up’ identity categories to increased diversity. It represents a politics of difference - involving different subjectivities and perspectives but that also include contradictions such as ambivalence and mimicry. Cultural diversity in this sense is not
related to multi cultures, but recognising the diversity within one culture that contributes to breaking down the boundaries (McLeod 2000). A postcolonial perspective enables tourism researchers to make visible the relative and partial nature of all “truths” (Hall and Tucker 2004: 15) and thus expose the ideological biases underlying hegemonic discourses such as colonialism. The result may reveal new forms of non-colonial relationships based around diversity and change, collaboration and inclusion.

This chapter discusses the issues and implications of representing culture as a tourism product. For indigenous peoples this highlights conflicts regarding commodifying culture, sustaining cultural integrity, control and management of tourism development within non-indigenous dominated environments and issues of identity, hybridity and authenticity. The re-assertion by many indigenous peoples to control and manage their cultural expression is also viewed in a postmodern context. Postmodernism rejects the concept of a single or absolute ‘truth’ and argues in favour of plural concepts of culture through which we can view the multiplicity of perspectives of heterogeneous groups (Smith 2003). I will also discuss representation and imagery within the context of Hall’s (1997) Circuit of Culture as a way of understanding how language and discourse operate as power structures within the production of culture. Discussion then focuses on the relationship between postcolonialism and tourism and the concept of hybridity as a means of disrupting power structures and re-negotiating concepts such as Other. These issues have wider implications in the management of indigenous tourism and how culture is represented and promoted as a tourism commodity, and how indigenous peoples (re)act to these challenges.

2.1 Culture and Tourism

The term culture shares the same root as the term cultivate (Bodley 2000). In its original meaning, it asserts the human acquisition of behaviour through learning and experience, thus culture is learned rather than biologically inherited. British anthropologist Edward Tyler described culture as that ‘complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art,
law, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society’ (Tyler 1871). The distinction drawn between biologically inherited and socially transmitted human traits is important in determining culture’s fluidity; it can be ‘unlearned’ and modified depending on context. For Tyler, the use of words and symbols by humans identifies one of the most important features of culture that shapes human action.

Culture has become a widely discussed subsection of tourism studies; researchers will tend to define culture based on their choice of research problems, their methods and interpretations, and their positions on public policy issues (Bodley 2000). My interpretation of culture for this research focuses on the decision-making of human actors (i.e. tourism operators, government and industry personnel, etc) that shape the nature and representation of cultural tourism and consequently the host/visitor experience. That is, emphasis is placed on the ‘narrative’ of culture as a determining feature of identity. I do not view culture as an abstract system, but as a dynamic, changing and evolving entity, constructed and interpreted by individuals. In this sense, there is no absolute cultural reality. Rather, culture consists of the narratives and symbolic dialogues that individuals construct – a view that emphasizes culture’s fluidity. As a socially transmitted and shared feature, culture changes, it has a history, and it can be used to manipulate and gain power over others.

The global importance of cultural heritage has been endorsed by the UNESCO through two key conventions, the World Heritage Convention and the UNESCO convention created in 2003 called the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. The latter has particular importance for indigenous peoples in its protection of heritage such as oral traditions and expressions, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and traditional craftsmanship as the following definition by UNESCO advocates:

---

20 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
The “intangible cultural heritage” means the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge, skills – as well as the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces associated therewith – that communities, groups and, in some cases, individuals recognise as part of their cultural heritage. This intangible cultural heritage, transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity.


Societies and communities have for tens of thousands of years concerned themselves with passing on their customs and knowledge to subsequent generations. Many of these stories have been passed on through oral literature – as is the case with Māori culture. In this respect we can view cultural study as a search for meaning from the perspective of the community one is studying, examining peoples symbolic as well as their material realities (Boas 1928, Perry 2003). Thus, culture is shared, learned, symbolic, and integrated.

Closely aligned with intangible heritage is the notion of identity. UNESCO’s goals aim to provide communities, groups and individuals with a feeling of identity and continuity; often linked with conservation education campaigns to develop a sense of ‘site identity’. As such, cultural landscapes represent a dichotomous relationship between culture and nature. The link with ancestral lands forms an important aspect of collective heritage identity and place identity for indigenous peoples (Pfister 2000; Shackley 2001; Timothy and Boyd 2003; Walker 1992); very often indigenous people are the ones with the most knowledge about places, artefacts and traditions. Likewise, their traditions in relation to nature are very often more sustainable than those proposed by outside experts (Timothy and Boyd 2003: 277). The retelling of a myth provides indigenous tourism guides with an opportunity to convey their sense of place by informing visitors of their historic, ancestral and spiritual ties with culturally specific areas (Carr 2008). Indigenous peoples have been differentiated as “insiders” within a landscape because of their historical ties with
particular areas, suggesting cultural values, physical locations and unique values and meanings for landscape may or may not be shared with “outsiders” (Carr 2004) such as tourists (Relph 1976; Hinch 1998; Muir 1999; Strang 1997).

One distortion of the culture concept is that of “traditional” indigenous culture being essentially stable (Perry 2003). If we accept the premise that culture evolves, changes, and is constructed over time, then we accept the notion that culture is dynamic. Yet the (often) static view of indigenous culture creates barriers that indigenous people must overcome when (re)presenting their culture as a tourist commodity. As noted, contemporary images of Māori are still under-utilised in promoting New Zealand tourism despite increasing demand from Māori that such images reflect their culture in the twenty-first century. Such representation has also been problematic for other indigenous communities engaging with resource-generating activities for economic benefit. An example of this is the North American native communities’ involvement in casinos, or negotiations by Canadian First Nations people regarding gas and oil production in areas such as Northwest Territories. Perry has stated such examples as representing ‘human choices that amount to dynamic readjustments of culture, not necessarily culture loss’ (2003: 197).

Cultural tourists are becoming increasingly interested in the culture, traditions and lifestyles of indigenous peoples, tribal and ethnic groups (Oakes 1993; Pitchford 1995; Smith 2003) reflecting what Hollinshead (1992: 44) refers to as a ‘centrifugal pull of interest away from centred cultures towards previously marginal peoples’. However, many tourists do not perceive themselves as ‘cultural tourists’ but are often ‘in search’ for a cultural experience. According to Schouten (2007) culture therefore can be viewed as a ‘practice’; it prescribes and gives reasons for human behaviour (Leung Kin Hang 2008). Robinson (1999) has concluded that tourists are increasingly searching for simpler times and places in such experiences in order to escape the complex and hectic lifestyle of urban environments with the motivation behind pursuing the ‘Other’ and in many cases actively searching for the ‘primitive’ as a way to develop an understanding of their own place in the world (Waitt 1999). Many tour operators are now capitalising on the
exoticism of indigenous, ethnic and tribal groups (Leung Kin Hang 2008; Smith 2003; Van den Berghe and Keys 1984; Yea 2002; Zeppel 1995; 1997; 1998; 2000) however, this “exoticism” reinforces a relationship between tourism and postcolonial theory in that many of these groups are colonised peoples (d’Hauteserre 2004, 2005). Tourism representations draw heavily on such exotic landscapes as perpetuated by the tourism industry. This often ignores the fact that such destinations are layered with indigenous cultural inscriptions and raises questions of perpetuating colonial practice.

The issue here is one of power – in the ability of ‘culture brokers’ (Adams 1984) to constitute people and places through control of the production of narratives about them. In the case of tourism the objective of narrative construction, especially promotional material, is to entice tourists to the destination, while the effect is to condition their perceptions and understandings of visited ethnic groups (Yea 2002: 177). The issue of ‘who’ represents is critical in safeguarding factors such as intangible heritage. The desire for authenticity and the implications this has for the presentation of certain social realities for the tourist gaze also has significant cultural and political consequences (Hall 1994: 182). The desire to see other peoples and places, to gaze upon new and interesting landscapes, seek out “otherness” in out of the way or exotic destinations, does ‘for the vast majority of people make the destination attractive for consumption by establishing its distinctiveness’ (Cave 2005; Hall 2001). The tourism industry chooses to represent the Other as part of this discourse and as such makes the Other more accessible to tourists.

Image plays an important role in this process, increasingly signposting markers that direct the tourist gaze. Dann (1996: 79) has commented that ‘tourism is a collection of projected images which establishes the boundaries of experience … tourism defines images – what is ‘authentic’, ‘real’, ‘exciting’, or ‘beautiful’, what should be experienced and with whom one should interact’. Within these boundaries indigenous people are often treated as ‘signs’ or what MacCannell (1976) terms ‘cultural markers’. Tourists identify with such markers and seek these out when motivated to visit a destination. According to Dann (1996) the projected images of a destination and its people, while
couched in the language and imagery of social control, remain to be confirmed or invalidated by experience. In her study of Iban culture and longhouse tourism in Sarawak, Zeppel (1997) comments that although tour operators arrange and structure longhouse tour programs to meet tourist expectations of experiencing “real” Iban culture, the reality is, however, that tourists will also see Iban people in western clothing, using outboard motors, chainsaws, and other modern consumer items. Such physical evidence of modernity jars with the expectation of some “authenticity-seeking” tourists (1997: 123). However, for many tourists, these physical markers become secondary to meeting and interacting with Iban people through which personal meanings are conveyed between host/guest that act as more ‘real’ identity markers and produce ‘authentic’ tourism experiences.

Thus the connection between meaning, language, culture and representation has important implications for tourism promotion. There is a practical need for the tourism industry, policy-makers and host communities to understand such meanings in terms of marketing, management and quality. The tourism industry is a key instigator of such induced images – images that emanate from the destination and are a function of the marketing efforts of destination promoters. This involves the interplay between the producers (e.g. Tourism New Zealand), the consumers (tourists), and the consumed (Māori) and how shared meanings are construed. The role of narrative in this construction is shaped by, and itself shapes wider social and cultural forces. Examining the importance of tourism imagery in relation to how destinations and their peoples have been portrayed packaged and presented by the cultural brokers of tourism are crucial to an understanding of how tourism discourses have contributed to the production of the Other - and how the Other re-constructs such discourses. The call from indigenous people to regulate and re-present their own image within current tourism marketing (Albers and James 1983; Blythe 1988, 1994; Brown 1996; Butler and Hinch 1996; Cohen 1993; Mead 2003; MTTF 1987; Sturma 1999; Van Meijl 2004; Zeppel 2001) stems from a desire to change perceptions of ways of seeing the Other and to re-create socially shared values that signify meaning in a cross-cultural context (Berno 1996). By challenging existing power structures within the tourism industry indigenous peoples re-
define cultural concepts through the re-construction of images. Thus, the imaging process is not linear or one way.

In many areas cultures are facing two forces of change: globalisation, which pushes towards uniformity, and tourism, which encourages commodification but still seeks uniqueness (Prideaux and Timothy 2008:7). Globalisation has brought to the fore debate about the advantages and disadvantages of tourism for local indigenous cultures (Robertson 1992; Schouten 2007). On a positive side tourism has aided the revival of cultural traditions and thus strengthened indigenous identity (Cohen 1988; de Kadt 1979; Jafari 1992; Jamison 1999; Picard 1993, 1996; Ryan 1991, 2000; Smith 1996; Smith 2003; Te Awekotuku 1981; Viken 2006). It has also benefited communities economically and is often seen as a more environmentally and culturally sensitive form of tourism (Notzke 1999, 2004; Smith 2001; Sofield and Birtles 1996; Timothy and Boyd 2003; Zeppel 1998). On the negative side it can be obtrusive and divisive in small-knit communities. Increased tourism can result in the erosion of the social fabric, acculturation, commodification of culture and destruction of natural habitats (Carter and Beeton 2008; Ryan and Aicken 2005; Smith 2003). It also emphasises the danger of staging for the tourist gaze (Hyndman 2000; Schouten 2007; Urry 1990). Urry (1990) has argued that the tourist gaze ‘cannot be left to chance’ and that ‘people have to learn how, when and where to gaze’.

The above discussion on the relationship between culture and tourism highlight the complexities and implications for indigenous peoples as they increasingly interact with the forces of globalisation, consumerism, and the commodification of culture for political and economic ends. Culture as a ‘strategy’ therefore can be manipulated as a positioning tool. For instance, assertions of cultural distinctiveness may be made in what appears to be the disempowering processes of globalisation, as much as the exploitation of the possibilities for new cultural forms that globalisation offers us (Meethan 2003). As Clifford remarks:
...when every cultural agent (especially global capitalism) is mixing and matching forms, we need to be able to recognise strategic claims for localism or authenticity as possible sites of resistance and empowerment rather than of simple nativism (1997: 183)

In supporting the notion of hybrid cultures Nederveen-Pieterse (1995) argues that although cultures can no longer be thought of as exclusively territorial in their scope, locality is not diminished in its importance for despite all the forms of travel and mobility, attachment to place still has salience in people’s lives. To focus on hybridity is to focus on the dialectical relationship between the local and the global. Thus, there are intrinsic and instrumental uses of culture (Griffin 2000). The intrinsic quality refers to forms of knowledge or ways of life that people regard as exemplifying their place in the world. The instrumental or strategic on the other hand, are ways that culture is used as a means to achieve economic, social and political purposes. Thus, discussion will now focus on the specific implications for indigenous tourism development and the cultural impacts for indigenous peoples.

2.2 Indigenous Tourism
The past decade has been characterised by dramatic growth in both the demand for indigenous tourism experiences and the supply of these experiences (Butler and Hinch 2007; Douglas et al. 2001; Hall 1994; Hinch 1996, 2004; Hollinshead 1992, 1996; 2007; Johnston 2006; Mercer 2005; Muloin, Zeppel and Higginbottom 2001; Notzke 1999, 2004; Ryan 2000, 2002; Ryan and Higgins 2006; Ryan and Huyton 2000, 2002; Ruane 2006; Smith 2003; Smith 1996; Sofield and Birtles 1996; Timothy and Boyd 2003; Waitt 1999; Yea 2002; Zeppel 1998, 1998b, 2000). Tourism literature refers to indigenous cultural tourism as an overarching term for both ethnic and tribal tourism, and any form of tourism that involves contact with indigenous peoples or their culture (Fagence 2000; Moscardo and Pearce 1999; Smith 2003; Zeppel 2001). Butler and Hinch (2007: 9) have provided a comprehensive framework for defining indigenous tourism as ‘tourism activity in which indigenous people are directly involved either through control and/or by
having their culture serve as the essence of the attraction’. As such, issues of control and culture are important in reflecting differing degrees of indigenous involvement or influence on development and their different roles in its process (McIntosh et al. 2004). However, visited host communities are often far from the homogenous cultural groups that tourists and the tourism industry take them to be (Hollinshead 1992, 1996). Thus, it is difficult to capture a single definition given the diversity of the varied and changing contexts in which indigenous people are found. The nature of such tourism usually involves visiting native or indigenous people in their ‘natural environment’ (Smith 2003) and the pursuit of an ‘authentic’ host/guest experience. However, contested cultural issues arise when indigenous people are passive or unwilling participants in this activity as they and their communities are presented as significant attractions in the tourism landscape by external stakeholders (Hinch 2004).

Effects of the tourist ‘gaze’ (Urry 1990) is oft remarked upon when discussing indigenous peoples and tourism. One example of the ‘ethnographic gaze’ in tourism is represented by Valene Smith’s (1996) concept the ‘four Hs’ of indigenous tourism development. This concept incorporates four interrelated elements: habitat (geographic setting), heritage (ethnographic traditions), history (effects of acculturation) and handicrafts and describes the indigenous tourism phenomenon as a ‘culture-bounded visitor experience which … is a micro-study of man-land relationships’ (1996: 287). Smith states ‘each tourist site will differ according to the varied role and interrelationship of the four elements in that one community, although habitat usually is the underlying platform’. According to Smith, these four ‘diagnostic tools’ are useful when analysing the strengths and weaknesses of indigenous communities ‘if and when’ tourism development is introduced. But I argue they are problematic in their inherent tendency to compartmentalise culture and thus work against the notion of hybridity. Although Māori tourism product incorporates these four Hs I do not advocate Smith’s concept as suitable to a Māori kaupapa approach to tourism development. Māori take a holistic view of these elements – encapsulated in intangible values such as manaakitanga21, kaitiakitanga, tino

21 hospitality
rangatiratanga, and nga matatini\textsuperscript{22} Māori. They are an extension of cultural identity and revolve around the central value of whakapapa in which to define Māori tourism. Thus, they are non-hierarchical and integrated rather than segmented.

With regard to the issue of who manages indigenous cultural tourism product Ryan (2005) has developed a framework for the network of indigenous tourism indicating four main players. These include indigenous peoples themselves; the tourism industry; the government (representing the wider public sector of both local and national government) and tourists. In this 4-way relationship indigenous peoples offer their culture to the market place and in return tourists offer money. The product is distributed by a tourism industry, which in many cases of cultural tourism is sponsored by governmental actions through, for example, National Tourism Organisations (NTOs) (Ryan 2005: 71). Within this process product development is affected by policy-making decisions taken within a wider framework of social and economic development shaped through discourses of privatisation, deregulation, restructuring, and economic growth (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002; Bargh 2007; Maaka and Fleras 2005; Pieterse 2004). Government’s role accepts responsibility of the market’s performance and seeks to promote policies that generate economic and social well being. Previously marginalised groups (such as Māori) become recognised and legitimised stakeholders in a process of distribution of public funds, and thus have an input into the formulation of policies (Ryan 2005).

In developed nations tourism has been promoted as a key component of economic diversification with the integration of more public-private alliances in international marketing and national tourism administrations (Easton 2003; New Zealand Institute of Economic Research 2003 (NZIER); Ryan 1991; Silver 1993; TNZ 2001, 2003, 2006). For example, New Zealand’s “Tourism Growth Strategy” implemented in the early 1990s was aimed at making international tourism New Zealand’s growth leader into the twenty-first century (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002). Western based socio-economic values have dominated these processes and the cultural agenda is often shaped by dominant First World capitalist principles (Britton 1991; Dirlik 1992; Robinson 1999; Walker 1982).

\textsuperscript{22} diversity
Paradoxically, indigenous peoples are compelled to work for changes through those frameworks that have historically served to advance colonial rather than indigenous interests (Niezen 2003) and which now present sites of collaboration and resistance.

One point made by Ryan’s analysis is the resulting formation of public images and views regarding indigenous people. The creation of images – particularly those developed through arts encouragement policies can provide mutual benefits for both sponsor and sponsored citing an example of Telstra (Australia’s major telecommunications company) as the principal sponsor of Bangarra Dance Company, a contemporary Aboriginal theatre group. Links to the creative life of Australia is promoted through Telstra’s technological and internet support and promotes positive images of each other. However, this success relies on the representation of key players in nodal positions. Stakeholders in Māori tourism have recognised this as critical in building Māori capacity within the industry (MTTF 1987; The Stafford Group (TSG) 2001) but do Māori yet occupy those key nodes wherein they begin to own the messages and direct the information and other flows?

The very term “indigenous peoples” implies something about their situation with regard to the wider context. Once autonomous societies many indigenous people have been incorporated into state systems, reducing their autonomy. Culture plays a crucial role in creating a ‘common identity’ amongst these groups, contributing to the creation of a cohesive force that unites rather than displaces such groups. This has been a major factor in the control of resources for Māori for example, especially in the many land claims made by iwi to the Crown. Cultural identity for indigenous people is also often twofold – representing not just attachment to traditional life-ways but as a strategy than empowers and promotes self-determination. Self-determination has been seen as a key for sustainable indigenous tourism and includes prerequisites such as: “land ownership, community control of tourism, government support for tourism development, restricted access to indigenous homelands and reclaiming natural or cultural resources utilised for tourism” (Zeppel 1998b: 73). The global expansion of tourism into remote natural areas and indigenous lands has seen increasing concern for sustainable tourism development, particularly with indigenous groups (McIntosh 1999; Mowforth and Munt 1998; Nepal
However some writers argue that tourism creates a publicly constructed view of aboriginality that is inferior to non-aboriginal culture (Waitt 1999) and that tourism is a consumerist lifestyle that accelerates cultural loss, poverty and environmental degradation. Indigenous peoples are particularly susceptible to these impacts to the extent that they are seldom privileged as power-holders in emerging tourism economies (Johnston 2000: 89-90). Walsh (1996) states indigenous cultures cannot significantly challenge the system they are seeking to profit from, although they may strive to develop products in a sustainable way, whilst Butler and Hinch (2007: 5) reiterate that tourism should be planned and managed so that ‘indigenous people dictate the nature of the experience and negotiate their involvement in tourism from a position of strength’. Teo and Chang (1998: 124) have stated ‘traditional cultures and societies do not dissolve in the face of tourism’. Postmodern analysis is useful in demonstrating the myriad of ways in which local people have responded to, and sometimes resisted tourism development, rather than assuming that they are victims of an unstoppable industry. Postmodernism as a ‘condition’ conceptualises culture less in terms of homogeneity and more in terms of diversity, hybridization and local discourses (Smith 2003).

The questions of who owns the local culture, who takes it and develops it for the local people themselves and who develops it for the touristic consumption of others, are thus increasingly being challenged (Gerberich 2005; Mbaiwa 2005). This also highlights differences within cultural value systems – such as the motivation for economic versus social and cultural gains. The motivation to promote ‘culture’ per se as a tourism product may lie in more intangible aspects such as the opportunity to restore pride and ownership to a subordinate group. However, this creates a paradox because by offering employment and income by capitalising upon and giving value to cultural arts and crafts previously thought unimportant, it then threatens to gain ownership of those designs and of the ways of thought of which they are an expression (Ryan 2005: 70). Thus, issues of intellectual property become contentious.
Whittaker’s (1999) study of Australian Aboriginal tourism highlights the challenges for indigenous people in reclaiming knowledge, culture and intellectual property rights. His findings showed that historicized images of Aboriginal people perpetuated an exploitative and racist narrative within tourism literature thus, tourism knowledge about indigenous people is generated within a Western (developed) culture with a history of colonialism (Loomba 1998; Palmer 1994; Said 1978, 1989; Spencer 2006; Tuhiwai Smith 2003; Whittaker 1999). The knowledge which is offered about them is different from the knowledge they would offer about themselves (Goldberg 1993; Kolig 2002; Lischke and McNab 2005; Tribe 2004). The process of decolonisation for indigenous peoples involves deconstructing the validity of such (mis)representations and grand narratives and inserting alternative knowledge (Bishop 2005; Hingangaroa Smith 2000; Johnston 2000; Meyer 2006; Stoll and von Hahn 2004; von Lewinski 2004; Tuhiwai Smith 2003). This alternative knowledge emanates from new discourses in which culture is not represented as a reified essence but, instead, as a political process of contestation among groups of individual members over the power to define social situations (Wright 1998: 10). Thus, a dynamic relationship between individual and community exists which is characterised by unboundedness (Van Meijl and Meidema 2004) and by association hybridity. Local, national and global networks converge to create a cultural identity that is no longer historically specific but ‘open-ended’ to change and adaptation.

The profile of tourists seeking indigenous cultural experiences is rapidly changing. With regard to Māori cultural performances in New Zealand it has been stated that “no more do tourists want to ‘see the haka’, they ‘want to do it’ (TNZ Tourism News 2003: 19). Indeed, the ka mate haka as a symbolic ‘icon’ of New Zealand culture is well known internationally via its attachment to the national rugby team The All Blacks. The symbolic performance of the ‘war-dance’ before confronting the ‘opposition’ is well recognised and often spontaneously performed at other national and international sporting events as a symbol of identity that reinforces being a ‘New Zealander’. Thus the haka crosses cultural boundaries in the context of New Zealand nationalism. However, the haka has recently been awarded the intellectual property of iwi Ngati Toa who claim
‘ownership’ under a multi-million dollar claim to the Crown\textsuperscript{23}. The deal was meant to "protect the haka from inappropriate use," said Ngati Toa chief negotiator Matiu Rei. New Zealand’s Prime Minister John Key said the agreement was about “cultural redress...not about a financial issue or an attempt to restrict New Zealanders” (Winkler 2009). Hard on the heels of this decision has been a conflict of interest with the Royal Shakespeare Company in the UK who has ‘misused’ the haka in a casual use of the sacred ritual. A spokesman for Ngati Toa in the UK stated:

"Everybody from our culture would resent that because it's just not appropriate. When we see our haka performed in a way that's disrespectful it hurts us as a people...It's passed down to us by our ancestors so we need to see it done properly and with the right respect, otherwise you're attacking us. They're presenting somebody else's culture in an inappropriate context. They should have gone to see the owners of this haka and talked to them about what they wanted to do.

Source. Dugan (2009) \url{www.nzherald.co.nz}

This comment highlights the contentious issue of ‘cultural ownership’ in a global context when such practice crosses cultural boundaries. But culture is of course transportable and subject to processes of trans-culturalism and mobility, just as the representative for Ngati Toa has ‘migrated’ in a sense to another cultural context. This reinforces points made in the opening of this Chapter regarding the realities of cultural mixing (or hybridization) occurring across locations and identities and the ‘clashing notions of cultural difference’ (Pieterse 2004).

In 1992 the Ministry of Tourism recognised that the choice between culturally non-sustainable and sustainable tourism lay in a more substantial expression of Māori culture such as the interpretive experiences of marae etiquette. Such sustainable development, it stated, needed the endorsement and participation of the Māori community:

\textsuperscript{23} The tribe has fought to protect the sacred ritual from inappropriate use, pursuing its claim through years of discussions with the government. New Zealand courts ruled that the originator of the haka was the chief of the Ngati Toa tribe, Te Rauparaha, as it was written to celebrate his escape from death in a battle in the 1820s (\url{http://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/news/article.cfm?c_id=1&objectid=10558095}).
The choice between concert party performances, and a more substantial expression of Māori culture, through, for example, interpretation experiences of marae etiquette and of myths and legends, traditional arts and crafts, use of natural resources for medicinal purposes, and methods of food preparation, may well be the choice between culturally non-sustainable and sustainable tourism (Ministry of Tourism 1992).

As will be highlighted in case study discussion, Māori tourism operators are increasingly incorporating such cultural aspects in order to diversify product and integrate traditional Māori values and beliefs in ways that promote the lived experience of modern Māori. They remain however, subject to tensions within Māoridom as to appropriate use not only by non-Māori but also Māori. Kin-accountability is one such issue that has been raised as a prerequisite if such practice is to ‘legitimately benefit Māori society’ (Tapsell and Woods 2008).

Differing world-views between indigenous and non-indigenous peoples can impact on progressing tourism development for indigenous peoples. Objectives of the NZTS (2010) support more definite moves towards consultative, joint or co-operative management. At a national level, tourism policy has had limited success as a strategy to operationalise the principle of self-determination of indigenous peoples in tourism (Hinch 2004) and has often been applied on an ad hoc basis. Economic versus cultural motives have tended to encourage the further commodification of indigenous cultures for tourism, thus inhibiting sustainability and supports Robinson’s (1999: 385) view that tourism policies emanate from the dominant social paradigm, reflecting ‘first world values of materialism, consumerism, and scientific rationalism’. The necessary power-shift from such ideology is paramount to indigenous control and representation of their own touristic image. The NZMTC has advocated the need for national and regional Māori tourism organisations to work on collaborative projects with industry organisations to reinforce New Zealand national and regional differentiation (NZMTC meeting Dec 2005) and they continue to lobby Government and the industry for Māori tourism leaders to provide strategic advice on how to improve the quality of Māori tourism businesses in order to improve Māori tourism’s contribution to the NZ tourism sector. Industry-based partnerships are a critical
step for indigenous people to determine the nature of their development in tourism and essential for destination operators if they are to function effectively within the broader tourism system.

The impacts of representing culture as a tourism ‘product’ are complex and non-uniform; cultures will respond to and react differently to tourism development. The tradable items of a culture: cultural expressions, are however tangible and subject to conflict over who represents. The production of meaning in this relationship is crucial for the empowerment of indigenous peoples over the expression of their culture in the tourism-culture nexus. Hence, discussion now turns to the issue of representation as an intrinsic feature of tourism promotion and imagery.

2.3 Representation and the Tourism Image

The ‘struggle over the relations of representation’ though it is not yet over, echoes strongly the legacy of empire in its ‘us’ and ‘them’ colonial relations. A politics of representation is altogether a more complex, more interesting and more open challenge for the future.

(Ali 1991: 211)

Representation – the production of meaning, language, discourse and image occupies a central place in current studies on culture, and is thus inextricably linked to the study of cultural tourism. Hall states, ‘representation is the process by which members of a culture use language (broadly defined as any system which deploys signs, any signifying system) to produce meaning’ (1997: 61). Thus, representation can be viewed as a source for the production of social knowledge involving processes of selection, translation, arrangement and interpretation (Gidley 1994). We can therefore say that ‘society’ constructs meaning, as opposed to objects or events in the world themselves having any fixed or true meaning.

---

24 For a more comprehensive discussion see Carter and Beeton (2008) on Managing Cultural Change and Tourism: A Review and Perspective. In particular their discussion of resistance and resilience of culture to change: a rationale for empowerment illustrates that host communities often adapt and can be responsive to perturbations without irreparably destroying its integrity.
Because cultures differ, meanings will always differ. This has important implications to how images of indigenous cultures have been represented by national tourism organisations.

Issues of representation and commoditisation create fundamental problems for indigenous peoples involved in tourism and raise critical questions of meaning, truth, knowledge and power within these relationships. In Hall’s (1997) view the circulation of meaning can never be separated from power. Hall’s ‘Circuit of Culture’ offers a more fluid and holistic view of the practices involved in the production of culture. In this model “representation” is one position in a matrix alongside processes of identity, production, consumption and regulation (Spencer 2006). In order to understand how these concepts interact and intersect to create different ‘realities’ it is useful to refer to Hall’s model (Figure 2.1) to deconstruct images and text and to read the ‘meanings’ behind their representation and importantly, re-construct meanings from different perspectives. Hall’s concept recognises that language, meaning and representation do not exist as isolated concepts but are inexorably intertwined in a continuous circle whereby language utilises representations to construct meanings (Morgan and Pritchard 1999). Central to this is the place of culture in defining personal identity (Spencer 2006).

![Figure 2.1 The Circuit of Culture (Hall 1997)]
For Hall meaning relies on representation through language. Language therefore provides one general model of how culture and representation work and has been divided into two approaches – the semiotic and the discursive. The discursive approach of language is concerned with the effects and consequences of representation – it’s ‘politics’. This concerns not only how meaning is produced but how knowledge and discourse connect with power, constructs identities and defines the way certain things are represented, thought about, practised and studied (Hall 1997: 6). Since the ‘cultural turn’ in the human and social sciences, meaning is thought to be produced – constructed – rather than simply ‘found’ (Aitchison 2006). Thus, culture is conceptualised as a ‘constituted’ process (Hall 1997). Representation is a process of constructing reality – a process that is clearly different across cultures and historical periods (Beale 2007). As part of this circuit tourism imagery reflects and reinforces the circuit of knowledge and power through its attempt to fix the meaning of images and language.

The role of images in tourists’ destination selection process has received greater attention in the field of tourism research (Albers and James 1983; Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Boorstin 1964; Cohen 1993; Dann 1988, 1996; Echtner and Ritchie 2003; Feighey 2003; Morgan and Pritchard 1999; Selwyn 1996; Sturma 1999; Urry 1990; Wang 2000; Whittaker 2000). According to Morgan and Pritchard (1999) although a growing body of work has been undertaken in tourism studies on the role of image formation, there is an unequal focus between economic and sociological/historical perspectives. The images and representations created by the ‘brokers of tourism’ reveal much about the dynamics of relationships between peoples, cultures and places (Baloglu and McCleary 1999; Echtner and Ritchie 1991, 2003; Walmesley and Young 1998). Thus, they work to construct particular identities. Tourism marketers use imagery to create identities that represent certain ways of seeing reality, images that both reflect and reinforce particular

---

25 In tourism studies, the ‘turn to culture’ coincided with the turn of the new century where subsequent developments have been evident in the publication of a range of research embracing new theoretical perspectives, methodological approaches and research techniques influenced by the developing poststructural literature in social science. Cultural critiques have changed from simplistic dualistic and linear approaches to ‘circuits of culture’, cultural webs, networks, and the inbetweenness of space (Aitchison 2006: 419).
relationships in societies. These relations are grounded in relations of power, dominance and the subordination that characterise the global system (Morgan and Pritchard 1999). Morgan and Pritchard note that:

> For too long, tourism imagery has remained divorced from discussions of power…the cultural power of tourism and the discourse of tourism imagery demands more attention, revealing as it does, micro and macro relations of power (1999: 342).

Understanding the interplay of the power relationships upon which the origin of images is based, and the roles which such representations create for the represented is crucial to analysis of such tourism processes and the implications for indigenous tourism. Rutledge (1994) states that, ‘society has increasingly been turned into images and spectacles with its reliance on visual persuasion and visual manipulation to assert its power’, whilst Wang (2000) comments that ‘tourist images … are the embodiment of consumer power’. Image packaging is one of the cultural conditions of capitalism and is reliant on changing trends, behaviour, motivations and attitudes of contemporary consumers. Destinations become part of this commodity-driven culture as NTOs spend millions of dollars to create or re-create their identities (Baudrillard 1998; Hall 2000; Milne, Grekin and Woodley 2001; Pritchard and Morgan 2000; Relph 1976; Ringer 2001). As places vie for advantageous images in attracting both capital and tourists under the condition of accelerating globalisation (Wang 2000) indigenous peoples are often part of these created images and hence, contribute to how such places and peoples are portrayed and perceived globally.

According to Whittaker (2000) the world’s indigenous people have provided a limitless reservoir for traffic in images. There are numerous examples of indigenous images being used to promote destinations, including: Māori images in New Zealand (Ryan 1997, Taylor 1998), Sami images in Norway, Sweden and Finland (Muller and Petterson 2001, Tuulentie 2006; Viken 2006), Aboriginal images in Australia (Spencer 2006; Whittaker 2000; Zeppel 1998b), and Inuit and Dene images in Northern Canada (Notzke 1999, 2006). The appropriation of indigenous images by the tourism industry has not always
been one of mutual benefit (MTTF 1987). Permission has often not been sought to use these images and advice by indigenous peoples on the most appropriate way to incorporate this type of information into promotions has resulted in misrepresentation of their culture. As a result indigenous peoples have become increasingly resentful of this practice (Waitt 1999).

Tourism imagery therefore cannot be viewed as value-neutral; it is a process that both socialises visitors and residents alike to a political impression of themselves *vis-à-vis* what they are seeing or remembering (Richter 1995). The power behind constructing cultural ‘difference’ creates meanings in the commonly held perceptions amongst groups of people about ‘others’ – i.e. the creation of stereotypes. Stereotyping in regard to the representation of the other has been discussed elsewhere in the tourism literature (see Cohen 1993; Dann 1996; Mellinger 1994; Pitcher *et al.* 1999; Scheyvens 2002; Taylor 1998; Wall 1997) and it is important to recognise that tourism is but one ‘site of representation’ in which difference is portrayed (Morgan and Pritchard 1999).

According to Hall (1997) stereotyping as a signifying practice is central to the representation of racial difference. In colonial discourse a central characteristic of stereotyping is the setting up of the symbolic frontier between the ‘normal’ and the ‘deviant’, ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, and between ‘us and them’ (Cave 2005; Childs and Williams 1997; Mills 2004). Representations reinforce cultural stereotypes and are affected by temporal and spatial aspects that can change over time. Contesting stereotypes means increasing the diversity of the images in tourism media and opens up new possibilities of identity construction. By taking apart the image (i.e. de-construct the image) politicises the image; more positive images can be created but are still subject to different meanings, since subject (and therefore meaning) can never be fixed. By deconstructing Māori tourism promotional material we can examine what changes are apparent in current national tourism discourse and if these changes represent sites of resistance to entrenched colonial discourse. Cultural conflicts and the commercialisation of culture thus become critical factors in negotiating these processes.
2.4 Cultural Conflict

Cultural conflicts in tourism are invariably related to conflicts between systems and structures, as well as individuals. Contested culture results from the convergence of multiple relations, such as between governmental institutions and civil society; tour operators, tourists, and local populations; and more directly between visitors and visited (Butler and Hinch 2007; Smith 1996; Smith 2003; Smith and Brent 2001; Sofield and Birtles 1996). Cultural tourism is now considered as a distinct market segment in the tourism industry. Robinson (1999: 4) states ‘the rapid diffusion of cultural tourism emphasizes the process of dissemblance between tourism and culture, and is marked by the way culture is now primarily being promoted for economic, rather than cultural ends’. This has potential to create conflict when culture becomes a site of contested meaning within this process (Ali 1991; Clarke 2000; Greenwood 1977; Hollinshead 1992, 1996; Medina 2003; Robinson et al. 2000; Ryan and Aicken 2005).

Tourism has often been criticised for exploiting indigenous cultures and denying the contemporary aspect of indigeneity. Greenwood’s (1977) early study of commoditisation of culture through tourism concluded that commoditised cultural products lost their intrinsic meaning and significance for local people. Cohen (1988) has described commodification as a process whereby ways of life, traditions and the complex symbolism which supports these, are imaged and transformed into saleable products. As a result the deeper meanings of culture – in particular intangible elements become lost to the superficial (Greenwood 1977; MacCannell 1992). Counter-examples can be found whereby local people are proud to present their art or cultural traditions for money to an external audience. Te Awekotuku’s study of tourism in Rotorua revealed that ‘paradoxically, tourism itself may be a conserving phenomenon, and to an extent, Aotearoa and Te Arawa may illustrate this’ (1981: 205). Most of the artisans in Rotorua she spoke with supported the view that were it not for the tourist interest, the traditional skills of garment manufacture and even house carving may well have lapsed and been discontinued stating:
Overall, tourism has had a minimally negative influence on the integrity of the traditional arts and crafts of Rotorua. The value of the crafts is held ‘within’ the object – thus, ‘the true arts and crafts’ – the traditional forms – are still solely Māori in execution, and control (1981: 235-36).

Similarly, Cohen (2004: 113) has stated that:

Commoditisation does not necessarily destroy the meaning of cultural products, neither for the locals nor for the tourists…tourist-oriented products frequently acquire new meanings for the locals, as they become a diacritical mark of their ethnic or cultural identity, a vehicle of self-representation.

In fact, this has often resulted in a form of cultural hybridity as local people adapt external cultural aspects with their own. On the whole, tourism is hoped and regarded to be a mechanism for cultures’ preservation and strengthening (Timothy and Boyd 2003; Viken 2006; Zeppel 2001). But rhetoric and reality may not always coincide between hosts and those major agencies (governments, planners, commercial operators) that possess the ability to make decisions about tourism and to shape its direction. Questions raised about the commercialisation of culture need to examine what features of culture are used to promote destinations and regions. How is input from national, regional and local bodies cohesively constructed? Examining discourse between Māori and non-Māori stakeholders in this process is critical in ascertaining what level ‘commodification’ of Māori culture is acceptable, managed or controlled by Māori. Examination needs to also extend beyond the immediate and the local to take in the socio-cultural context within which the tourist encounter is framed and what impact the tourist gaze and globalised culture has on local identity and the perception of self.

It is therefore important to define characteristics of the cultural experience in order to critique how these are commodified in acceptable ways according to indigenous value systems. According to McKercher and du Cros (2002), all successful cultural tourism attractions share common features:
1. Tell a story
2. Make the asset come alive
3. Make the experience participatory
4. Make the experience relevant to the tourist
5. Focus on quality and authenticity

Thus, in order to be consumed by the tourist cultural assets are modified, commodified, and standardised. When this involves intangible heritage (e.g. indigenous knowledge of myths and traditions) issues of cultural integrity and ownership of cultural/intellectual property can become problematic (AMTF 1994; Mead 2003; Pihama and Smith 1997; Whittaker 1999). As previously noted Māori claim not only ethical but also constitutional ownership over their culture both tangible and intangible; thus conflict arises between cultures within destinations when such cultural assets are appropriated by the broader tourism industry (Carbonell 2004; Corsane 2005; Gore nd; Hinch 2004). Or indeed, appropriated by similar industries such as the recent example I discussed regarding the use of the haka by the Royal Shakespeare Company. Clarke (2000) has advocated that the ownership of culture should not be something which is transferred out of the local, despite global pressures to do so. Problems often stem from the formulating agencies of tourism that are not providing what is needed to make the touristic encounter a success and without conflict. This rests with pre-information, imagery and representation of culture and how this is disseminated to potential visitors. In New Zealand these have often been promoted by non-Māori operators, an approach which is increasingly being challenged by Māori (AMTF 1994; Barnett 1997; Keelan 1993; MTTF 1987; NZMTC 2006; Ryan 1999, 2000).

Control of these processes is the over-riding safeguard for most indigenous peoples and include taking responsibility for making decisions on the authenticity of their culture, the balance that they would like to have between traditional and contemporary representations of their culture, and ultimately whether they would like to commodify their culture (Hinch 2004). And importantly, how the term ‘commodify’ is defined by the culture in question. Prideaux and Timothy (2008: 11) comment that:
The neo-colonialist view that tourism is a destructive influence has been challenged but ultimately it is the owners of the culture and heritage who must decide how to present their culture and how much this presentation is representative of their core cultural values.

In regard to Māori, Clydesdale (2007: 63) has stated it is often not just a question of ‘yes we should’ or ‘no we shouldn’t’, but ‘how can we develop it in a way that is respectful to ancestors and culture?’ Tourism is an industry with great potential to provide improved welfare for indigenous peoples and cultural conflicts are complex and varied, crossing several relationship boundaries along the way. We cannot ignore that some negative effects such as exploitation of local resources, loss of local control and commodification and bastardisation of culture are wrought by tourism development (Viken 2006). Disregard, on the part of tourism policy-makers for Māori concerns have been evident (McIntosh et al. 2002). A study by McIntosh et al. revealed a tendency to commercialise Māori identity as so-called attraction-based identity at major tourist attractions in New Zealand such as Te Papa Museum and Tamaki Tours Rotorua (see McIntosh et al. 2002). Carr (2008) has also commented that tourism managers need to consider whether, despite tourism providing an opportunity for economic development, by commodifying culture are Māori unwittingly placing yet another layer of western ‘economic’ values on their land? But the merging of these values is increasingly becoming blurred as people like Māori engage with global capitalism. Sustainability requires that social, economic, and environmental issues be balanced within a management framework that accepts cultural adaptation is inevitable but controllable. The argument ‘against’ commodification may be over-riden by an emphasis on autonomous forms of development that work inclusively within a collective entity.

The process of globalisation is driven by the search for difference. Within this process cultural identity becomes a means through which difference is portrayed. Although the dangers of homogenisation and commodification exist, the trend is to promote tourism itself as a trans-cultural product. Tourism has the potential to transform, articulate, contest and communicate hosts’ evolving cultural identity (Lacy and Douglass 2002).
Processes of cultural exchange and re-invention occur within local cultures and as such operate as forces of cultural change and fluidity. It is therefore to issues of ‘difference’, ‘authenticity’ and ‘hybridity’ that I turn in order to discuss the complex nature of (re)presenting culture within a tourism context.

2.5 The Authenticity Debate

The authenticity debate in tourism has centred on whether tourists consume ‘authentic’ representations of other peoples’ societies and lives or whether they are duped by ‘inauthentic’, ‘pseudo’ events and products manufactured for the undiscriminating tourist masses (Morgan and Pritchard 1999: 8). The early concept of Boorstin’s (1964) ‘pseudo events’ was an attack on tourism’s propensity to create inauthentic places and attractions for a gullible public – and portrayed tourists as ‘alienated’ souls. For Boorstin, contemporary tourism was a series of contrived experiences in which tourists were lured by constructed and false images/representations. This illusory world was generated and sustained by the tourist industry and media. For Turner and Ash (1975: 292) this resulted in ‘a small monotonous world that everywhere shows us our own image...the pursuit of the exotic and diverse ends in uniformity’. MacCannell (1973; 1976) disagreed with this view, advocating that contemporary tourists sought out authentic experiences in other times and places; in a sense they were modern-day pilgrims. The lives of ‘others’ were constantly probed for a more ‘real’ experience than was offered by the tourism industry who thwarted the tourist by creating ‘front-stage’, ‘back-stage’ spaces. According to MacCannell these “false backs” became “insidious” and “dangerous”, drawing tourists into more deviously contrived “back regions” (1976: 102-103). Building on this notion, Graburn (1976) extended the tourist’s experience to one of a ‘sacred journey’, encompassing the home environment of the tourist who passes through the sacred (in the Centre of the Other) and re-enters the home situation anew, reflective of a rite of passage (Allcock 1988).
Such ideas prompted a range of criticisms and conflicting views from various authors (see Allcock 1988, Cohen 1979; Schudson 1979) and contemporary discussion has moved away from these philosophical concepts towards the notion of authenticity as a socially constructed concept: its social connotation is, therefore, not given, but “negotiable” (Cohen 2004). This also shifts the balance of power as to who “defines” the authenticity of a cultural experience (Taylor 2001). Taylor notes those who “make up” that culture can articulate counter-narratives that challenge pre-defined notions of authenticity and wrest “truth” from the hands of its creators (2001:14). According to Cohen (2004: 113) these may be regarded by locals as forming a continuity of cultural diversity, a ‘diacritical mark of their ethnic or cultural identity, a vehicle of self-representation before an external public’.

Cohen (2004) also argues tourists conceive authenticity in different degrees of strictness and most rank-and-file tourists will be content with much wider, less strict criteria of authenticity: that is a ‘recreated’ version might suffice. Interaction between the host/guest in the tourism experience is assimilated in such a way that tourists become “active players” in the production of their own “meaningful environment” and their own experiences of authenticity (McIntosh and Prentice 1999: 609). In her study of Iban culture Zeppel (1995) found that tourists achieved a genuine tourist encounter with Iban culture linked with social and environmental experiences and the personal meaning of a longhouse tour whereas in her study of tourists’ expectations and perceptions of Māori culture McIntosh (2004) found that tourists generally found authenticity related more to the setting of the encounter. For example, visiting a Māori community or marae, or through more personal interaction in a ‘less commercial’ encounter than existing product offerings may currently provide. Similarly, Ryan and Higgins (2006) suggest that the authenticity demanded by tourists is more to do with the sense of staging induced by the environment in which the activity take place, rather than the nature of the performer or the performance itself. However many tourists still compare their experiences with their expectations, expectations that are fuelled by tourism promotion and imagery and which McIntosh and Ryan (2007) caution that although tourists want authenticity, most require some degree of ‘negotiated’ experience.
The difficulty lies in blending what is deemed ‘traditional’ and thus, ‘authentic’, with contemporary and ‘changed’ culture. Anecdotal evidence reveals that some visitors (e.g. Germans) want to see ‘authentic’ Māori culture, which means images of ‘traditional’ culture (Wilson et al. 2006). For them, the ‘grass skirts’ and traditional ‘moko’ are signifiers of an ‘authentic’ Māori cultural performance. Authenticity is thus a projection of tourists’ own beliefs, expectations, preferences, stereotyped images, and consciousness onto toured objects, particularly onto toured others (Bruner 1991; Silver 1993). This implies a level of authenticity that is of a fixed version of the culture rather than the authentic feel for the living cultures of the places visited. These findings blend with Wang’s (2000) classification of authenticity into three different types – objective, constructive and existential. These types range from reference to the ‘original’ and linked to the museum usage of the term, to that which is socially constructed and thus relative and negotiable, to personal or inter-subjective feelings that are activated by the liminal process of tourist behaviours (Wang 2000). This latter classification has been emphasised by tourism literature as a human attribute signifying being one’s true self or being true to one’s essential nature (Steiner and Reisinger 2006: 299) and can be understood as having an “authentically good time” (Brown 1996) through activity related experiences.

The idea of an authentic culture is one that has been present in many debates about postcolonial cultural production (Ashcroft et al. 2000; Chaney 2002; Hughes 1995; Moore-Gilbert 1997; Silver 1993; Tuhiwai Smith 2003) and one that is inherently linked to the construction of cultural identity. In particular, arguments about ‘inauthentic’ culture often become entangled in an essentialist cultural position in which fixed practices become iconized as authentically indigenous and others are excluded as hybridised or contaminated (Ashcroft et al. 2000). This works against the idea that cultures change temporally and spatially. Taylor (2001) also links authenticity with the concept of Time stating that “Before the “discovery” of New Zealand, Māori culture is seen to have existed in a vacuum, as a holistically defined and static form of social organisation” (2001: 9). But authenticity is multidimensional, including elements of time,
space and theoretical approach in one dimension and the objective, constructive and personal in the other dimension (Prideaux and Timothy 2008: 7). The plurality and unstableness of the term enables researchers to use such analytical concepts to facilitate tourism discourse. Hence, my interrogation of the term “authenticity” draws out the tensions of its colonial origins and its current usage by Māori as a form of postcolonial critique.

The term authenticity I argue has been entrenched in our language by colonialism. Colonial discourse often referred to indigenous peoples as ‘authentic’ connoting ‘untouched’ civilisation, whilst simultaneously altering such meaning by colonial practices of assimilation or integration. In its ‘duty’ to reproduce itself in colonial society and ‘advance’ civilisation colonial discourse constructs the colonising subject as much as the colonised (Ashcroft et al. 2000). The power of this discourse is such that individual colonising subjects are not often consciously aware of the duplicity of their position. Concepts such as hybridity, ambivalence and mimicry (Bhabha 1994) have revealed the inherent vulnerability of colonial discourse and as such create third spaces in which to challenge colonial discourse. I would argue that a Māori perspective of cultural authenticity is based on a notion of the particular. By this I refer to the particular identity as Tangata Whenua. Māori have adopted this term for their own discursive practices and thus interrogate the duality of colonised and coloniser by its use. From a postcolonial perspective it calls into question established categories of culture and identity and imposes new ways of thinking. The tribal nature of Māori culture offers a more unproblematic view of how the term authenticity may be used by promoting that tribal identities are a particular resource for product development encased within an inclusive and shared identity as Tangata Whenua. The delivery of particular stories as attached to tribal and personal identity also serves to give meaning to the interactive experience whilst simultaneously blurring the boundary between who is on display and who is consuming the event (Taylor 2001: 24).

Authenticity becomes integrated with identity construction as both host and visitor share a mutually beneficial relationship when these cultural traits are shared. An example here
draws on one interview with a Māori Regional Tourism Operator. This North Island MRTO has developed its own mark of ‘authenticity’. They comment the success of such a mark of authenticity is ‘dependent on input from Tangata Whenua, as it is their story that is being told’ (NZMTC Wananga Report 2006: 54). This initiative is a first for MRTOs and has been designed in partnership with the local iwi and recognised as being ‘one way that local iwi can retain some control over their culture as it is presented to both visitors and locals’. There is also a strong emphasis on commercial benefits, with the ‘ability to charge a higher price per customer’ derived from criteria demanding a particular standard of quality on tourism products. Thus, culture and commerce are treated as mutually inclusive, countering the often binary view of culture and ‘making money’ as detrimental to indigenous cultures. Many Māori tourism operators access tribal resources that can further develop these economical outcomes. Herein lays a paradox in that Māori have also used the term ‘authenticity’ and promoted similar images of themselves in much the same way as the colonisers. However, this enters the debate on appropriation whereby the ‘colonised’ take aspects of the imperial culture (e.g. language) to articulate their own social and cultural identities. Thus, language and text become critical factors in the process of decolonisation and resistance.

Crick (1988) has suggested that the very nature of the inauthentic or authentic debate is spurious and inappropriate since we live in a world whose cultures are by no means static. Cultures are instead being continually re-invented and are subject to changes stimulated by both internal and external forces. Tourism literature has tried to definitively define authentic tourist experiences; this has proved to be a relatively futile activity, as the definition of authentic is determined by the tourists and indeed the community, tourism industry, and other stakeholders, and is embedded in their own (re)constructions – all essentially and probably different (Jennings and Nickerson 2006). Hence, the term authentic will remain problematic and contested. The debate surrounding “authenticity” is likely to continue for some time, as tourism researchers and others impose a myriad of incompatible ideologies on the term. Its continual use in everyday discourse not least that of tourism, is likely to sustain its presence albeit in various guises. As Belhassen and Caton (2006: 853) candidly point out, ‘scholars cannot
simply abandon a term/concept that continues to play such a significant role in as it functions in reality’.

2.6 Postcolonialism and Tourism

The very idea of postcolonial spaces is layered with, and evocative of, empires past, present and future, complicated stories and identities, intimate and alienated relationships, shifting borders and contested terrains, ambivalent, partial and contradictory meanings

(Tuhiwai Smith 2006: 549)

The idea of postcolonialism is located within a highly contested political and theoretical terrain (Rizvi, Lingard and Lavia 2006) and is by no means a unified set of ideas. The relationship between tourism and postcolonialism has increasingly influenced discussions in tourism studies over the past few years (d’Hauteserre 2004, 2005; Duval 2004; Hall and Tucker 2004; Hinch 2004; Hollinshead 2004; Simmons 2004) as researchers increasingly engage in concerns over identity and representation, and the social and political implications for the tourism experience. Key texts in the postcolonial field (e.g. Ashcroft et al. 2002; Loomba 1998; Young 1995) have failed to acknowledge the potential contribution that tourism studies can make to understanding the postcolonial experience (Edensor 1998) despite the centrality of tourism to the processes of transnational mobilities and migrations, and globalisation (Hall and Tucker 2004) tourism studies has tended to be on the ‘fringe’ of postcolonial discourse. However, its relevance for tourism studies is the emphasis on being critical of the colonial situation and the postcolonial condition especially when many colonised countries and peoples have been transformed and promoted into tourist sites/sights. Tourism has the ability to shape constructions of colonised landscape and peoples through powerful promotion and marketing strategies (Morgan and Pritchard 1999) that commodify culture such as indigenous and colonial lifestyles, heritage and histories, artefacts and arts and crafts. This highlights tourism’s capacity to perpetuate the discursive and textual production of Said’s Orientalism and draws our attention to the ways in which discourse and power are
inextricably linked to postcolonial theory. Thus, tourism both reinforces and is embedded in postcolonial relationships (Hall and Tucker 2004).

I therefore engage with postcolonial theory as a means to ‘disengage’ with the notion of Māori as Other, and ‘re-engage’ discourse through concepts such as hybridity that reconstitute the Māori Other. In this respect I aim to place “Other-ness” in a positive realm of inclusivity that subverts dualisms such as colonised/colonised in favour of non-hierarchical entities. To achieve this I use Bhabha’s (1994) notion of hybridity as one that engages with and negotiates cultural identity as involving ‘the continual interface and exchange of cultural performances that in turn produce a mutual and mutable recognition of cultural difference’. For Bhabha identity is always ‘hybrid’, produced performatively in various contexts and whereby a complex, ongoing negotiation occurs that emerge in moments of historical transformation (1994: 23). Tranformation then, is a key to recognising the fluidity of culture and how for instance, Māori tourism operators re-present their culture in dynamic and diverse ways. The emphasis on tranformation is important in a global context as new forms of sovereignty that do not rely on fixed boundaries emerge and are ‘managed through ‘hybrid identities’, flexible hierarchies, and plural exchanges’ (Rizvi et al. 2006: 251). I do not view hybridity as the panacea for disrupting colonial discourse per se, nor as the ‘antidote’ to cultural essentialism but hope to present new perspectives on how tourism practice might act as a medium for offering postcolonial counter-narratives of resistance to those colonial relationships (such as Māori and Pākehā) that in various forms, still exist.

Postcolonial theory is built in large part around the concept of Otherness (Ackermann 1998; Ahmed 2002; Cave 2005; Chambers and Curti 1996; Duncan 1993; Fabian 1983; Gandhi 1998; Lester 1998; Little 1999; Lye 1998; O’Barr 1994; Prasad 1997; Prasad and Prasad 2002) and deals with the effects of colonisation on cultures and societies (Ashcroft and Ahluwalia 2001). Lester (1998) comments that our construction of identity and creation of the conceptual Other have been influenced by the development of relations between coloniser and colonised, described by cultural representations. It is concerned with the responses of the colonised: the struggle to control self-representation,
the struggle over representations of place, history, race and ethnicity (Ashcroft and Ahluwahia 2001). Echtner and Prasad (2003) have commented representations of Third World indigenous peoples remain disturbingly tied to a set of nostalgic colonial images – reified through tourism’s propensity in forming the Other as a stereotyped subject. Images of the Other are seen as reiterative, reflecting and reinforcing historically embedded colonial myths; tourism representations adopt the myths and also serve as another vehicle that continues to perpetuate them (Griffiths 1994; Hennig 2002; Monraham 1995; O’Connor 1993; Palmer 1994; Pritchard and Morgan 2003, 2005; Selwyn 1996). Indeed, neo-colonial relationships whereby independent countries continue to suffer intervention and control from a foreign state highlight the ongoing political, economic and cultural influence of the former imperial powers in postcolonial states (Hall and Tucker 2004). The core-periphery relationship between developed and non-developed countries is often the focus of much postcolonial theorising indicating once again the link between tourism studies and postcolonial studies.

Selwyn (1996: 29) proposes that three settings, or contexts, may be identified in which tourist myths are constructed. These relate to centres and peripheries, the cultural milieu in which contemporary tourism operates, and the search for the authentic. The paradox inherent in these comments is that the colonised also use images and representations that were generated by the colonisers. However, such mimicry has also been described by Ashcroft et al. (1995, 2002) as a postcolonial strategy of ‘writing back’ and as such, a form of resistance. Hall and Tucker (2004: 187) note that ‘ambivalence arises in this postcolonial theorising, however, when it is the postcolonial agent’s pre-colonial heritage being used to mark the end of colonisation’. This is caused when pre-colonial images and representations that were generated by the colonisers are used by the colonised. It is thus important to recognise the perpetuation of this practice by both indigenous and non indigenous. Hence, we need to explore how representation perpetuates negative stereotypes of non-European people and cultures and how such stereotypes affect the identity of those stereotyped. It may be that colonised identities become enriched and dynamic (as well as oppressive) through the cross-fertilisation of cultures, thus forming a hybrid identity.
As tourism researchers we need to recognise when cultural identities which appear to mimic colonial representations should be read as empowering forms of ‘cultural hybridity’ or when they should be read as the result of violent acts of colonial discourse which can be ‘incrementally and savagely crippling’ (Hollinshead 2004). Postcolonial critique therefore should also be viewed as the analysis or unpicking of, as well as the contestation of, the legacies of colonialism and colonial domination (Hall and Tucker 2004). The hegemonic structures of language and representation as discussed in this and the previous Chapter shows how tourism imagery creates particular ‘truths’ and ‘realities’ for both tourism practice and destinations. The presence of such ‘colonial discourse’ is still prominent throughout the postcolonial world and issues of ‘who represents’ become more complex when perpetuated by the ‘colonised’. This necessitates that we examine the internal motivations and implications for such practice and what impacts these have on constructing postcolonial cultural identities.

In academic discourse the term postcolonialism has become a somewhat contested word (Childs and Williams 1997; Dirlik 1994, McClintock 1992; McLeod 2000; Williams and Christman 1994; Young 1995) particularly in its inference of ‘time after’ colonialism. Ashcroft and Ahluwalia (2002) refer to the ‘post’ in the term postcolonial as ‘after colonisation began’ rather than ‘after colonialism ended’, because the cultural struggles between imperial and dominated societies continue into the present. Hall (1997) views the ‘post’ signifier as both epistemic and temporal, arguing that to attempt to dissociate the two would be to reject the relationship between power and knowledge (Bell 2004). For Hall the critique of colonialism crucially involves understanding their interaction. However, the ‘post’ in postcolonialism can be a useful irritant – one that reminds us there is persistence and need for an ongoing political engagement with its results (Jackson and Jacobs 1996: 3). It also stakes its claim in terms of the fact that some other, related but as yet “emergent” new configurations of power-knowledge relations are beginning to exert their distinctive and specific effects (Hall 1996: 254).
Stuart Hall (1997) claims postcolonialism offers a “difference” – a shift in the “them” and “us” that is relative to tourism representation and identity. Consequently, my application of postcolonialism re-articulates this dichotomy to advance the contribution that tourism studies can make in understanding the postcolonial experience whilst addressing the ‘relative paucity of research on the interface between postcolonialism and tourism’ (Hollinshead 2004: 30). For tourism, the term postcolonialism denotes a range of critical perspectives on the diverse histories of indigenous peoples and the impact of colonial practices. It critically engages with colonial legacies in the present and adds to the discourse of its future development for both coloniser and colonised. The use of postcolonial theory in many disciplines attests to its discursive relevance, one that shifts and changes with the changing relations between coloniser and colonised. It is precisely this fluidity and multiplicity that offers tourism researchers a tool to engage with and disrupt existing discourses within cultural tourism. As Hall states, ‘it obliges us to re-read the binaries as forms of transculturation, of cultural-translation, destined to trouble the here/there cultural binaries forever’ (1997: 247). In Tuhiwai Smith’s view, postcolonial research opens up those kinds of possibilities ‘for scrutiny, for knowledge creation, for inspiration and for debate’ (2007: 552).

The emergent nature of culture and identity as a topic in tourism and postcolonialism opens debate to acknowledge and celebrate cultural hybridity rather than lamenting the loss of some *a priori* notion of cultural tradition (Coles et al. 2004; Tucker 2003). For me, as a Māori researcher these complexities and paradoxes are twofold. They relate to my own upbringing in a Pākehā oriented environment however, my ‘identity’ as a Māori has always been clearly felt. It may be argued that I too contribute to creating binary oppositions between Māori and Pākehā by perpetuating this identity. However, the meanings underlying such practice are complex and I recognise that identity is constantly in the process of change and transformation (Cohen 1995; Pritchard and Morgan 2003; Rojek and Urry 1997; Urry 2002; Van Meijl and Miedeme 2004). Thus, I expect my identity to change in the course of this research process, influenced by internal and external factors that I will encounter along the way. Thus, discussion now turns to
themes of hybridity and difference as relative to an analysis of cultural change and the contemporary processes of cultural production.

2.7 Hybridity and Difference

Identity patterns are becoming more complex, as people assert local loyalties but want to share in global values and lifestyles. Hybridization then, is a perspective that is meaningful as a counterweight to introverted notions of culture such as indigenous cultures as homogenous (Lipschutz 1992; Pieterse 2004).

Hybridity describes the inevitable process of cultural translation which, according to Spencer (2006: 242) is inevitable in a world where communities, peoples, cultures, tribes, are no longer homogenous self-sufficient autochthonous entities tightly bound within by kinship and tradition. The term is an important concept in postcolonial theory as hybrid accounts of cultural identities are often considered politically progressive, ‘opening up’ identity categories to increased diversity and change as a result of ‘straddling two cultures, an in-betweeness and the consequent ability to negotiate the difference’ (Hoogvelt 1997: 158). Lye (1998) refers to it as the integration of cultural signs and practices from the colonising and the colonised cultures and is thus a useful concept for helping break down the sense that colonised cultures are monolithic, or have essential, unchanging features. Hybridity offers a strategy to negotiate the affinity and differences that exist in postcolonial settler societies such as Aotearoa New Zealand and to explore multiple subject positions that rethink our assumptions about culture and identity. This also links with Pieterse’s (2004) notion of hybridity as layered in history, including pre-colonial, colonial, and postcolonial layers, each with distinct sets of hybridity. There are not only multiple layers of hybridity, but a variety of hybridities that vary not only over time but also in different cultures (2004: 4-5). Thus, hybridity ranges across both the past and present and is not seen as ‘fixed’ by a particular historical period (McLeod 2000).
The concept of hybridity and its associated realm of the *third space* has been extensively theorised by Homi Bhabha and continues to be useful amongst post colonial critics because it provides a subtler and more nuanced view of colonial subjectivity and colonial relationships than the usual ‘us’ and ‘them’ distinctions (Ashcroft et al. 2002: 206). My research draws on Bhabha’s notion of hybridity as an influential theory that creates a new *third space* in which Māori tourism operators re-negotiate their image, identities and cultural difference. This third space is a mode of articulation, a way of describing a productive, and not merely reflective, space that engenders new possibility (Meredith 1998). As concluded in Chapter One ‘articulation’ can take a variety of forms. Therefore its relevance to Māori tourism representation lies in examining the complex cross-section of subjectivities that ‘links together’ various local, regional and national entities of New Zealand tourism. Tourism provides a means through which cultural ‘differences’ can be used to promote autonomous expression for Māori. Therefore I am interested in how Māori identity encompasses a wider set of subject positions influenced by global relations and the desire of Māori tourism operators to reflect diversity to a global audience. Thus, the term is embraced not as a threat to identity, but as a route to representing ‘all identities’ (Gidley 1994).

In contemporary New Zealand many ‘differences’ intrinsic to the bicultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā society lie in the representation of Māori culture manifest through the likes of tourism imagery. Such ‘differences’ have not necessarily constrained Māori to the extent that self-determination and autonomy have become strong political, economic and social agendas especially within the tourism environment. This desire to re-present does not come from breaking with the past, but relies on the past to inform the present and the future. If we consider hybridization as “the ways in which forms become separated from existing practices and recombine with new forms in new practices” (Rowe and Schelling 1991: 231) then we can also apply this principle to structural forms of social organisation (Pieterse 2004) such as tourism. As a consequence relations of power and hegemony are inscribed within hybridity. When re-negotiating cultural identity it is therefore important to note the ways in which hegemony is not merely reproduced but refigured in the process of hybridization (Pieterse 2004: 74). Bhabha’s (1994) notion of
a *third space* offers Māori a position from which to disrupt and displace hegemonic colonial narratives of cultural structures and practices that have often (mis)represented and essentialised them (Bell 2004; Meredith 1998).

Hollinshead (1998) points out that in tourism, ethnic populations are frequently far from being as distinct and singular as the brochure designers and travel promoters would have it. This is true of past representation of Māori culture and as a result tribal diversity of Māori culture has often gone subsumed by the essentialising processes of tourism promotion. This does not ignore the fact that Māori have also been complicit in this Othering process but a pluralised culture allows for a multiplicity of styles, knowledges and stories. A reclaimed but hybrid identity is created by the coloniseds’ attempts to constitute and represent identity. This counters such arguments that hybridised identities are sometimes said to have lost authenticity, and thus authority and belonging to an indigenous community (d’Hauteserre 2005). Counter-narratives can be assumed in the way some Māori operators use heritage to tell their side of the colonial story. Braid (1995) has termed such events as ‘interaction narratives’ and sees such narratives as an opportunity for the performer to creatively construct and communicate their own images of identity. Thus, previously edited versions of history become subject to (re)interpretation and part of the narrative encounter between host and guest.

This also introduces the notion of Bhabha’s ‘performative hybridity’ whereby culture ‘as practice’ is demonstrated. Bhabha’s focus is on the act of representation itself; this space, opened up by the enunciative act, the performance of identity, he terms the space of hybridity, or the Third Space (Bell 2004). In its ‘construction’ this performance is contradictory and ambivalent. In the discursive act presented by the ‘actors’ of this ‘colonial’ encounter meanings and symbols of culture have no fixity. The ‘signs’ of culture can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricised and read anew (Bhabha 1994: 37). This third space displaces the histories that constitute it, and sets up new structures of authority; other possible histories and voices; in each performance identity is performed and changes in its performance, thus it is fluid. Subjects move between past representations of identity and performance in the present (Bell 2004). Because iteration
of identity is a translation, a hybridising act, this moment offers the possibility of developing something new:

These in-between spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood – singular or communal – that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself (Bhabha 1994: 1-2).

It is here where hybridity encapsulates the strategies of negotiation and points of tension that are involved by such ‘cross-cutting’ identities (Pieterse 2001). It also seeks to validate hybridised identities as reflective of the lived experience of minority groups and the tensions they face (Bell 2004: 73). This is part of what Hollinshead (1992) has termed a discourse of ‘counter-identification’ (challenge) and ‘disidentification’ (overthrowal of dominant thinking) where individuals can take on board the stigmatised individualities that they have been assigned by the dominant social group and re-establish their own image. This reverses negative terms/stereotypes in a positive and (re)imagined context creating a location from which articulations of cultural difference emerge.

In his discussion of postcolonial Māori/Pākehā relations Meredith (1998) has coined the term ‘cultural lubricants’; both differences and affinities between cultures he says ‘make an important contribution’ to New Zealand identity. I would agree with this statement with particular reference to promoting tourism products. With regard to cultural and heritage tourism experiences history is (re)told from a Māori perspective; stories are told from both individual and communal experiences; stories are told from Māori and Pākehā experiences. This provides the ability to translate, negotiate and mediate affinities and differences in a dynamic of exchange and inclusion (Meredith 1998) and emphasises a postmodern approach in that local people have agency and they can modify or negotiate their position (Dann and Potter 1994; During 1995; Scheyvens 2002). Hokowhitu (2002) comments that at the very least postmodernism should be acknowledged as a useful tool for deconstructing narratives about the Other and reconstructing the colonial condition. In respect to issues of identity and representation for indigenous people it provides a pluralistic framework within which to conceive the difference of others.
The important issue for this thesis is the concept of hybridity being counter to that of biculturalism and thus ‘boundaries’. The idea of two parallel and equal cultures has more recently been under the microscope of ‘revision’ (as will be discussed further in the following chapter) as a resulting separation and ‘turning inwards’ on the part of both Māori and Pākehā (Spoonley 1995) that works against the establishment of identities and cultural practices that make connections between them (Bell 2004). The mixing that hybridity represents cannot fit within the bicultural frame; it problematises boundaries and therefore helps break down binaries. These binaries will not necessarily disappear, but the politics of hybridity carves out new spaces of power. Cultural diversity is one such space in which essentialism and homogenisation are contested and the recognition of multiple identities widens the debate for more critical engagement of identity politics.

2.8 Summary

Destinations are dynamic centres of cultural interaction. Culture has become a saleable commodity in tourism; and tourism has become its own culture – shaping the world, how it looks, how it functions, and what it means. Much has changed in the way that social scientists have viewed culture in the past three decades (Hollinshead 1998) and a substantial literature on heritage and cultural issues has emerged, paralleling the growth in recognition of the place that heritage and culture now hold in the tourism industry (Prideaux and Timothy 2008: 3). The ensuing complex mosaic of cultural expressions provides the tourism industry with an array of experiences on which to capitalise and create economic growth and benefits for its stakeholders. Indeed, in the recent Draft New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2015 TNZ recognises the relationship Tangata Whenua has with the industry and vice versa:

Tourism has provided Māori with important opportunities to nurture, celebrate and present their culture – traditional and contemporary – to the world. In turn, the Māori culture continues to add unique value to tourism in New Zealand.
The role that Māori play within this strategy is as a ‘strong point of difference’ and interest to international visitors. This creates potential to portray regional Māori culture in contrast to the single nationally portrayed ‘culture’ where stereotyped images have dominated.

This chapter has discussed literature surrounding culture and indigenous tourism development and issues of representation, commodification, authenticity, power and discourse in relation to constructing the Other and has demonstrated how such concepts intersect with the globalising forces of tourism. The importance of postcolonial theory as a productive critique of how we think about and do tourism is gaining popularity in the academic literature of tourism (Hall and Tucker 2004) indebted to theorists such as Edward Said and Homi Bhabha. Academics such as Keith Hollinshead and Stuart Hall have drawn on these works to present alternative views of tourism epistemologies and colonial hierarchies that have dominated cultural discourse in not only tourism studies, but the broader arena of social sciences. What is clear in any discussion about representation is that the concept embodies a range of meanings and usages. If we take Hall’s view in a cultural tourism context meanings are produced by human beings, participants in a culture, who have the power to make things mean or signify something (Vukcevich 2002). This works within a ‘circuit of culture’ where representation becomes the process or channel or medium through which these meanings are both created and reified. If representation is approached with an eye toward the relationships and processes through which representations are produced, valued, and exchanged, we are able to re-work the notion of representation as something larger than any one single representation (or identity) such as the Other. Hall (1994) has advocated for a stronger assertion of self-identity in order to eliminate stereotypes and combat misrepresentation. Such a process involves identifying the myths that permeate and maintain colonisation as the first step in its deconstruction.

The notion of Bhabha’s hybridity opens up new forms and ways of thinking about culture, identity and representation. For Bhabha ‘culture’ is best viewed as an imaginative process rather than a palpable entity; in a globalised world it no longer needs
a definitive geographical or pervasive socio-historical context. It is a creative mix of ideas and practices, dynamically produced, reproduced and transformed (Hollinshead 1998). Thus, the existence of ambivalent or emergent ‘third spaces’ allow the postcolonial Other to create new identities that inventively hybridise perceived notions of culture. Cultural hybridity can be seen as a discourse which resists and re-negotiates Western notions of tradition and value in colonial contexts and where new ambivalent and indeterminate locations of culture are generated. However, as Bhabha points out these new identities are themselves problematic forms of signification which resist discursive closure (Bhabha 1994).

It is worthwhile to draw further on Bhabha’s comments to conclude this chapter. Bhabha warns of the risks of producing ‘a jargon of the minorities’ when discussing ‘the politics of identity, the politics of difference, ethnic particularism, cultural pluralism, multiculturalism’ (1994: 269). The move away from singularities of classifications as primary conceptual and organisational categories has resulted in a useful awareness of the multiple subject position that ‘inhabit any claim to identity in the postmodern world’ (1994: 269). Bhabha therefore advocates that thinking beyond initial categories and focusing on those interstitial moments or processes that are produced in the articulation of “differences” provide (third) spaces for elaborating strategies of selfhood and communal representations that generate new signs of cultural difference and innovative sites of collaboration and contestation. Those productive Third Space articulations of cultural difference permit the people of those Third Spaces to elude the politics of polarity and emerge (i.e. to begin to re-envisage themselves) as the others of their selves (Hollinshead 1998: 144).

Māori thus negotiate their ‘nationhood’, their ‘community interest’, their ‘cultural values’ through the sum of the “parts” of difference. Both collective and individual identities emerge from such domains of difference. These are driven by discourses that dually refuse the binary politics of polarity, or the necessity of homogeneity through interrogation of the conditions under which knowledge, images, and discourses are socially authorised. By re-conceptualising culture as a category of translation (Bhabha
1994: 271) “difference” is not so much a pre-given and static trait of “fixed” tradition as it is a complex ongoing negotiation against the powers of iteration, its forms of displacement and relocation.
CHAPTER THREE

From Constraints to Choices: A Postcolonial Critique

Introduction

The Treaty of Waitangi created a partnership that requires the Crown to actively protect the interests of Māori and to respect a degree of autonomy, therefore the complexity of this relationship requires the Crown to engage with problems of identity (Gover and Baird 2002: 40). In the context of Māori/Crown relations, this has resulted in the ‘colonial power treating the native as one’ (Panaho and Steblein nd.) and thus failing to recognise the multiplicity of Māori culture. It is therefore relevant to examine how discursive frameworks operate within larger-scale belief systems that have contributed to the construction of the Other. Postcolonial theory is a useful perspective that draws attention to the power structures constructed and maintained via forms of discourse (Hollinshead 1999); this also includes the diverse histories of colonial practices, and, importantly their legacies in the present (Nash 2002).

Since the 1980s there has emerged a strong critique of the prevailing system of representation of Māori in tourism-related discourses (Ingram 1997; KCSM 2004; MTTF 1987; McIntosh et al. 2002; Taylor 1998; Walsh 1996; Wall 1997). This chapter discusses constraints that have contributed to inequities for Māori economic development (Fleras 1999, Maaka and Fleras 2005; Tuffin, Pratt and Frewin 2004) but promotes new choices for Māori. This acknowledges the Crown in its role as Treaty partner is fostering new ways of consulting, negotiating, and decision-making that explicitly acknowledges the centrality of Māori to society (Fleras and Spoonley 1999) and thus tourism development. I will draw on a selected number of government and national tourism reports within New Zealand with the aim of critiquing the existence of colonial tendencies within current discourse. I will then discuss new initiatives and collaborative examples occurring within national and regional tourism structures whereby increased
Māori involvement represents a postcolonial critique of such tendencies. This discussion will be supported by interview data with key industry personnel who contribute to the strategic development of regional and national Māori tourism. Discussion seeks to highlight the multiplicity of the Māori voice at these levels as also contributing to *third spaces* of Māori tourism. Discourse from this stakeholder group adds yet another ‘layer’ of hybridity to temporal and spatial systems of cultural change and exchange. According to Gidley (1994) cultural exchange involves reciprocity; a core value of Māori culture. In a postcolonial perspective I view this as meaning a relationship involving mutual exchange and respect for equity and autonomous control. Defining multiple Māori identities as part of this framework contributes to the interface between local, regional and national tourism policy for both Māori and Pākehā stakeholders.

The colonial and postcolonial ‘periods’ have created a situation whereby Māori development depends on innovative, organisation structures and governance arrangements (Panaho and Steblein nd.). In a small and comparatively integrated society like New Zealand’s, incentives for inclusivity exist, including the multiple affiliations of individual Māori to different groups. The negotiation and re-positioning of multiple Māori voices in this process creates potential for non-colonial relationships that challenge previously embedded colonial practice. Thus, it promotes choice – or mana motuhake\(^{26}\) over constraints as the way forward for Māori tourism development. There is a need to focus on the differences within groups such as Māori which in turn can offer unique insights and understanding of cultural difference. Re-articulating their position as ‘postcolonial agents’, one that interweaves elements of the coloniser and colonised goes beyond the realm of colonial binary thinking and allows a new hybrid identity or subject-position to emerge (Meredith 1998).

This chapter also discusses contemporary demand for Māori cultural tourism and the problematic issue of ‘defining’ Māori tourism. Identities are inherent to this process; their meanings are negotiated within interactions, emerging and shifting depending on context. As such this process provides Māori a *third space* in which to (re)construct

\(^{26}\) Discrete power (Walker 1999)
image and identity within the parameters of a Māori-led paradigm; one that challenges colonialism.

3.1 New Zealand: The Socio-Political Context

Many would argue New Zealand is now a multicultural society. There is little question that immigration has contributed to the reality of New Zealand as an ethnically diverse society including Pasifika, Asian, Indian, Middle Eastern as well as the ‘core’ culture that derives from our British colonial settler heritage. Multiculturalism addresses the concerns of voluntary immigrants and endorses a commitment to diversity against a backdrop of unity (Fleras and Spoonley 1999). However, the use of the term “multiculturalism” without a qualifier is misleading as it can be interpreted at different levels of meaning: ie fact, ideology, policy, practice, critical discourse and social movement (Fleras and Elliot 1992). As official policy (which New Zealand does not adopt) multiculturalism is defined as a doctrine and set of practices for promoting an inclusive society by dealing with diversity in a proactive manner (Fleras and Spoonley 1999). However, the underlying principle of biculturalism in New Zealand is to give recognition to the existence in New Zealand of two national communities with a focus on ‘power-sharing’ between the groups as opposed to multiculturalism which is concerned with the institutional accommodation of diversity.

Biculturalism acknowledges the special status of founding peoples as ‘first among equals’, thus Māori assertion of original occupation in New Zealand gives sufficient moral foundation for particular recognition; one that goes beyond a bicultural commitment that still privileges a monocultural core (Maaka and Fleras 2005). As Fleras and Spoonley comment ‘the ground rules of society (in New Zealand) are inescapably rooted in Eurocentric values and structures; the game plan is unmistakably tilted towards perpetuating Pākehā power and culture’ (1999: 235). These tensions are further complicated by Māori demands for Treaty-driven, bi-national arrangements and the rights of their position as Tangata Whenua for entitlement and tino rangatiratanga. Neither
biculuralism nor multiculturalism addresses the root cause of the Māori Pākehā problem: the colonisation of Māori and the corresponding loss of self-determination of identity, land, and political voice (Durie 1998). Thus neither delivers a framework for addressing the concerns of tino rangatiratanga.

The dominant political structures of tourism development in New Zealand, originating with the Department of Tourist and Health Resorts in 1901 and its subsequent restructuring under the New Zealand Tourist and Publicity Department (NZTPD) have reflected a fundamentally economic-rationalist ideology that has been present until the 1990s (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002). Hinch (2004: 254) has commented such policies may strengthen a country’s position as an international tourism destination but have not enhanced the level of self-determination from the perspective of Aboriginal people; such paternalistic characteristics are not equipped to deal with the transfer of power. Māori land assets lost in the period 1864-1922 have had on-going social effects for Māori development; notwithstanding that Māori ‘identity’ was seriously weakened through land alienation and its connection with Māori collective social values (Orange 2004; Pihema 2002; Walker 2004). However, the effects of colonisation and attitudes of paternalism and assimilation on Māori tribes have been disparate and experiences differ from tribe to tribe.

This parallels the fact that a number of national Māori bodies have existed in the past, and continue to operate today. Examples of early post-settlement movements crossing tribal boundaries include the pan-tribal Kingitanga movement centred on the Tainui iwi and the Paremata Māori (the Māori Parliament). These groups sought to consolidate Māori political power against the emerging colonial government by mirroring centralised Crown structures (Gover and Baird 2002). Headed by a king the Kingitanga (or King Movement) had arisen in the 1850s as an effort to pre-empt the ongoing encroachment of the Crown on the Māori polity. The colonial government of the time saw the movement as a threat to the authority of the British Crown and after military suppression and subsequent land confiscation the movement fought on for autonomy. It survives as an
important and enduring expression of Māori unity and today holds an established place in New Zealand society (Hill 2004).

The social situation of Māori changed dramatically during the mid twentieth century with rapid urbanisation during the 1950s and 60s (Barcham 1998; Durie 2005; King 2003; Orange 2004; Pawson 1999; Walker 2004). The demand for cheap urban labour stimulated Māori migration from rural to urban areas as well as many Pasifika peoples arriving from Pacific nations. Government policies of the time actively promoted the migration away from rural areas and were a conscious intention to accelerate the detribalisation process and integrate Māori into Pākehā society (Armitage 1995; Belich 2001). The lack of concern by Government to see Māori as ‘equal’ shareholders in the country’s economic advancement was evident in the lack of policies to ensure Māori achieved at the same rate as non-Māori in the education system (Durie 1998, 2000). There was no conscious policy of recruiting and promoting Māori into positions of responsibility in both the public and private sectors. Many Māori were unable to escape from unskilled occupations and the resulting welfare dependency that has become a hallmark of indigenous development seen in other settler nations such as Australia and Canada (Armitage 1995; Havemann 1999; Maaka and Fleras 2005; Mulholland 2006). Assimilation policies further impacted on the socio-cultural world of Māori. In particular Māori language (te reo) became a victim of the dominant Native Schools system.

Government reports such as The Hunn Report (1961) were a clear example of the colonial discourse of the time that adopted a neo-Darwinian evolutionary framework to integrate Māori and Pākehā (Law 2004). This report aimed to ‘modernise’ Māori by way of integration and/or assimilation processes and recommended expanding government efforts to address an emergent ‘Māori problem’ (Levine 1997; Maaka and Fleras 2005). Tuhiwai Smith (2003: 90) has commented on the notion of the ‘indigenous problem’ or the ‘… (insert name of indigenous group) problem’ as a recurrent theme in all imperial and colonial attempts to deal with indigenous people. For Smith, this originates within the wider discourses of racism, sexism and other forms of positioning the Other and reinforces unequal power relations. In Hunn’s view evolution should govern policy, and
evolution had decided which were the ‘fittest elements’ of Māori culture (Law 2004). Government should have absolutely no role to play in perpetuating Māori culture – it was a Māori ‘matter of individual choice’ that could decide (Hunn 1961). This was a paradoxical view for a people whose culture was based on collective values, rather than individual. The rhetoric of the report was of a mono-cultural mindset that believed that any problem can be solved by making Māori more like the mainstream and reiterates colonial discourse of the “civilising mission”. Although elements of the report drew support from some Māori leaders, needless to say its integration policy was not warmly embraced by them (Law 2004). This portion of the report reinforces the dominant discourse of integration imposed on Māori:

Integration…implies some continuation of Māori culture. Much of it, though, has already departed and only the fittest elements (worthiest of preservation) have survived the onset of civilisation. Language, arts and crafts and the institutions of the marae are the chief relics. Only the Māori themselves can decide whether these features of their ancient life are in fact to be kept alive; and, in the final analysis, it is entirely a matter of individual choice.


The paternalist rhetoric inherent in the Hunn Report became the basis of government policies towards Māori in the 1960s and as such the meta-narratives of governmental institutions have been a determining factor in Māori social and economic well-being. This was a time of rapid sociological shifts in Māori society and culture. Ranginui Walker (1981: 502) has argued that Māori were confronted by three main “developmental tasks” at the time: ‘learning survival skills in the cash economy of the urban-industrial complex, transplantation of their culture into the urban milieu, and the development of political structures and strategies for dealing with metropolitan society’. Māori were living alongside Pākehā – adapting Māori cultural practices to new, urban contexts, and pictured not integration, but the flourishing of historically novel forms of Māori culture and identity (Skinner 2004).
This ‘closing of the gaps’ policy (Humpage 2003) sought to ‘advance’ Māori people to a modern way of life, in line with Europeans, ignoring Māori self-governance in favour of state intervention. This focuses discourse on needs over rights and perpetuates the asymmetrical relationship of biculturalism. The referral of ‘chief relics’ in the Hunn Report serve to ‘fix’ Māori culture in a timeless view of authenticity that works against the dynamism of culture. Echoes of Said’s (1978) Orientalism are also evident in such discourse. However, Said has been criticised (see McLeod 2000; Spencer 2006; Spivak 1988; Yegenoglu 1998) for ignoring the self-representations of the colonised and focusing on the imposition of colonial power rather than on the resistances to it (Loomba 1998: 48-49). In this Bhabha (1983: 200) criticises Said’s static model of colonial relations as one in which ‘colonial power and discourse is possessed entirely by the coloniser’ and therefore there is no room for negotiation or change.

Similar discourse was also evident in tourism promotion of the time. Travel guides of the 1950’s describe Māori in a contradictory manner, reflective of the tourism industry’s attempt to present the previously defined – and still desirable – image of the “authentic” Māori alongside a new modern image (Taylor 1998). Again, Māori ‘culture’ was being constructed within western paradigmatic discourses that treated Māori as an ‘unequal’ partner in the bicultural relationship. According to Taylor (1998) the construction of a one-way process highlights European culture as dominant and progressive and confines the other to the “public” domain as tourist spectacle. The temporally defined dichotomy between essentialised notions of Māori and European ways of life represented a wider political discourse that sought to establish “European standards” as the preferred social norm. Here, cultural “adjustment” is a purely one-way process in which Māori are seen to have made a remarkable temporal leap upward, into the modern European present (Taylor 1998).

The politics of tourism advertising during the 1970s took on an even more utopic vision of Māori and Pākehā – a paternalistic notion of biculturalism that situated Māori in the “nostalgic past” within a singularly European New Zealand (Blythe 1988, 1994). Māori culture was relegated to the mythological and exotic fare of tourism: “stories and
legends”, songs “chanted to the rhythms of their dances” and “traditional dress” – visual signifiers of nostalgia (Taylor 1998). Such “Otherness” Hall (1998) reminds us is ‘essential in tourism … such encounters with the “Other” have always provided fuel for myths and mythical language’. But it is the interpretation of “Otherness” that is a critical factor in its (re)presentation; from whose domain such interpretation emanates controls how identities are constructed. Thus, the struggles over the official symbolic representations of reality are inherent in the tourism relationship and whereby cultural identity is ‘an ongoing process, politically contested and historically unfinished’ (Clifford 1988: 9).

Resurgence of Māori cultural identity was asserted during the 1970s in the period called the ‘Māori Renaissance’. This was a time of cultural and political strengthening of Māori culture within Pākehā dominated society and was a reflection of the wider global movements of human rights and calls by indigenous people for autonomy and self-determination. This was also an example of Spivak’s (1987; 1988) “strategic essentialism” whereby Māori cultural assertion was a mechanism used to achieve a renewed sense of value and integrity in the face of colonial ideologies. Maaka and Fleras (2005) comment the politicisation of indigeneity as a discourse marked a reshaping of the political contours of white settler societies thus, a discourse of post colonialism emerged to challenge assimilation paradigms and bring about change. Māori challenges to the racism of Pākehā society led to an increasing demand for separation between the two peoples – hence, biculturalism emerged as the way ‘forward’ (Levine 2002).

Biculturalism challenged the one people ideology and advocated a partnership within the framework of the Treaty that involved both cultures existing side by side in New Zealand. Biculturalism recognised the need to uphold Māori culture and identity against the old colonial practices of assimilation and was, essentially the idea of two parallel and equal cultures. However, a major difficulty with this concept is that it encourages a restrictive emphasis upon two main groups and thus perpetuates binary opposites of Māori and Pākehā. Biculturalism works against establishing cultural practices that mix or connect (Bell 2004) hence, it works against the idea of hybridity. The
acknowledgement of ‘identity’ in this process is of prime importance – for both Māori and Pākehā. Coming to terms with ‘equal’ notions of identity may provide a clearer understanding of cultural ‘difference’ and an acceptance of the need to promote and celebrate this diversity as part of New Zealand’s cultural identity.

Māori were demonstrating emerging hybrid characteristics at this time, particularly in the arts and literature. Māori artists adapted elements of European culture to enrich their art; using new media and western techniques to develop new art forms – some creating new hybrid forms of representation (Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal 2006). This was noted in the 1960s by Margaret Orbell (1964: 4) who stated:

Those artists and writers who are Māori, are in particular pioneers, for in their own very individual and different ways, they are beginning to express a new experience, and to shape a new culture: that culture which, drawing its strength from two traditions, will in the future speak for all of us.

The rapid urbanisation of Māori in the mid twentieth century brought with it a questioning of the validity of a universal Māori identity. By the 1980s there was a growing need to cater to the largely increasing urbanised Māori population through pan-tribal and urban groupings. Many third and fourth-generation urban dwellers had lost their tribal identity; ‘urban Māori’ or ‘non-tribal Māori’ therefore is an identity increasingly being claimed (Meredith 2006). These new Urban Authorities were no longer based on descent or kinship (Pihema 2002; Ward and Hayward 1999). With over 80 per cent of Māori people living outside of their traditional tribal territories, for some of these individuals the tribe is no longer the sole focal point of their Māori identity (Maaka 1997: 7). The relevance of place and identity is herewith raised whereby the discursive determination of being “authentically” Māori has been identified by Bell (2004) as the geographical location of the urban city. This is a dichotomous link between traditional and modernity, rural and urban which illustrates the continuing need for “authentic” indigenes to be spatially separated. Bell (2004: 63) states this has been a ‘divisive tactic by Pākehā New Zealanders … the city as the site of western modernity is clearly not the place for ‘real’ Māori who must maintain a distinct way of life within a ‘traditional’ rural
setting’. This argument is commonly put up by Pākehā when debating culturally based rights such as the Foreshore and Seabed claim in 2004. Pākehā often resort to a discourse of the “primitive” to disqualify contemporary Māori claims to traditional or special rights. Such debate perpetuates essentialist accounts of identities based on notions of authenticity and inauthenticity (Chaney 2002). What is obviously missing from this logic is the acceptance of culture as dynamic and changing. The tradition/modern binary is still entrapped in a bicultural mindset that promotes western progress whilst negating Māori the same rights. According to Bell (2004) it also works to distance the settler from the status of coloniser: in constructing identities of Māori Pākehā such ‘primitive discourse’ is a form of cultural essentialism.

Public sector reforms from 1984 to 1990 led to New Zealand’s economy changing from one of the most protected in the OECD to the most liberal (James 1997). New legislation was passed under which substantial resources were re-distributed to tribes as part of Treaty of Waitangi claims. Under the 1992 Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Claim Settlement Act and the 1985 Waitangi Amendment Act significant land, fisheries and financial resources have been returned to tribal collectives and is still ongoing (Clydesdale 2007: 60-61). Government policies of iwi management were encouraged, reaffirming the importance of tribal identity over a more bland Māori identity hence, Māori politics during this period promoted the tribe as the vehicle of Māori self-determination (Durie 1998; Levine 2002; Sullivan 1995; Walker 2004).

Another significant initiative of the Crown was the creation of the Rununga Iwi Act (1990) which meant that iwi structures became strongly centralised in order to fulfil the criteria of government resource allocation for the purpose of delivering government

---

27 This controversial piece of legislation enacted by the Crown in 2004 enabled the New Zealand government to take ownership and control of the foreshore and seabed from Māori customary use. The Waitangi Tribunal found serious flaws in the Crown proposals for dealing with the foreshore and seabed and that the policy clearly breached the guarantees of the Treaty of Waitangi and removes from Māori the protection of the rule of law. The issue raised concerns in the wider indigenous international arena and that the act violated domestic and international human rights. For further discussion see Inns, ‘Thinking globally, acting locally? The New Zealand government, foreshore and seabed, international human rights and double standards’ pp219-230 in Cant, Goodall and Inns (Eds) 2005.
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services to Māori (Maaka and Fleras 2005; Walker 2004). The Act set out the “essential” characteristics of “iwi” and the rules for their operation. The government of the time (Labour) was concerned that Māori could not deal effectively or efficiently with these resources thus, they dictated the ‘terms’ of negotiation. The Act was criticised, not least for the paternalistic attitude of the Crown to prescribe the characteristics of iwi (Gover and Baird 2002), but also as an attempt to ‘create’ a Māori Treaty partner in the image of Pākehā legal institutions (Irakehu 1990). Thus legislation attempts to freeze for contemporary Māori a bureaucratic version of the Pākehā understanding of Māori identity (Panaho and Steblein nd).

Such changes encompassed a dialogue about power sharing; however discourse between Māori and government differed; Māori discourse was around parallel development and separate institutions; central authorities talked about tinkering with the existing system by way of Māori add-ons (Levine 1997). Subsequent changes in government during the 1990s saw the repeal of the Rununga Act, but the legacy of iwi as a strong centralised structure remained. This is problematic in that by returning resources to tribes, there is an explicit intent to revitalise the identity and the operational capacity of the old organisation form (Clydesdale 2007) to the exclusion of new forms. As a result this created a fracturing of some iwi/hapu alliances and differing discourses between non-tribal entities such as Urban Māori Authorities and traditional forms of iwi organisational structures (Ballara 1998; Joseph 2007; Levine 2002).

In terms of identity the Act imposed government-defined and inflexible iwi-only identity to the exclusion of other Māori organisations, and as such failed to recognise the complexities that ‘make up’ Māori culture. As a result, many Māori are not represented and do not receive the benefits of the resource distribution. Urban Māori have challenged the exclusive right of the tribal bodies to deliver resources and development programmes and re-articulated new understandings of what it means to be Māori. Whilst urban Māori have lost some of the symbols of rural/land-based identity, they have created other symbols to demarcate their ethnic and cultural identity (Barcham 1998). Some of these new symbols draw on the hybrid mixing of cultures prevalent in such urbanised
environments and fuel innovative and entrepreneurial approaches to economic development including tourism. Thus, kinship-based arrangements and the factional nature of tribal society can be counter-productive in a western-dominated society that is increasingly hybrid in character. Tapsell (2006) has commented however that the urban or pan-Māori marae has perpetuated the (Western) media’s propensity to put all Māori into one racially biased basket, ignoring the diversity within this ‘basket’ that includes individual, inter-tribal and hybrid identities.

By the 1980s Māori generally had their economic, social and cultural lives shaped and formed by government at the individual, hapu and tribal level (Pihema 2002; Sullivan 1997). The policies of privatisation and corporatisation have been evident signs of New Zealand’s neoliberal stance since this time (Bargh 2007). The long-term goal for these changes is economic growth, measured in terms of the country’s GDP. However, flaws are inherent in such policies such as the inability to perceive ‘who’ is really benefiting in the distribution of wealth (Maaka and Fleras 2005). The pursuit of economic growth as ‘development’ can have conflicting consequences in terms of cultural homogenisation and the global forces that impact on local culture (Bargh 2007). According to Bargh successive New Zealand governments since 1984 have pursued neoliberal policies with a ‘faith, vehemence and confidence in their success that few other governments appear to possess’. She states that many indigenous peoples view the way that neoliberal practices maintain this dominance is akin to colonisation (Bargh 2007). Neoliberal practices on Māori have been criticised as being negative, denying Māori the opportunity to continue to pursue alternative forms of governance (Bargh 2007; Jackson 2004). However, Māori must accept and re-work the same values and policies if they are to work from ‘within’ to strengthen their position and gain a measure of autonomy albeit from a position still within the dominant structures of colonially derived institutions and bicultural policy agendas and therefore not necessarily one of equal power.

Government’s focus on iwi tribal groupings has tended to undermine the more intimate relationships maintained through hapu groups. Ancestral lines (thus identity) were clearer and closer through these social groupings and their continued social interaction
through daily living (Pihema 2002). As a result, there has been a divergence of values and practice of Māori culture through such fracturing of Māoridom and a (re)forming of new relationships in contemporary Māoridom. Although the ‘tribe’ is a major feature of modern Māori society, it is but one avenue for policy implementation for Māori. Given the percentage of Māori who live in urban contexts, do not affiliate with a particular iwi (approx 20 per cent) the relevance of tribal development cannot be viewed as homogenous for all Māori (Durie 1998, 2005; Meredith 1998; Pawson 1998). Diversity therefore is an important factor when considering outcomes for Māori economic development including tourism opportunities. Some tribes such as Ngai Tahu have already implemented these through Treaty settlements and economical re-structuring within iwi groups (Te Ahu Poata-Smith 2004). A ‘bottom up’ strategy is also crucial if Māori are to negotiate with government agencies in a more holistic framework. The sustainability of Māori tourism will rely on multiple discourses to expound their claims for better representation at both regional and national levels as part of this process.

3.2 Change and Adaptation: Contemporary Māori Tourism Development

A key imperative for Māori tourism in the mid 1980s was the Māori Economic Summit Conference, commonly called the Hui Taumata 1984 (Durie 2002, 2003; NZIER 2003; Sullivan 2005, TMTA 1989). Its purpose was to restore economic and social momentum for Māori and was especially concerned with creating independence. It demonstrated that Māori wanted a less intrusive, less controlling and more distant state. The principles agreed to at the Hui were that Māori objectives needed to be defined by Māori and that Māori needed to have control of resources through a Māori delivery system (Durie et al. 2002; Sullivan 1995). Thus, they wanted Māori, not bicultural solutions to their concerns (O’Sullivan 2007: 85). Policy recommendations sought to empower Māori within the existing political and economic structures that were in place, and accommodate the needs and wants of Māori self-determined development. Bargh has criticised such policies as
‘corporatising iwi’ and thus shifting the relationship between Māori and their iwi from one as ‘communitarian’ to ‘contractual relations between individuals and agencies’ (2007: 40). However, such changes could be said to be reflective of Bhabha’s (1994) *third spaces* that incorporate multiple identities and the emergence of hybrid individuals and/or institutions. These changes represent forms of postcolonial resistance.

It should also be noted here that the development of cultural tourism for some indigenous people has revived cultural traditions and contributed to empowering local community status (Cloher and Johnston 1999; Smith 1996, 2001). Ngai Tahu’s Kaikoura Whale Watch operation is a case in point and is an example of how local Māori have used a natural resource (sea/whale) to create an internationally acclaimed eco-tourism venture. The government granted Ngai Tahu a monopoly to carry tourists to view whales that swim off the nearby coast. The once economically depressed region has been re-invigorated by this multi-million dollar success story whose process reveals a form of cultural hybridity (Bhabha 1994). What has traditionally been a resource in Māori food gathering activities; the whale now offers local kin groups a sustainable and contemporary resource for the future economic development of its people in a newly interpreted way – i.e. under the rubric of ‘eco-tourism’. This has been managed by a ‘corporate’ style governance framework that has proved successful for Ngai Tahu.

Arguably, Māori tourism development has been subject to corporate style structures that have, at times, been in opposition to Māori values and worldviews and there are risks that Māori may fall prey to outsider consultants with specialist knowledge. However, this only reflects the reality of operating in a global system that is largely driven by Western economic principles, one in which Māori must increasingly participate. In Ngai Tahu’s case they have recognised that tribes cannot act like autonomous and independent units as in traditional days (Clydesdale 2007). Despite instances of inequality (van Meijl 2002) of power Māori are seeking increased participation and articulating their desire for collaboration at all levels of tourism development. Industry-based partnerships represent an even more direct way for indigenous people to determine the nature of their development in tourism (Hinch 2004).
My postcolonial critique of change and adaptation for contemporary Māori tourism development takes as its referent point the *Māori Tourism Task Force Report 1987* (MTTF) which culminated as a direct response to the 1984 Hui Taumata. I view this document as a benchmark for Māori assertion to progress and a measure of autonomy within New Zealand’s tourism industry. The Report represents a paradigmatic shift in the representation of the Māori image by the national tourism organisation to one advocating control and representation by Māori. This parallels the bicultural policies of the 1980s with Māori voicing their concerns about where ‘they’ fitted in the already mature and dynamic industry that was tourism in Aotearoa New Zealand. Tourism was seen as a potential avenue for Māori economic advancement and the report sought to draw together the necessary resources and management policies that would benefit Māori who already operated within the industry as well as those looking for future opportunities in tourism (MTTF 1987: 9).

The release of this report indicated that Māori wanted a stronger presence in the control and development of their culture within the wider western-dominated tourism sector in New Zealand. Following a government sponsored Manaakitanga Hui held in 1985 in Rotorua (Ingram 1987; MTTF 1987) two specific motions called for: the establishment of a Māori Tourism Association, and the establishment of a Tourism Task Force (MTTF 1987: 8). The Task Force’s evaluation of the ‘present situation’ for Māori tourism recognised many challenges, including the ‘ability of our traditions, our social structures, and our cultural and tribal patterns to adapt to an industry which runs on good business management, highly skilled professional performance and unerring dependability’ (1987: 9). Delegates sought to present a framework within which Māori could promote their businesses and an assurance that Māori interests would not be submerged in the new wave of tourism development (1987: 9).

The Report’s research covered the whole of Aotearoa on a tribal basis and evaluated both national and regional aspects of industry structure. One of the main aims sought was to ‘gain a representative Māori voice on some of the Councils and Boards of the Industry’ (1987: 9) thus illustrating Ryan’s (2005) point of having previously marginalised groups.
in ‘key nodal positions’ if they are to effect change. This representative ‘voice’ would obviously speak collectively for Māori, which in itself is problematic. The tribal nature of Māori is fraught with inherent differences between kin groups. In fact, one of the major findings of the report recognised that ‘divisions and rivalries within Māori communities inhibit individual and group initiatives’ (1987: 11). The Task Force also found few linkages existed between Māori and the tourism industry decision makers (Ingram 1997) advocating there should be a close liaison between these appointees and a Māori tourism association. A key aspect the Task Force observed was a need ‘to strengthen the tribal cultural base so that the local people are strong in their knowledge of their language, tribal history, arts and crafts and have a vigorous cultural life that will resist encroachment’ (MTTF 1987: 49). This comment by the MTTF highlights the necessity to cater to the variable identities within Māori culture and how these contribute to tourism product development. In acknowledging the ‘local’ aspect of Māori culture we must also accept the ‘global’ will influence this site of cultural identity and may at times conflict. However Wever (2006) has stated the effect of global forces on local cultures has for many inflected the ‘power of place’ and strengthened the dynamics of locality, identity and culture.

The MTTF Report (1987) identified significant barriers to Māori tourism development and voiced concerns over lack of Māori involvement in policy-making decisions, employment opportunities for Māori, and limited knowledge and skill bases. In particular, there was concern over the Māori ‘image’ being marketed without economical benefit to Māori, and resentment over the stereotypical imagery that had been presented by the national tourism body for most of the twentieth century. This was reiterated by the following comment:

It has been of deep concern to the Māori that the Māori image has been used as a marketing tool in the promotion of the tourist industry for over a hundred years. Māori are also critical of the way they are stereotyped into guides, entertainers, carvers, and as components of the natural scenery. This has been without consultation and with little commercial benefit to the Māori people (MTTF 1987: 25)
It is clear that the Māori image has commercial value however this reveals that imagery as a political process encodes and reinforces the dominant ideology of colonialism, and by association the discourse of tourism. Discourse, Foucault (1980) argued, never consists of one statement, one text, one action or one source. ‘The same discourse, characteristic of the way of thinking or the state of knowledge at any one time will appear across a range of texts, and as forms of conducts, at a number of different institutional sites within society’ (Hall 1997: 44)\(^{29}\). This influences how peoples are perceived and how they perceive themselves. Of key importance was the recognition by the Task Force for the ‘creation of a viable trade association so that Māori operators can manage their industry collectively and have a voice to negotiate with government and other sectors of the tourist industry’ (1987: 25). Over the ensuing decade this aim would remain tenuous for Māori involvement in tourism. The Aotearoa Māori Tourism Association (later named the Federation AMTF) established in 1988 was represented on both the New Zealand Tourism Industry Federation (NZTIF) and the New Zealand Tourism Council (NZTC) but lack of cohesion and government funding meant it did not last past the late 1990s (Ingram 1997; TPK 1995). Although the MTTF Report advocated control of Māori tourism development recommending that government give priority to growth of a Māori commercial presence in tourism and that those Māori tourism initiatives be centred on a partnership between the private and public sectors much of the rhetoric about the importance of Māori and Māori culture for the tourism industry progress was not realised on key issues. An ad hoc approach to Māori tourism participation at a national level ensued and many of the identified barriers from the Task Force report still existed in the early twenty-first century and at the commencement of my research.

Regional development of Māori tourism was also taking place during the 1990s with entities such as the Tai Tokerau Māori Tourism Association (TTMTA) established in 1996 for Northland, The Māori Tourism Forum in Rotorua in 1994, and Te Ara A Maui from the greater Wellington region, the Wairarapa, Kapiti, Nelson and Marlbourgh and Kaikoura (Ingram 1997). These collaborations represented a need by Māori to network together and gain strength within the wider New Zealand tourism industry if they were to

\(^{29}\) Foucault has referred to this as the *episteme*.
participate in its future growth and development. Tourism was recognised as an industry with great potential to provide improved welfare for Māori communities and entities such as TTMTA were keen to take advantage of opportunities in a region with a high proportion of Māori population but with lower socio-economic status compared to other regions of New Zealand. They wanted a tourism that reflected their values and would offer economic opportunities for an improved livelihood and sought a ‘Māori tourism’ that was community orientated, owned or at least partly owned by local Māori and based on social, economic, cultural and environmental sustainability (Cloher and Johnson 1999). Whilst they realised that tourism could commercialise their culture 88per cent indicated that promoting culture was a better way of making it sustainable than protecting it from tourists. They do not see Māori culture as a closed system of beliefs and rituals and by combining various facets of sustainability in a holistic framework, they sought to empower their communities, preserve traditional values of kinship and reciprocity, and limit negative impacts on their environment (Clydesdale 2007). Hence, they advocated controlling and managing what tourists were allowed to experience and how this was promoted and packaged as a commercial enterprise.

My interview with a government representative for Māori tourism development provided insight to regional development in Rotorua during the same period. This research participant had a history of over 30 years in Rotorua’s tourism industry and whānau members were also active in its tourism development. The 1990s was a ‘strategic time’ for Māori tourism in the region and tribal matters were brought to the fore with ‘outsider’ operators’ cultural shows coming in to local hotels performing for tourists. This was ‘crossing boundaries and traditional restrictions in the name of business’ said the research participant. At the time local Māori stakeholders asserted the need for portfolio groups to be set up as part of the wider District Council’s tourism marketing arm. There was a need to plan and ensure a ‘Māori component as part of the regional Strategy’ as they recognised ‘on their own it would be a big battle’. However, objectives dissipated as Māori at different levels decided to form one group and motivations varied amongst everyone. The ‘politics’ of local representation became problematic with the overarching question “who is driving the Māori one (plan)?” Key people in Tourism Rotorua
recognised the value of Māori iconic product to the local industry and the strength of ‘tribal’ identity. The research participant stated:

“Input tribally is very strong … the ability to have grown compared to other regions makes Rotorua quite different because of this history. The whole cycle of what distribution channels are for tourism, what the input has been for the community in terms of Māori development and this whole identity perspective is something that has made Rotorua tourism what it is”.

In her view the mid 1990s was a ‘time to reconsolidate’ and a time of ‘transformation’ for Māori tourism as major players such as Tamaki Tours, Whale Watch and the Māori Arts and Craft Institute were attracting national and international media attention for their successful enterprises. But ‘what was happening at a regional level? – what was happening was tribal’. In her opinion this is what drives business for Māori – the source is in the regions. Critical components of this are lifestyle, strengthening community support, helping Māori influence regional councils. In terms of Māori regional development she says, ‘it’s also where we get the distinction of stories … stories connect us to our ancestors, our land, our people, to our identity’. This aspect will be discussed in case study analysis as an underlying theme of regional differentiation and identity construction in the representation of contemporary Māori tourism product.

3.3 ‘Closing the Gaps’ – *He Matai Tapoi Māori*

The increase of reports and literature specifically targeted at Māori tourism over the next decade identified that Māori were indeed forming an integrated part of national tourism discourse. These reports represent a re-positioning of the Māori ‘voice’, be it collective, multiple or individual, as discourses that affect a desire for autonomous representation. Māori concerns were being sought and implemented as part of strategic development. Although this indicates a collaborative partnership there is still an underlying sense of paternalism in the rhetoric and strategies undertaken in their implementation and problematic value dimensions that stem from the different cultural contexts and
understandings between Māori and Pākehā. This is not unduly surprising considering the point Pawson (1999: 28) makes that ‘Pākehā colonisation of New Zealand thus brought together peoples whose underlying cultural assumptions and practices were very different’.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century the New Zealand Government ushered in a policy of “Closing the Gaps” aimed at assisting socially disadvantaged ethnic groups, particularly Māori and Pacific Islanders (Durie 2003; Humpage 2003; Pihema 2002; The Stafford Group 2001). This controversial policy expects government departments and agencies to address the economic and social gaps that exist in their respective areas. The publication of the Closing the Gaps Report in 1998 by TPK confirmed what many had suspected: the socio-economic gaps between Māori and non-Māori as well as gaps between rural and urban Māori persisted (Maaka and Fleras 2005: 135). TPK was formed in 1993 as the Ministry of Māori Development and is the principal advisor to Government on Māori issues (NZIER 2003) and are responsible for assisting Māori economic advancement as part of the Government’s industry development policy. O’Sullivan (2007: 299) has highlighted tensions between state controlled policies versus the more holistic and integrated world-view that has traditionally been seen as intrinsic to Māori, commenting ‘it is not and nor should it be Te Puni Kokiri that determines tribal economic strategy’. Walker has called such institutions ‘subalterns within the power structure of the state … expected to co-operate with its bureaucratic systems of control and social management’ (2004: 293). Thus, tensions are also evident amongst Māori as to how best to serve Māori social, economic and political aspirations. The Gaps report bore resemblances to the monocultural tone of the 1961 Hunn Report in its analysis and assessment of the ‘Māori problem’ and its objectives of making Māori more like the mainstream. The discourse surrounding the Gaps policy is fraught with the dichotomous historical relationship that has existed between Māori and Pākehā for over a century. Not surprisingly the Report has been criticised for being ‘carried out, not for Māori or by Māori but on Māori for government as part of a Māori tourism auditing programme to assess its integration into the national and global tourism market’ (Pihema 2002).
For tourism one of the outcomes from this policy was the government’s research report ‘A Study of Barriers, Impediments and Opportunities for Māori in Tourism: He Matai Tapoi Māori’ (The Stafford Group 2001). He Matai was an extensive review of the position of Māori tourism and sought to: indicate the extent of Māori involvement in the tourism industry compared with non-Māori; identify barriers and impediments unique to Māori and which inhibit Māori involvement and performance in the tourism industry; identify opportunities for Māori involvement in the latter and recommend policies to stimulate and facilitate those opportunities, and provide further recommendations for progress (TSG 2001). The allusion to problems ‘unique’ to Māori however echoes colonial discourse and reinforcing binary opposites. Although the aim of the report seeks to integrate Māori tourism more tightly into the global/national tourism structure – which can be seen as a necessity for sustainable tourism development (Hinch, McIntosh and Ingram 1999; Teo 2002) there are however cultural factors that are often over-shadowed in these processes, whereby discourse and power (by those in control) dictate the order of the day. Pihema has argued that the report ‘seeks to legitimise and extends the power of the state to define Māori tourism’ (2002: 72). He also argues that such integration represents increasingly dangerous assimilation where ownership of culture becomes contested (2002: 33). This reflects epistemological differences between cultures, and displays a commercially-driven ideology that is at odds with the more holistic and integrated model supported by Māori. It also raises the question of research, by whom and for whom (Tuhiwai Smith 2003).

Closing the ‘gaps’ requires that Māori take control of the policies and structures that will determine equity in their relationship with government and tourism stakeholders and resist the paternalistic approach traditionally maintained by government. The New Zealand Government is keen to support the development of Māori participation in tourism by ensuring they have a voice and are able to effectively utilise the organisations already in place (KCSM 2004). Since the Report’s release there is evidence of Māori progress however, there is a splitting of opinion between Māori tourism operators and these sectors in terms of substantiating these objectives (KCSM 2004; NZMTC 2006). An ‘inclusive’ Māori tourism strategy at national level will require multiple Māori voices
to be heard in order to subvert paternalistic tendencies to make decisions for the ‘whole sector’ as opposed to allowing a more equitable voice for Māori. The New Zealand Tourism Strategy is thus an important strategic document for guiding Māori tourism into the future as collaborative ‘partners’ in the growth and sustainability of New Zealand’s national and international tourism industry.

3.4 The New Zealand Tourism Strategy (NZTS) and Māori

The New Zealand Tourism Strategy 2010 (NZTS) was launched in 2001 and represented a long-term vision for tourism in New Zealand to the year 2010 (TNZ 2001). As a major contributor to the New Zealand economy tourism has shown strong growth over the past several years. Tourism is New Zealand’s biggest export earner accounting for 18.7 per cent of all exports and contributing 9 per cent to GDP (Statistics NZ 2005). International visitor arrivals reached an all-time high of 2.37m in 2005 and visitor arrivals have doubled since 1993 to 2.42 million in 2006 (TNZ 2006). TNZ stated:

“The Strategy was designed to enhance an already robust sector with a sharper focus on sustainable development and identifying the challenges ahead in maximising its contribution to New Zealand” (NZTS 2010: 3)

At a national level, tourism policy has had limited success as a strategy to operationalise the principle of self-determination of indigenous peoples in tourism and has often been applied on an ad hoc basis (Hinch 2004). Economic versus cultural motives have tended to encourage the further commodification of indigenous cultures and inhibit sustainability. Objectives of the NZTS (2010) supported more definite moves towards consultative, joint or co-operative management. The importance of tourism to Māori was clearly identified in the NZTS which noted that tourism was an area where significant gains can be made for the benefit of Māori. The new vision of the strategy states:
Visitors and their host communities understand and embrace the spirit of manaakitanga (hospitality) while, New Zealanders’ environment and culture is conserved and sustained in the spirit of kaitiakitanga (guardianship) and Tourism is a vibrant and significant contributor to the economic development of New Zealand (NZTS 2010: Executive Summary ii)

The significance of the cultural connotations in this statement cannot be ignored. The NZTS has specifically incorporated Māori values (manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga) at the core of its vision and highlights the involvement and input from industry stakeholders and the Māori Tourism Advisory Group (MTAG). However, it has been commented that Māori were invited “at the 11th hour” in advising government and Tourism New Zealand on Māori issues in tourism (Sole 2006). The importance of the NZTS is recognised by both parties but deviates when it comes to the framework Māori used to formulate their submissions and continue to work within tourism. The MTAG reiterated this in their paper to TSG established to develop the NZTS 2010. The MTAG framework is based on the rights guaranteed under the Treaty of Waitangi and represents an expression of a right as Treaty partners and as indigenous peoples to control their future. They expressed the framework from which Tangata Whenua chose to work from stating:

But more importantly Māori see opportunities for an economic well being that will support Māori social structures based around marae, iwi, hapu and whānau. The industry needs to develop ways in which to support control by Māori over Māori culture and the use of its symbols, language, images and practices beyond that as a tourist asset or marketing tool (TNZ 2001: Appendix 3)

The core values articulated by the MTAG (and which also remain the core values of the NZMTC) included Māori concepts of: Rangatiratanga, Kaitiakitanga, Utu, Manaakitanga, Whānau/Hapu/Iwi, Whānaungatanga, and Kotahitanga but these are particular Māori concepts that are difficult to integrate with colonial-based concepts, and thus create cultural conflict between Māori and Pākehā in determining a bicultural relationship. TNZ’s CEO, George Hickton stated:
TNZ is enacting the Treaty by ensuring that the culture is recognised in as broad a range of product as we can (devise). If you add to that the other element of the Strategy, which is sustainability, that’s consistent with the Treaty in my view (Sole 2006: 100).

In 1989 The Māori Taskforce 2000 Report agreed unanimously that the “Principles of the Treaty” are the catalyst for growth in tourism, and should be enshrined as a first priority of the consultative process. The Taskforce felt it was critical to allow, in partnership, the support and assistance of Māori in the preparation and formation of policies in tourism towards the year 2000 and beyond (Ministry of Tourism 1989). More recently the New Zealand Minister of Tourism also says that while the Treaty is a core document for all New Zealand, he doesn’t think it has a role in tourism or has directly contributed to tourism (Sole 2006: 100). Such views overshadow Māori objectives to improve participation in tourism on their terms. Although the Treaty constitutes an important part of Māori identity, as these comments demonstrate it is still viewed somewhat ambiguously by Pākehā. The NZMTC advocate that Māori tourism does have a significant role in the development of the national tourism scene and that this will be achieved ‘if we remain adaptable to change’ (NZMTC 2007: 4). This requires a strategically aligned Māori/Crown tourism structure incorporating Māori values and priorities. This has been reiterated in the latest NZMTC’s Statement of Intent for 2007/2008 whereby in relation to the Crown they state: ‘The Council’s core value of utu30 reflects especially in the Council’s operating relationship with the Crown’ (2007: 5). This discourse places emphasis on the Crown’s obligation ‘in meeting its reciprocal obligations under the Treaty of Waitangi’, and to ‘actively redress the wrongs by the Crown so that Māori can effectively participate in the economic development of New Zealand’. Such comments reveal the inextricable relationship between tourism, power and politics.

The NZTS has been instrumental in Māori tourism’s stronger presence in the overall development of New Zealand’s tourism structure, albeit nearly two decades since the MTTF Report was released. However, its originating form is still reflective of the
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colonial institutional structures that have presided since earlier tourism days and which are now influenced by New Right processes that emerged within discourses of globalisation and neo-liberalism. A mid-term review of the NZTS was undertaken in 2006 and one in which Māori ‘presence’ was collectively represented. A number of Māori tourism stakeholders were brought together at a hui facilitated by the NZMTC with the general consensus Māori tourism was ‘in good shape’ and was working collectively at all levels of the tourism sector. The NZMTC believes that a strong Māori tourism sector is critical to sustainable growth and that Māori continue to offer an important point of difference for New Zealand in the international marketplace, yielding benefits not only to Māori but also to the tourism industry and the economy as a whole. The Council recognises the significant progress made over recent years by Māori tourism, but state it has not yet reached its full potential. Although MRTOs have been established along with a national body, government’s failure to deploy a ‘Whole of Government approach to implementation of MRTOs plans requires attention’ (NZMTC 2006: 8). Two of the key strategies that arose from these discussions relate to themes examined in my thesis:

1. **Compelling Brand**: *Key Strategy* – to ensure that unique elements of Māori culture reflect in New Zealand’s brand positioning. *Key Actions* – Government and industry work with Māori tourism to reinforce the unique positioning of New Zealand in the global marketplace and the promotion of a diverse range of Māori experiences across the whole nation.

2. **Māori Participation**: *Key Strategy* – to improve Māori participation in tourism. *Key Actions* – to maintain and develop a strategically aligned Māori tourism structure based on Māori values and priorities … that market research is undertaken which embraces the full spectrum of Māori tourism.

Source: NZMTC *He Toa Takitini* November 2006
The first strategy reflects nga matatini Māori. Tribal diversity of Māori culture contributes to the diversity of Māori tourism product although not wholly recognised in this statement. The ‘diverse range’ of Māori experiences needs to also recognise the diverse identities inherent in Māori culture. This diversity necessitates a ‘rebranding’ from the homogenous image of Māori tourism to better reflect regional diversity and thus, identity of Māori within New Zealand. In order to promote a ‘diverse range of Māori experiences across the whole nation’ will require changes to the stereotypical images portrayed of Māori tourism. Images of ‘hongi’, ‘haka’ and ‘warrior’ are distinct aspects of traditional Māori culture albeit their tendency to dichotomise Māori as Other and reinforce perceptions of Māori culture as ahistorical and unchanging. But images need to also reflect the contemporary nature of Māori culture and reflect how modern Māori perceive their culture. To date visitor perception of Māori culture as ‘exotic’ (see McIntosh 2004) is still mostly experienced in ‘traditional’ ways such as in museums or at cultural performances in the Māori ‘capital’ Rotorua. Avenues for implementing change in visitor perception could for example be promoted through the TNZ website, well recognised guide books such as Lonely Planet and Rough Guide, and on-board media information promoted by the national carrier Air New Zealand.

The second strategy is aligned with self-determination. Improving Māori participation in tourism allows Māori more control of their image and product development. The right to determine their relationships in the tourism industry and to manage and protect all aspects of Māori culture are evident in this strategy. If based on Māori values and priorities this is closely aligned with kaupapa Māori principles: a determining feature of tino rangatiratanga. Inherently these principles encompass notions of a bicultural framework albeit the argument that biculturalism cannot deliver a framework for addressing the concerns of tino rangatiratanga (Fleras and Spoonley 1999). State-determined bicultural discourses still expect Māori to fit into a Pākehā norm, thereby ensuring a continued pattern of power and privilege (Wickliffe 2000). By contrast, reinforcing a Treaty-based power-sharing discourse allows Māori a degree of self determining autonomy apart from the State (Humpage 2003).
A paradigm shift within the prevailing westernised ideologies of New Zealand’s tourism industry will maintain equity and ensure sustainability for Māori within its wider tourism environment. Issues of power still dominate the tourism industry and it is within this realm that Māori must continue to strive for equity. For example, it was not until 1996 because of a coalition agreement between government parties National and New Zealand First that the New Zealand Tourism Board had to formally consult with the Māori Ministry over Māori tourism issues (Hall 2007). Institutional arrangements are a critical element in tourism development and policy making yet in many governance structures in developed countries such as New Zealand indigenous groups have very limited influence because they are in a minority (Hall 2007). The exercise of power in these processes must be balanced more in favour of the ‘minority’. Reassertion of identity by those previously marginalised is related to broader processes of cultural production and localisation within the dynamics of global economy; tourism is an integral component of this dynamic and provides a mechanism to articulate previously silenced voices.

Māori are in a stronger position than ever before in terms of determining the path of their tourism development and representation of their image. By describing their cultural identity in diverse ways Māori enter the ‘market’ and thus gain power to enter the system. But there is still much progress to be made. The majority of Māori tourism businesses are small micro sized enterprises. Access to finance, training and education are still major barriers for many operators. The “grass-roots” of Māori tourism will need the support and management of collectives such as MRTOs and at national level the NZMTC will continue to lobby government on policy and funding issues to progress Māori tourism. The Māori tourism image in the twenty-first century will evolve from the regions – where nga matatini of Māori culture is evident. This diversity has the potential to create distinctive tourism products that reflect and strengthen tribal identity, and add to the collective representation of Māori culture as part of New Zealand Tourism’s global brand.

I will now focus discussion on the specific nature of demand for Māori cultural tourism and the responses from Māori in meeting the needs of a consumer-driven market amidst
the challenges of negotiating equity as Treaty partner in national tourism policy-making. By examining the relationship between supply and demand of Māori culture we can ascertain to what degree and in what ways tourism is constitutive for the contemporary Māori identity.

### 3.5 Demand for Māori Cultural Tourism

My research is directed at the supply of Māori cultural product with a core focus on identity being a key element of its production. It is however necessary to briefly discuss issues regarding the demand of Māori tourism in order to draw conclusions from my fieldwork that I can juxtapose with current literature on the market perspective of Māori (in) tourism. The most relevant government oriented tourism research was conducted just prior to the commencement of my thesis and hence informed and influenced my views whilst planning my research design. A published report in 2004 titled ‘Measurement of Māori in Tourism – Te Ahu Mai, He Tatau Tapoi Māori’ (Colmar Brunton 2004) showed that Māori cultural tourism is on the ascent, and that those involved are playing an increasingly important role in giving this country a key point of difference. The report found that Māori participation in tourism had increased 72 per cent in the decade 1991-2001 and comprised around 11 per cent of the total tourism related workforce. However, Māori roles in tourism tend to be as part-time workers, mostly younger (44 per cent under 30 years), lower qualified (77 per cent have no qualification or school only), and employed at lower income levels than the total tourism workforce (Colmar Brunton 2004). Thus, socio-economic indicators are still prevalent that policies such as ‘closing the gaps’ were not achieving desired outcomes. *Te Ahu Mai, He Tatau Tapoi Māori* is the first report to focus on Māori in tourism, and as such, an overdue one given the history of Māori participation in New Zealand tourism for over 150 years. It mirrors policy initiatives such as the NZTS 2010 and *He Matai Tapoi* in calling for increased participation and development of Māori tourism product and capacity building.
Until recently, the lack of market research available to help Māori tourism businesses in New Zealand adapt, develop and market their products to meet identified demand has been notable (McIntosh and Ryan 2007: 74). Statistics from a report titled Demand for Māori Cultural Tourism: Te Ahu Mai – He whao tapoi Māori conducted by the Ministry of Tourism and TNZ in 2004 indicated that 20 per cent of all those who travel from overseas have a Māori cultural experience while in New Zealand - around 600,000 people annually based on the total visitor throughput of 2.4 million (Colmar Brunton 2004). This figure has remained consistent with visitor arrivals at 2.466 million in the year ended December 2007 (TNZ 2008).

Indigenous culture is viewed by tourists as a major ‘point of difference’ in the total experience of a destination (McIntosh and Ryan 2007: 77) and international visitors to New Zealand are displaying a strong inclination to experience, and participate in, Māori cultural activities and events in this country. Research shows 46 per cent of international visitors visited sites important to Māori history and 45 per cent experienced Māori cultural performances (Colmar Brunton 2004). Arguably, the sorts of experiences gained by international tourists are mainly related to cultural product and performances, that is, products specifically created for commercial ends (McIntosh 2004) that have tended to rate more as ‘entertainment’ than authentic cultural experience (Barnett 2001; Taylor 2001; Tahana and Opperman 1998). Marae stays were identified as having low participation although tourists indicated a strong desire to experience such product. Lack of awareness and perceived lack of comfort and ‘fear of the unknown’ were governing issues. According to Smith (2003) the fact that tourists want to interact with traditions and lifestyles of indigenous peoples itself strengthens their position however, changing patterns of consumption and diversifying typologies of the cultural tourist pose challenges to indigenous people whose future economic development also encompasses caring for the economic welfare of their people at the same time as protecting their culture. Cultural protection is deeply embedded within historical legacies (Clydesdale 2007) which impact on contemporary economic development and the realities of a globalised and consumer-driven world. Marae stays are a potentially viable addition to the cultural experience for visitors, but internal issues are also problematic in sustaining
this as a ‘commercial’ operation – e.g. tangihanga would take preference over a tour group booking and might jeopardize the ‘reputation’ of such a product in being able to consistently cater to market demand.

The CEO of New Zealand’s most visited cultural attraction in Rotorua, Te Puia, made comment at the 2006 Hawaii Tourism Conference that, ‘A destination can gain significant leverage from its indigenous culture, and you can earn both mana and money from successful cultural tourism’ (TNZ *Tourism News* 2006: 5). In this statement the CEO encompasses an attitude of economical status derived from the commercialisation of Māori culture; no doubt influenced by the past and present involvement of Te Arawa in Rotorua’s tourism industry. This comment also mirrors those of Ngai Tahu with regard to combining culture and commerce in corporate style ‘iwi politics’. As discussed in Chapter One Ngai Tahu finalised a Treaty settlement of 179 million dollars in 1997 with the Crown as redress for past injustices (Goodall 2005; O’Regan 2001; Walker 2004) and the iwi has invested heavily in tourism. They now operate ten mainstream tourism products in both the North and South Islands including such internationally recognised ventures as Whale Watch Kaikoura, and Shotover Jet. The diversity of the businesses includes boating experiences, guided walks and eco tourism ventures in some of the most spectacular locations in New Zealand. Ngai Tahu’s CEO Anake Goodall advocates the iwi’s strong tribal development model based on economies progresses mana motuhake for members and does not see a separation between ‘traditional’ Māori culture and the ‘coin economy’ (Goodall 2008). Thus, they are not binary opposites when considering tourism opportunities for existing and new Māori businesses; cultural tourism and issues of authenticity are inexplicably tied to ‘making money’ (Hodgson 2008).

Māori participation in the production of The *Demand for Māori Cultural Tourism* Report represents a postcolonial stance in that it researched the market rather than ‘assuming’ Māori expectations. However, some criticism is warranted in that ‘colonial discourse’ is echoed in the way Māori culture is still Othered. The NTO has constructed a particular
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image and identity that is distinctly New Zealand based on attention to promoting ‘Māori culture’ as ‘New Zealand culture’ and our pristine landscape as “100% Pure” (TNZ 2005). It is more ‘recognisable’ from an international visitor’s perspective if it is ‘dressed’ as Māori – ‘a unique people with a unique culture that is very different from the visitor’s own life at home’ (Colmar Brunton 2004: 18). Thus, fragments of particular Māori culture has been used to represent a generalised, authentic “Māoriness”, detached from any specific tribal traditions and bears the mark of essentialised authenticity (Bell 2004).

This comment from the report not only reflects power structures inherent in colonial ideologies, but also serves to enforce a dependence on Māori as a tourist commodity. The need for an “Otherness” to boost the country’s appeal has been advocated to lie in the promotion of culture. Thus, Māori culture has been identified as the major ‘unique selling point’ that differentiates New Zealand from the rest of the world. But being Other contains many problems and paradoxes in relations to the tourism experience according to Hall (2007). The promoted Otherness of Māori to portray a ‘unique’ dimension of New Zealand culture in the international marketplace is at odds with everyday Māori life – in which, the wearing of grass skirts, for example, would be seen as most unusual (Hall 2007: 316). Overt cultural representations of Otherness for the benefit of tourists reinforces stereotypes – which are hard to re-negotiate over time. Such Othering also neglects the adaptive nature of Māori culture to global influences. Although this marketing gives a strong sense of a Māori ‘identity’ within New Zealand’s cultural framework as a whole, this is problematic in terms of differentiating their product and promoting tribal differences within the regions. The need to distinguish this ‘product’ further also lies in recognising the diversity within Māori culture. Failure to do so perpetuates a homogenous image of Māori as Other rather than as collective groupings with differences that distinguish regional identities.

The use of the descriptor ‘unique’ is worth discussing in relation to Bhabha’s concept of mimicry. Its use echoes colonial discourse whereby the West constructed the ‘Other’ as a body of knowledge that served to tell non-Western cultures the ‘truth’ about themselves
in a way which is congenial to the West (Childs and Williams 1997: 100). According to Bhabha ‘colonial mimicry is the desire for a reformed, recognisable Other, as a subject of a difference that is almost the same, but not quite’ (2002: 114). Mimicry is seen as a ‘double articulation’, a complex strategy of reform that “appropriates” the Other as it visualises power. But it is also a term taken up by many Māori tourism stakeholders when promoting Māori culture as a ‘unique selling point’ within New Zealand’s national tourism image. Thus, there is a need to ‘break down’ this descriptor to more fully appreciate the specificity of Māori culture. Therefore, regional differences between kin groups could not only be a major platform for product differentiation, but serve to renegotiate the ‘bi-cultural’ image of Māori within the discourse of New Zealand tourism.

*Te Ahu Mai* was based on extensive primary research among both domestic and international (actual and potential) travellers to New Zealand. A key result from the report identified travellers who are actually able to experience Māori cultural products tend to rate them much more favourably than products of other indigenous cultures elsewhere in the world, and that overall satisfaction with Māori cultural offerings tended to be highest where there was physical and emotional involvement with the particular activity being experienced (Colmar Brunton 2004). But there remains a dichotomy of difference between international and domestic markets in terms of interest in Māori tourism product. That is not surprising given the close spatial proximity (Ryan 2002) New Zealanders have to Māori culture and our often ‘fraught’ historical colonial relations that creates a polarity of identity politics. Whilst 32 per cent of international visitors surveyed in the *Te Ahu Mai* report had visited a marae, only 3 per cent of domestic travellers did the same, and, whilst 45 per cent of international travellers surveyed had attended a Māori cultural performance, only 2 per cent of domestic travellers had done likewise (McIntosh and Ryan 2007: 75). The domestic market is then an important ‘potential’ contributor to Māori tourism, if product and image can be ‘re-worked’ to attract them. It may be that more contemporary experiences (e.g. urban-based product), or product based on eco/adventure style experiences that infuse a Māori cultural component will attract local New Zealanders.
Te Ahu Mai identified New Zealanders being ‘out of touch’ with our cultural offerings, often relying upon their perceived knowledge. In terms of providing visitors with knowledgeable advice about where to experience New Zealand culture, local New Zealanders need to be more aware themselves of what happens at a regional level. In particular, Māori ‘culture’ per se is not always experienced as a cultural performance at a traditional Māori place (e.g. Rotorua). Māori cultural offerings in the regions can be experienced via a diverse range of products – fishing, farm-stays, eco/nature walks and tours, rafting, jet-boating, mountain-biking, whale watching, museums, arts & crafts, cuisine/restaurants, and music/hip-hop. Thus, relationships between culture and tourism arguably remain inadequately understood by the tourism industry, and the agencies and authorities involved in the development of tourism. The New Zealand tourism industry in some cases also needs to develop a better understanding of the cultural identities of its host communities and offerings. The result is likely to be a better level of understanding between host-guest relations and tourism policies and products that reflect and promote distinctive characteristics and place identities (Robinson et al. 2000).

Ryan and Huyton (2002) argue that the way forward for indigenous tourism product in commercial terms is to offer more “mainstream” product but use indigenous culture as the “added extra”. There is merit in this comment and it is evidenced by such existing mainstream product offered by Ngai Tahu’s products. The “added-value” concept may broaden the visitor experience and their knowledge of Māori culture however this would be at the risk of maintaining control and management over cultural integrity and the specificity of kin group identity. In a postcolonial view it could position Māori as the ‘junior partner’ (O’Sullivan 2007) in a controlling mechanism that ‘speaks for all’. It also affects the opportunity to fully portray Māori identity in a regional context; that is being particular to Tangata Whenua of that region.

Te Ahu Mai had two main deficiencies. Firstly, the Māori cultural products that formed the basis of the Report were limited in scope. Popular activities such as eco/nature tourism and adventure activities are not included. These activities often form the basis of a Māori tourism product connected with rural land resources and that remain an inherent
part of Māori whakapapa and identity. Analysis of a broader range of products would therefore gain a better understanding of the nature of supply and demand issues regarding development of Māori tourism. Secondly, the report failed to take into consideration the supply/demand issues on a regional basis, as Māori tourism differs not only by kin group but also in its tourism development stage. The diversity of resources in the regions, particularly tribal differences amongst Māori mean that demand and supply issues are likely to be quite different compared with a ‘national’ perspective and highlights different narratives at national versus local/regional levels.

There are currently over 350 Māori tourism businesses in operation throughout New Zealand (NZMTC 2006). Of note, 37 per cent of these products are guided tours and illustrate the move away from ‘hangi and performance’ based products. According to the NZMTC national customer satisfaction surveys conducted by TNZ have been based on a rather narrow view of Māori products and services (NZMTC 2006). In fact, Te Ahu Mai lacked inclusion of the broad spectrum of available Māori cultural products, focusing primarily on ‘mainstream’ products such as Māori cultural performances, music concerts, historical sites, marae visits and souvenirs. Although these represent the core attractions that most visitors recognise and seek out, if Māori tourism is to reach its full capacity, then attention to the diversity of product and regional differences need to be taken into account.

Tourism is an important and increasingly significant driver of cultural remaking and reinvention. Broader shifts in the structure and organisation of the tourism industry (moral and ethical issues, concerns about preserving the environment) have also changed the relationship between consumers and producers of tourism products, and ‘how the meanings of the tourist experience are negotiated by various agencies’ (Squire 1994: 8). New meanings can be created through promotion of cultural diversity; for Māori tourism operators that potential is connected to regional identity at the “grass-roots” level.
3.6 Māori Tourism: Regional and National Context

It could be argued that Māori tourism has been subject to the ‘dual discourse’ of biculturalism that has rarely matched the lofty rhetoric associated with the promise. Fleras and Spoonley (1999) criticise government for paying ‘lip service’ to Treaty principles without acknowledging the reality of taha Māori as an integral part of a post-colonising Aotearoa. This comment also has relevance in a tourism context whereby concerns of Māori over equity and control in the industry have gone largely unheeded. Maguire (2003: 199) notes ‘for nearly 160 years Pākehā have been driving the bus and telling the history ... a mono-cultural history that has shaped, built, and maintained our institutions thus keeping inequality deeply rooted in behaviour, culture, practice, and outcomes’. The view behind this comment is that the Treaty offers change to this process. Māori demand institutional change and recognition of their values within the partnership agreement the Treaty advocates. The re-presentation (by Māori) of Māori tourism product offers a re-inscribing of taha Māori as an integral part of national tourism discourse. This inherently links with the regional perspective of “grass-roots” Māori tourism as a key driver of this process. Comments from a research participant at TPK with over 30 years experience in Māori tourism, was that:

Māori identity – is still being manipulated through government processes. Treaty claims and tribal resources are making Māori “pawns of politics”… those kinds of things can direct focus away from economic development (in the regions). The focus of national has to be regional – they reflect the “legs of the table”. The regional development of Māori tourism needs to be the driver of what is happening at the national level. If it loses focus of its own people – the legs fall off.

The importance of the Treaty, for Māori tourism development, was also voiced by the CEO of the NZMTC at a conference at Otago University in December 2006. He stated:

The development path chosen by New Zealand Māori for their participation in tourism focuses on the retention of their tikanga or traditional values and achieving mutually beneficial results through their key Treaty relationship with government and through their business relationships with tourism industry stakeholders (Edmonds 2006).
The development of Māori Regional Tourism Organisations (MRTOs) over the past decade indicates the desire and need for Māori representation at a regional level (TNZ 2001). MRTOs are self-identified collectives of mainly Māori tourism operators in a particular region and at June 2007 there were 11 operational MRTOs (Figure 3.1). MRTOs originally needed support of iwi to start with and, according to one research participant I spoke to, considered themselves as ‘iwi-based’ organisations. After one year they had evolved to operator based but in order to get funding from TPK they needed to see that it had iwi ‘buy in’. Thus, they were manipulated by government-defined policies of iwi-only identity and criteria ‘set’ by government as to who administers services to Māori. Notably however is that some iwi don’t have resources to back tourism. As commented to me by an MRTO interviewee “the iwi (in this region) are focused on land claims and will invest money in aquaculture or agriculture, tourism is not a focus for them”. It is also pertinent to note Te Awekotuku’s assessment of tourism on Te Arawa kin of Rotorua over 25 years ago, ‘in the final analysis, accept, acknowledge, and assess the opportunities offered by tourism development, and above all, never be afraid to reject them, or those aspects of them that are incompatible, offensive or undesirable (1981: 286)’.
3.1 MRTO Map


MRTOs’ key functions include facilitating co-ordination and co-operation amongst members, educating members about the industry, providing network opportunities, working with Regional Tourism Organisations (RTOs) to ensure Māori tourism operators are well represented in the RTO’s marketing and product development activities. RTOs are funded by local government for marketing and promotion of regional tourism (MOT 2008). In 2001 the Government provided one million dollars to help MRTOs define and implement their strategic directions administered through TPK who established the Māori Regional Tourism Programme (KCSM 2004). TPK’s role also included helping MRTOs develop and strengthen their relationships with RTOs, however tensions have arisen.
between the two entities. MRTOs want to develop partnerships with RTOs but many have voiced concern over maintaining control of their organisations and differing perspectives between Pākehā and Māori values. Strong views by various Māori tourism operators are evidence of the tensions between these regional structures voiced in TPK’s Evaluation of the Māori Regional Tourism Programme Report (2004):

“Every time we talk strategically, the non-Māori operators get very threatened. The non-Māori attitude to Māori product is poor – they don’t even understand what the product is”

“The RTO is more for Tourism New Zealand and mainstream tourist operators – they need to leave Māori tourism to have its own spaces. This is a fundamental. We haven’t been allowed to lead, to develop the Māori product”.

“The Pākehā operators will continue to control things (if we don’t have our own organisation) – and we will stay the bus drivers and the haka performers. (A Māori package) is the only way for us to gain some control. (In this region), these Pākehā don’t give a stuff about us – they just want to exploit us – they just want to line their pockets. We want (the local iwi) to have a say in their own cultural tourism”.

Source: Evaluation of the Māori Regional Tourism Programme (KCSM 2004)

There are obvious cross-cultural tensions inherent in these remarks and Māori are advocating a much stronger role in developing and controlling their product. This is manifest in the third comment whereby the operator feels Māori are stereotyped into ‘labour-based’ employees that do not reap the benefits from their cultural product. However, there are also tensions between Māori within these structures. For example, the instability of the East Cape membership caused by differences between iwi in the region affected cohesive development and establishment of a sustainable MRTO. Tribal differences offer a platform for Māori product development, but as the MTTF Report reminded us ‘divisions and rivalries within Māori communities inhibit individual and group initiatives (1987: 11) and thus disrupt strategic policy. Although some RTOs and
MRTOS are working collaboratively and positively together there remain tensions between the levels of organisation (i.e. operator/regional/national bodies) reiterated by these comments about TIANZ, the national organisation who represent industry personnel:

“For us, TIANZ is a key, but a non-event for Māori Tourism…TIANZ talks about being connected to Tourism Strategy 2010 – all except for Māori”.
(MRTO Executive Officer)

“The Ministry of Tourism and Tourism New Zealand have changed strategically, but TIANZ remains a big challenge – major changes need to happen there”.
(Tourism Operator)

Source: Evaluation of the Māori Regional Tourism Programme (KCSM 2004)

As a result, The Ministry of Tourism undertook a study in 2005 entitled ‘Fostering Improved Relationships between MRTOs and RTOs’ aimed at developing guidelines for better working relationships between these organisations and formed part of the Ministry’s commitment under the NZTS 2010. As commented by one research participant from TNZ there is a “different kaupapa” between MRTOs and RTOs and highlights the different value systems inherent in Māori Pākehā relations. Another research participant stated:

“There is (still) a lack of understanding by the RTO about Māori tourism. The initial objective of the NZTS 2010 was for RTO to ‘lead’ marketing and promotion of regions. Mainstream tourism may not ‘do the job’. In contrast MRTOs feel only Māori can fully understand and implement strategies for growth of Māori tourism. Identity is a problematic issue between these two groups – RTOs don’t “understand Māori identity” they “don’t get it”.”
The NZTS 2015 advocates ongoing strengthening of the RTO/MRTO relationship reiterated in the following recommendation to:

Strengthen relationships between Regional Tourism Organisations and Māori Regional Tourism Organisations to maximise the development of Māori tourism product that reinforces regional differentiation and meets visitor demand (TNZ 2006: 24)

However, during my interviews with industry personnel tensions were raised about the current structures such as MRTOs in place for Māori tourism. There were some long-term established MRTOs already in regions such as Rotorua/Taupo, Northland, and Auckland. Conclusions from TPK’s Evaluation Report note that ‘the reality is that for most of them they have relied on the volunteer services and the assistance of individuals who are active in the tourism industry’ (2004: 43) and that sustainability of MRTOs was problematic. Comments to me from a TPK representative support this view:

MRTOs were created without strategic thought. They (TPK) dangled a carrot … but some regions didn’t have product there – better to have concentrated on the core regions (e.g. Rotorua, Northland, Auckland, Te Ara a Maui and Ngai Tahu) and build from existing infrastructure and strengths from these established regions. These groups are not sustainable in this form … the current forms were confusing structures – they look the same as Pākehā!

This research participant’s expectation was that the wider MRTO structures will probably reduce in number to a core of four or five entities, stating ‘motivation comes from those who want to be organised, co-ordinated and proactive’ (e.g. Rotorua). Similar views were voiced by a Rotorua tourism operator I interviewed, involved with marketing a well established Māori tourism product, stating ‘MRTO’s were born out of necessity … it breaks and fragments the Māori tourism sector into smaller pieces … it fragments the whole pie. There’s not enough strength in this strategy’. Their view was one that built on the ‘heroes’ of Māori tourism – these provided the ambition ‘to grow the pie’. They saw growth from successful Māori businesses such as Whalewatch Kaikoura, Te Puia, Tamaki Tours and the Waitangi Trust.
What such comments reveal is the differing opinions amongst Māori on the ‘best way forward’ for regional and national development and that Māori tourism would progress ‘on its own self-determined path’ led by the success of ‘iconic’ operations. There is risk for further ‘homogenising’ the product by not taking into account the distinction that derives from kin identity as linked to land resources. It also offers benefits for the most important component of Māori culture – the whānau. This aligns with TNZ’s aim to ‘support iwi and hapu who are considering the role they may play in working with the tourism sector in the development of iwi and hapu management plans’ (TNZ 2006: 50).

Research participants who were small owner operators were of mixed opinion about MRTOs, commenting that they did not receive much ‘input or assistance’ from them and that they viewed them as ‘superfluous’. Primarily these “grass-roots” operators are focused on ‘surviving day to day’ and wider issues at regional and national level are viewed ‘at a distance’. One Northland operator stated: “MRTOs are too structured and dominated by the ‘industry’. They are fragmented and not doing much for their operators”.

Relationships and representation for Māori has however improved with the establishment of a national body for Māori tourism. In 2004 MRTOs formed the New Zealand Māori Tourism Council (NZMTC), integrating operational, regional and national Māori tourism entities with a common goal of creating successful and sustainable businesses. The establishment of the NZMTC brings a collective voice for Māori to the table of national tourism whilst still retaining a strong focus on grass-roots individual tourism operators. Although initiated by MRTOs, government has played an important and supportive role during its establishment. One of the key objectives of TPK’s Evaluation Programme was to ‘promote the interests of Māori tourism within key organisations’ (2004: iv). The NZMTC has now established formal relationships, including advisory roles, with nine national bodies relevant to the tourism industry including the MOT, TNZ, TPK, TIANZ, Inbound Tour Operators’ Council, Aviation Travel and Tourism Training Organisation, Qualmark and the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) (Carr 2007). A
number of government organisations employ Māori staff at upper management level enhancing Māori Tourism interests by providing strategic input into policy and product development, marketing and promotion, education and training. There has also been support and mentoring available to Māori tourism businesses through the Māori Business Facilitation Service administered through TPK.

The NZMTC framework endorses the philosophy of a ‘bottom up’ approach to its management and recognises that investment in Māori human capital is critical to both Māori and the general New Zealand economy. The framework for this relationship is a unique concept – depicted as an inverted pyramid with Māori operators at the ‘top’ and the Council at the ‘bottom’ (Figure 3.2). This model has been mooted as a potential tool for other indigenous peoples involved in tourism whereby the strength of this organisational model is that “ownership” lies with Māori businesses and both regional and national organisations are motivated by the needs of the businesses.

Figure 3.2   NZMTC Framework 2007

Associate Minister of Tourism, Dover Samuels, comments that the foundation of the NZMTC acts as ‘one voice for Māori in tourism’ (NZMTC 2005: 2). One of the main
challenges for Māori tourism says Mr Samuels is ‘to increase the industries’ understanding of how Māori tourism is evolving and can add value for everyone’ (NZMTC 2006). This discourse advocates a greater appreciation (by Pākehā) of Māori cultural identity (and therefore diversity) and its contribution to the economical benefits of tourism (for both). If focus is on broadening the ‘understanding’ that Māori offer particular points of difference for example, through tribal diversity, this counters the more homogenously promoted imagery of the past. Control of this presentation by Māori is however a critical aspect of their role in ‘adding value’ to New Zealand tourism. One of the key issues the NZTS 2015 highlighted under the heading Growing Māori Tourism was:

Māori tourism adds a rich dimension to both the domestic and international visitor experience and creates a vital point of difference for New Zealand. Potential lies in building greater levels of participation by Māori in the sector – not just in offering product and experiences that are traditionally viewed as Māori but in infusing cultural elements across the full range of tourism product (NZTS 2006: 22)

This statement focuses on building Māori capacity within the national framework and that ‘traditional’ Māori tourism requires change in its delivery mechanisms. However, the key element in this proposal will be that Māori conceptualise this delivery and Māori represent this delivery if issues such as cultural integrity and ownership are to be safeguarded. Given the concern from Māori tourism operators that Māori culture has often been presented by Pākehā without their permission this would create ongoing problems between Māori and Pākehā stakeholders. The risk of control of the product and its ‘authenticity’ in terms of presenting a particular perspective as attached to Tangata Whenua counters this with the opportunity to promote the diversity of Māori culture in the regions.

Establishment of the NZMTC has been a significant factor for progressing Māori tourism development. Without a national body for Māori tourism, the Māori ‘image’ would continue to be further exploited and controlled within western paradigms of governance.
The ad hoc policies and approaches to establishing similar organisations during the late 1980s and 1990s failed in its attempts to consolidate Māori tourism as a whole. Arguably, lack of funding (at Crown level) was a major factor, but it also reflected the lack of power through devolution and the inability of Māori to influence policy. The creation of a viable trade association such as the NZMTC and MRTOs has enabled operators to manage their industry collectively and have a voice to negotiate with government and other sectors of the tourist industry. It is however important these structures do not lose focus of the ‘legs of the table’. The establishment of these structures for Māori tourism mean Māori have ‘entered the game’ and intend to be ‘key players’. This challenges bicultural ideology to make way for a more equitable partnership; one that incorporates non-colonial relationships. Increased self-determination by Māori at local, regional and national level will undoubtedly reveal a variety of different voices and perspectives.

The progress to date for Māori tourism has been great – but will rely on increased diversity to create a strong regional and thus, national product. Although there is a ‘national voice’ for Māori tourism, the Māori ‘voice’ in tourism is as diverse as its own cultural structure. The interplay between local, regional and national structures within New Zealand’s tourism industry is affected by the wider political and economic structures inherent in a democratic society.

3.7 Re-evaluating Māori Tourism

The difficulty in defining Māori tourism arises when trying to incorporate different perspectives into one concept (MOT 2004: Appendix A). New Zealand’s Ministry of Tourism use two categories when analysing Māori tourism statistics: ‘Māori in Tourism’ and ‘Māori Cultural Tourism’. ‘Māori Cultural Tourism’ is defined as those tourist experiences that include visits, activities and stories that incorporate some or all of the following elements: Māori history, lifestyle, land, customs and performances, spiritual values, arts and crafts, heritage and language (Colmar Brunton 2004). The former relates
to Māori people involved in the whole tourism industry, while the latter relates specifically to tourism activities involving Māori culture. Tourism products that incorporate all or some of these elements are considered to be Māori cultural tourism products. I adopt both categories to analyse an ‘inclusiveness’ of Māori tourism as I perceive it. In order to examine the complexities of Māori identity, one cannot be divorced from the other and play a dichotomous role in terms of discovering new subjectivities that emerge within postcolonial contexts. As such these aspects influenced the choice of operations I selected for site visits and case studies, all of which incorporate some Māori cultural experience (e.g. commentary on Māori history, tikanga, stories and legends of the area, interpretation, Māori pōwhiri/welcome) combined with tourism activities such as guided tours, adventure activities, nature or ecotourism and involvement of Māori owners and staff.

There have been numerous attempts at defining Māori tourism (AMTF 1996; Barnett 1997, 2001; Ingram 1997; Keelan 1996; Pohorama et al. 1998; The Stafford Group 2001) ranging from broad descriptions to more specific. Definitions included either aspects of contact with Māori culture, control of the business and interpretation of the product by Māori and Māori ownership of the business/product. Ingram (1997: 2) focuses on the importance of natural and cultural resources when defining Māori tourism as ‘tourism products and operations that utilise cultural, historical, heritage, or natural resources that are uniquely Māori with substantial Māori ownership and control of the business’. She further expands her description by separating the Māori tourism product into one that is either a unique cultural experience (such as hangi or kapahaka) or Māori arts and crafts and one that is a Māori owned business which provides a unique Māori perspective and cultural interpretation. Given the diverse range of product emerging over the past decade, Māori tourism is much broader than Ingram’s description, but the holistic components in her main definition are still very relevant to development of contemporary product.

A review by McIntosh et al. (2004) of published literature concluded that there is no single definition of Māori tourism or a Māori tourism business or product however, two
main themes emerged: those being a focus on control of the business and the nature of the Māori tourism product. Butler and Hinch (1996: 5) also identified these two themes in their earlier edition of *Tourism and Indigenous Peoples* when defining indigenous tourism. But, according to McIntosh *et al.* (2004) the level of description offered by Butler and Hinch still lacks a culturally acceptable perspective and fails to capture the more qualitative, culturally *value*-based criteria such as maintaining the integrity of the Māori culture, benefits to the community and environment and sustainability (Cloher 1998; Cloher and Johnston 1999).

A values-based approach to Māori tourism is important for retaining cultural identity and to ‘avoid further misappropriation and misrepresentation of the Māori culture in tourism’ (McIntosh *et al.* 2004). It is also important for the support and promotion of sustainable Māori self-determined development not least the recognition that unique values and viewpoints are distinguishing features of most indigenous tourism operations and risks of succumbing to pressures of dominant western economic ideology can impact on these objectives. McIntosh *et al.* (2004) have coined the term “Māori-centred tourism” to portray their notion of values-based criteria. Due to a ‘lack of an agreed or recognised working definition of Māori tourism’ the concept of Māori-centred tourism defines specific characteristics in a ‘koru spiral of values’ (Figure 3.3) that aims to avoid essentialising Māori and Māori culture.
Fundamental to the concept of Māori-centred tourism is the integration of commerce and culture. The symbolic ‘koru spiral of values’ allows Māori tourism to position itself within local/regional and national spatial constructs which may overlap, intertwine, or work alongside each other. Framed within a Kaupapa Māori approach this concept revealed a number of Māori values, supported and endorsed by a majority of MRTOs. These values are not seen in isolation nor do they represent a hierarchy of values but are viewed as a dynamic set of relationships. These values are summarised as follows:

- **Wairuatanga** (state of being spiritual)
- **Whānaungatanga** (relationship, kinship)
- **Nga matatini Māori** (Māori diversity)
- **Kaitiakitanga** (guardianship)
- **Manaakitanga** (warm hospitality)
- **Tino Rangatiratanga** (self-determination)
- **Kotahitanga** (unity, solidarity)
- **Tuhuno** (principle of alignment)
- **Purotu** (principle of transparency)
- **Puawaitanga** (principle of best outcomes)
Māori approaches to development do not recognise clear sectoral demarcations between social, cultural and economic areas (Loomis 1999). An important factor is that Māori-centred tourism is based on whakapapa i.e., that it “deliberately revolves around Māori people, Māori assets and Māori priorities” (Durie, 2002: 6). As an inherent component of Māori whakapapa - values are related to regional resources and kin group identity. The negotiation of resource access and use for Māori tourism development are fundamentally linked to Māori epistemology and by association the marae as the ‘repository of all the historical things, of all the traditions, all the mythology and other things which make up the intangibles of Māoriness’ (Rangihau 1975: 226). Tourism products then become regionally specific to kin group collectivity and individuality. As John Rangihau comments on “Being Māori” – ‘there are so many different aspects about every tribal person. Each tribe has its own history. And it’s not a history that can be shared among others (i.e. other iwi) … because I am not of those people’ (1975: 232).

It is from this point that my research contributes to previous literature by suggesting the concept of hybridity as also relevant to defining Māori tourism. The ‘dynamic’ relationships portrayed within the koru spiral expose ‘layers’ of cultural identity and narrative; bound to Māori epistemology. The particular value most representative of this is nga matatini Māori in which tribal differences create regionally diverse subcultures and representations of Māori, thus extending conceptualisation of Māori tourism to include the diversity of kin group identity in representing the ‘product’ as a whole. This also places emphasis on the postcolonial nature of this diversity in order to promote the differing responses to colonial practices that have otherwise ‘defined’ Māori tourism within a bicultural context.

The cultural malleability of Māori as evidenced through adaptation to colonial practice reveals Māori culture as an ‘imaginative process’ (Bhabha 1994) one that, by its ‘lived experience’ allows a multiplicity of emergent identities to evolve. Meredith rightly points out that ‘the last 200 odd years of contact and colonisation cannot be written out of the “Māori” subject’s narrative, nor can the impinging forces of globalisation’ (1998: 13).
Thus, the past is reconstituted, revisited and realised in partial, incomplete ways (Hall 1996). In this, what is produced is a hybridised cultural theory that includes giving recognition to the impact of the broad range of New Zealand and global experiences that influence its makeup; shape its expression and challenge its existence (Meredith 1998). This in turn disrupts the notion of Other if we look at the idea of authenticity as relational. Identities can no longer be stable and Self/Other relationships are a matter of power and discourse, rather than cultural ‘essence’ (Clifford 1988, 1997). Traditional culture becomes newly syncretised as part of an inevitable ongoing process. This is part of global interconnectedness and challenges traditional ways of viewing culture and subjects and mixing new and vibrant syncretised and hybrid amalgamations (Bhabha 1994; Pieterse 2004). The ‘colonised’ have more to gain from histories that challenge the concept of identity than from histories that sustain the illusion of a unified subject (Maxwell 1994). Thus, hybridity reveals culture as uncertain, ambivalent and open to the future, and resists unitary and ethnocentric notions of diversity.

One example of a Māori tourism operation that reworks the grand narrative of colonial discourse between Māori and Pākehā is a newly developed attraction in Christchurch – the Tamaki Heritage Village. This product has been designed to ‘deliver their story of the impact of European culture on Māori’ (Coventry 2007). Owner Mike Tamaki states:

It is not about right or wrong, or finger pointing. It is a sensitive story that shares some of the realities of this period in our history – the real impacts, issues and challenges faced by our ancestors … It draws upon the battles our people faced, internal battles mostly. It is about the conflict between hapu, iwi and families and the consequences of those wanting to hold fast to the ancient ways and those who seized the new Pākehā ways. (Coventry 2007: 2).

The cultural performance (Coleman and Crang 2002; Edensor 1998; Rakena 2007) presented by the ‘actors’ are signifiers of past identities, linked to, and re-interpreted through their actions as contemporary Māori. As a counter-narrative it allows visitors to experience the diverse impacts that colonisation in New Zealand had on Māori – from a Māori perspective. We might ask does such performance perpetuate binary oppositions
of colonialism. Or does it allow Māori tourism operators to be viewed as multiple narrators – as simultaneously social selves affected by collective discourses and subjective selves creatively going beyond socially dominating narratives (Oliveira 2005). They construct their own narratives and themselves by means of narrating (Archakis and Tzanne 2005; Braid 1995; Connelly and Clandinen 1990; Currie 1998; Fulford 1999; King 2005; Reeves 2004; Schnell 2003); as a result they represent multiple subjectivities.

The cultural director at the village, Awatea Edwin, stresses this tourism experience is an ‘authentic southern expression of (Māori) culture…as we say in the story, we’ve been waiting more than 150 years to tell our story. We don’t just mean that as Māori, but we mean that really specifically as people in the south’ (Christchurch City Libraries (CCL) 2007). As the southernmost iwi, Ngai Tahu are seeking to re-emerge from the ‘European cultures that came over the top of us, but then when it became trendy to be Māori again, it was the northern culture that came over’ (CCL 2007: 3). They are keen to celebrate the ‘nowness’ of Māori culture through the ‘reality and closeness to the true ways of what happened’. Such processes are produced in the articulation of cultural differences. Edwin sums up the collective and the particular in the following comment, illustrating their point of difference through attachment to place:

We’ll tell the stories that will echo this environment, but will resonate throughout the whole country because they are not different around the country in terms of the basic story, but the nuances and the particulars (my emphasis) make them unique to the place you’re in.

The ‘koru spiral of values’ reinforces the need to examine Māori tourism product within a holistic framework that combines both natural and cultural dimensions. Values as attached to Māori culture also acknowledge that Māori culture is fluid and evolves within the context of socio-economic influences (Zygadlo et. al. 2001). Thus, contemporary representation of Māori tourism may reflect resistance to essentialising Māori and Māori culture. Recognising that Māori culture is tribal and that Māori identity and society is dynamic, an inclusive definition of Māori tourism must be careful not to risk assuming a stereotype “Māori identity” (McIntosh et al. 2004). However, an important determining
factor in providing a quality Māori tourism experience will rely on more than the person ‘being Māori’. For many operators it will also draw on their interpretation of tikanga and whakapapa as identity-forming concepts in which to (re)present Māori culture and identity in a postmodern and postcolonial context. The contribution of tikanga Māori need not fix culture in a static worldview, but offers new practices and protocols based on traditional values used in contemporary ways. Thus, ‘contemproising’ culture from a Māori perspective can be one avenue for re-presentation that goes beyond traditional stereotypes and images that have prevailed as part of national and Eurocentric representation of Māori culture.

The other value that has relevance to a postcolonial conceptualisation is that of tino rangatiratanga. As a self determining practice this value links with issues of control, authenticity, protecting cultural integrity, and asserting rights for ownership of resources for tourism development under the Treaty of Waitangi. These two values are detailed more fully in Table 3.1 in order to appreciate the multi-varied layers that makeup these dimensions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Principles</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *Nga Matatini Māori* (Māori diversity) | • Belonging to traditional and/or non-traditional Māori tourism organisations  
  • Representing the diversity of Māori culture in the Māori tourism product  
  • Acknowledging that Māori tourism development is tribally and regionally specific  
  • Expressing hapu/iwi identity through the product  
  • Allowing for different types of Māori tourism development strategy  | • Recognition of diverse Māori structures  
  • A more reflective portrayal of Māori culture in the product  
  • Recognition of tribal and regional diversity in Māori tourism  
  • Acknowledgement of the different social/commercial realities of Māori development |

| Tino rangatiratanga (self-determination) | • Controlling the process of tourism development (i.e. the decision-making process)  
  • Controlling commercial / economical independence  
  • Controlling the representation of Māori culture in tourism – accountability and authenticity  
  • Asserting Treaty of Waitangi rights for ownership of resources for tourism development  | • Ownership of the business (or partnerships with non-Māori) and management  
  • Self-determined tourism development  
  • Protection of cultural integrity and the tourism product  
  • Determination of authenticity of Māori tourism product  
  • Expression of ‘constitutional ownership’ under the Treaty of Waitangi |

Table 3.1  Values of Māori-centred Tourism  
Source. McIntosh (2004)

The definition and use of Māori culture in the tourism industry is increasingly being directed and influenced by Māori at both regional and national level. There is a need to reflect Māori cultural values through more interactive and collaborative relationships with the national tourism organisation and other industry stakeholders. Thus, emotional
capital is recognised as an important asset for Māori tourism development. Emotional capital and social/cultural capital (the latter includes institutions, legal codes, governance, networks, values, shared worldviews, traditional ecological knowledge) are intrinsic to Māori identity. Loomis (1999: 8) has identified social/cultural capital as an essential foundation for Māori self-determined development stating that, ‘indigenous people actually identify and value social/cultural capital as a vital resource … to conceptualise and accomplish their own self-determined development’. As such the concept of Kaupapa Māori development develops and strengthens this concept – basing development on traditional values and norms.

In a cultural context we need to remember that as a dynamic construct, culture changes. Māori culture prior to colonisation was not static, nor is it today. Māori culture was forced to negotiate the forces of colonialism and imperialism; it has been negotiating these forces and relationships ever since (Hoskins 2000). Māori are also complicit in representing themselves as other in their own marketing practices. But we may argue the representation by the other of the other works from within different discursive frames. Re-evaluating Māori tourism in a postcolonial context allows for more wide-ranging investigations into power relations which recognises complex differentiations within cultural relations and the uneven institutionalisation of the dominant Pākehā hegemony (Ashcroft 1995; Gandhi 1998). This has important policy implications for Māori tourism in New Zealand and highlights the incompatibility of current public policy on business and economic development with aspirations of Māori self-determined development. Thus, postcolonialism critiques the inequalities of marginalised groups through the structure of power relations and attempts to deconstruct this position within the more complicated dynamics of agency and subjectivities that give hope for a more optimistic, inclusionary inter-cultural politics of hybridity, relationships and possibility (Meredith 1998). This shifts relations from a bi-cultural stance to an inter-cultural one that is transformed through acknowledging cultural diversity.
3.8 Summary

The Treaty of Waitangi has provided an organised framework for dialogue with the dominant interests of New Zealand society and of government (Tuhiwai Smith 2003: 109). As such the importance of Treaty principles has also entered the national discourse of tourism development and has become a prerequisite for dialogue between Māori and non-Māori tourism stakeholders. This chapter has discussed some of the major government and tourism reports affecting development of Māori tourism. The relationship between Māori and government has been, and continues to be, controversial, complex, challenging and significant. Much of the ‘struggles’ Māori have encountered and still encounter, is based on their political, social and economical position since 1840. Underlying many of the grievances held by Māori today is the right to Māori sovereignty (Awatere 1984; Durie 1998; Maaka and Fleras 2005; Melbourne 1995; O’Sullivan 2007; Turner 2002; Walker 1999, 2004). At its most conservative, Māori sovereignty could be interpreted as the desire for a bicultural society. But the term is complex and ambiguous and defeats single definition. Rather than something fixed or objective, sovereignty is increasingly interpreted as a social construct that is historical and contingent, as well as contextual and contested (Biersteker and Weber 1996). In this it aligns with the concept of tino rangatiratanga.

The marginalisation of Māori from many aspects of New Zealand’s political decision-making processes over the past one and a half centuries has taken its toll on Māori culture, language and identity. Tourism is an important sector that can promote and strengthen these for Māori, but it is also a site that perpetuates particular conceptualisations of place and identity. It will be critical that Māori retain control and ownership of their tourism development so that place and identity are represented in culturally diverse ways that reflect the reality of Māori life. Māori culture itself has undergone much change during the twentieth century and its ‘integration’ into western concepts of social reform. Urban Māori Authorities have emerged as strong institutions of ‘new identities’ for Māoridom claiming that they should be accorded iwi status under the Treaty. Treaty settlements are encouraging regionalism among Māori and are
increasing Māori expectations regarding access to local decision-making and their economic development.

The harsh reality of globalisation makes it difficult to ignore mainstream economic structures for many indigenous peoples involved in tourism. This also relates to the control of resources. There is growing pressure for indigenous people to capitalise on the resources inherent in their lands; Māori for example are becoming increasingly open to non-traditional uses of the land and tourism has been an acceptable ‘alternative’ for some. This may realign some of the basic values that are reflected in the way Māori relate to the land as they increasingly engage in entrepreneurship and the global economy but does not negate a sense of ‘site identity’ and attachment to place that stems from traditional values such as whakapapa. Tourism has become one avenue whereby seeking a balance between conservation and the financial rewards of development results in the maintenance and reaffirmation of indigenous control (Hinch 2004).

The importance of promoting Māori identity as a ‘point of difference’ and the need to use ‘tradition’ in creative ways has been advocated almost twenty years after the first Hui Taumata in 1984. Hui Taumata 2005 was a national hui focused on accelerating Māori economic development with a vision ‘to expand Māori economic pathways … to create, grow and succeed in our future together’ (Hui Taumata 2005: 2). This was a time to ‘reflect rest and recharge for the generations ahead’. The Hui served no political purpose but aimed to create impetus for Māori socially, economically or politically at both a local and global level. The emphasis in this Hui lay in the need to plan for the future of the Māori economy. A key difference between the 1984 Hui Taumata and that of 2005 was the ‘freedom and determination with which potential partners contributed to the Hui. There is great diversity among Māori … this diversity allows for many partnerships to be forged’ (2005: 3). One of the overarching messages that emanated from the Hui was to ‘capitalise on the exploration of Māori identity, both as a point of difference for New Zealand and an inexhaustible source of innovation and creativity’. There was a call for Māori to radically rethink what it means to be Māori, and to work to develop distinctive, innovative products. In these objectives it is clear that Māori discourse is advocating
change and adaptation, dynamism and diversity. Māori now seek choices within a context of ongoing struggle against colonising constraints. Thus, the process of decolonisation makes clear the assertion that culture is a matter of active practice and that Māori autonomy will be built on the ability to create, rather than just conserve ‘tradition’ as underpinning Māori cultural survival (Bell 2004).

Māori are negotiating within ‘third spaces’ that produce new meanings of identity and that challenge the colonial constructions of national organisations such as the tourism industry. As such, the NZTS (2010) is deemed an important guiding tool for Māori tourism at both national and regional levels. Its mid-term review has revealed much progress for Māori, although ‘gaps’ are still obvious. The Māori ‘voice’ is persisting and making strong inroads. Research at the end term of the NZTS 2015 will no doubt be a clear indicator of Māori tourism’s progress within the wider development of New Zealand’s national and global tourism position. This will require legitimate scope for autonomous Māori action driven by individual, tribal and collective identities. Tourism offers Māori an arena that reveals cultural diversity through innovative product development and that uses identities in diverse and dynamic ways. In the wider political, social and economic domain of Māori/Pākehā relations it will also require incorporation of Māori models of development and thus a change from colonially derived policies of amalgamation or integration. Several Māori iwi have already made substantial progress through property and commercial assets, investment in tourism, agriculture, fishing and aquaculture. Cultural freedom depends on economic freedom (O’Sullivan 2007).

As Māori continue to engage with global capitalism the binary interdependence with Pākehā and the Crown erodes. Traditional Māori world views are adaptable to change; colonialism and post colonialism is but one step on the road to self-determination. Māori ‘choices’ must be actively claimed by Māori. ‘Constraints’ are created by a bicultural framework. Renegotiating that bicultural relationship affords Māori a measure of representation that acknowledges their status as Tangata Whenua and also as global citizens. The construction of non-colonial relationships will rely on multiple Māori
voices to emphasise that Māori are not a homogenous body politic, and that autonomous expression encompasses many different identities.
CHAPTER FOUR

Research Methodology

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to outline my methodology within a framework that is compatible with research and indigenous peoples and to respond to the research question and objectives stated in Chapter One. My research is informed by postcolonial theory and uses an in-depth qualitative approach to study the representation of Māori culture within a tourism context. Two critical factors determine the nature of qualitative research: a focus on studying things in their natural settings – that is, in the “real world”, and studying those phenomena in all their complexity (Jennings 2001). Hence, what we study has many dimensions and layers and cannot be described in terms of an ultimate truth. If we are to offer reflexive research we must actively interpret our experiences in the field, and then question how those interpretations came about. Being reflexive about my position as a researcher and the methodological and epistemological interpretations that shape this process undoubtedly affect the research outcome.

First I will discuss my research within the context of qualitative methodology and the theoretical perspectives that have influenced my research followed by a review of the research question and objectives. I will then discuss the research design and methods and analysis of textual material that motivated my research before justifying the selection of participants, interview process and selection of study sites. The challenge for me was to identify a relevant framework to apply to selected sites and tourism operations in New Zealand. Smith’s (1996) concept of the 4Hs had been relevant to my Canadian research. Although not an indigenous framework (i.e. developed by indigenous people) it offers a framework for analysing indigenous tourism development. However, it does not offer a new perspective. Of relevance was McIntosh et al.’s (2004) and Zygadlo et al.’s (2003) koru spiral of values as unique to Māori and provided a context in which to situate Māori
tourism. The koru spiral describes values that represent key defining characteristics of a Māori-centred tourism based on Kaupapa Māori development models (Zygadlo et al. 2003, 2005). Thus, it offered a “grass-roots” perspective that was inherently connected to Māori identity and representation. However, I saw a need to address the current discourses of Māori/Pākehā tourism relations in a way that reflected the diverse realities of Māori culture. This required taking a critical perspective of biculturalism that rethinks our assumptions about culture and identity. The choice to situate my discussion in a postcolonial context and examine Bhabha’s notion of hybridity as an aspect of Māori cultural identity offered new insights to my research. I did not intend to inscribe the concept of hybridity on all Māori but to see it as a way to examine the creative, innovative and entrepreneurial role of Māori tourism operators in translating and negotiating their tribal identities in a global context. Hybridity thus offers a concept by which I can examine the diversity of Māori culture as a mix of ideas and practices.

4.1 Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is a field of inquiry in its own right and encompasses a complex, interconnected family of terms, concepts and assumptions (Denzin and Lincoln 2003). Given the scope of literature written about qualitative research I have taken the following definition of the term by Denzin and Lincoln as applicable to my research approach:

> Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible. These practices transform the world. They turn the world into a series of representations, including field notes, interviews, conversations, photographs, recordings, and memos to the self. At this level, qualitative research involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world. This means that qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them (2003: 3).

In this description the emphasis on interpretive, transform, and meanings are key elements of my research methods. If we accept that there is no one way of seeing things
then our methods need to reflect this and embrace rather than deny diversity (Moewaka Barnes 2000). The emergence of multi-method approaches in qualitative research allows for a variety of empirical methods to be combined and enables the researcher to explore a variety of ‘representations’ within a given cultural environment. This includes mixing case studies, personal experience, examining historical texts, documents and photographs, interviews and observational techniques, to make sense of, or interpret phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.

My research methodology aims to re-present Māori culture from a grass-roots perspective that realigns the centre/periphery discourse of national tourism that has marginalised Māori from much of its development. (Re)locating the ‘Māori voice’ from the margins provides access to a domain within which they can control and (re)define those images which are held up as reflections of their realities (Tuhiwai Smith 2003). This allows the principal players (i.e. Māori tourism operators) to speak of their own situations and subjectivities within the context of promoting culture in a tourism environment. In the conduct of research, researchers and scholars have the power to choose what will be made visible and what will remain hidden and to choose what will be represented and how it will be represented (Clare and Hamilton 2003). Using both voices in this process creates a sense of power and autonomy – not just for researcher but also researched (Hertz 1997). Therefore it is important that I remain fully conscious of the ideology, culture, and politics of research participants and maintain an “ethical mindfulness” which contributes to “an ethic of trust” in our relationships with research participants and ourselves (Bond 2006).

A qualitative approach to my research is one that sits within the framework of kaupapa principles and one that I view as the most applicable form of research involving indigenous peoples. Classification is not an inherent part of my research design because of its tendency to strengthen or even construct stereotypes of those studied and are, according to Goodson and Phillimore (2004) a method still underpinned by positivist modes of thinking. This creates the reflexive dilemma of how we hear and represent the Other. For me, the engagement with Tangata Whenua based on kaupapa principles
negates this dilemma by writing about what is already determined by the audience engaged with. In this respect the research process evolves me as a researcher into a kaupapa Māori framework.

4.1.1. Theoretical Perspectives of the Research

My research is viewed through a historical/colonial lens that examines the representation of indigenous peoples and the issues of power, discourse and identity that have constructed perception of the Other. It is also viewed through a contemporary postcolonial lens that seeks to re-negotiate this position. Contemporary realities reflect a hybridised and fluid mixture of past and present for many indigenous peoples. This reflects an indigenous environment that has changed in light of an interconnected world that is rapidly changing, more diverse, and increasingly uncertain (Maaka and Fleras 2005). A post-colonial approach to my research is relevant because New Zealand is a colonised country and as such there are complex and ongoing cultural and political issues between Māori and Pākehā that originate with New Zealand’s colonial heritage. The parameters of Māori-Crown relations are slowly shifting as Māori enter the ‘corridors of power’ (Maaka and Fleras 2005) and increasingly contribute to decision-making processes that narrow the extant centre/periphery nexus of both cultures.

My research draws on authors such as Foucault and Edward Said whose work has been instrumental in defining and writing about hegemonic discourse and the material operations of colonisation that has marginalised those who are Other through power configurations. Critical analysis of how discourses operate within tactics and strategies of power expose how categories of “truth” are established not least of which involve knowledge of the “Other”. I am therefore interested to uncover counter-narratives that shift the terms of discourse within this environment and deconstruct hierarchical structures of power through which conceptions of truth, order and reality have become established. Concepts such as Bhabha’s hybridity, Urry’s tourist gaze, and Hall’s circuit of culture have also been influential discourses that critique the construction of Other.
Their work has influenced tourism researchers interested in issues of representation, contestation and identity (Bell and Lyall 2002; Hall and Tucker 2004; Hinch 2004; Morgan and Pritchard 1999; Robinson et al. 2000; McCabe and Stokoe 2004; McIntosh et al. 2000; Tuulentie 2006; Viken 2006) and which are increasingly recognised as central to the nature of tourism (Hall and Tucker 2004).

A postmodern approach is also relevant because postmodernists ask questions about representations of peoples and places (Morgan and Pritchard 1999), social relations between tourists and those living in destination areas (Urry 1990) and commodification of culture and authenticity (Cohen 2004). Postmodernists are also concerned with cultural identity and cultural politics and how for example, indigenous peoples have adapted aspects of their own culture in the face of tourism development (Potter et al. 1999). Hokowhitu (2001) states the concept of postmodernism is not set in concrete – it is still developing and will be informed by Māori who ‘grasp it, tease it apart, and develop it for their own uses’. He says, ‘Māori do not come from a place of centrality, and should not feel that they have to’ (2001: 7). By exploring Māori identity and representation within a postcolonial/postmodern framework my research aims to contribute new perspectives on the field of tourism as one that ‘articulates’ new spaces in which indigenous peoples reaffirm and repossess their cultural identity. To borrow from Hollinshead this proposes that ‘the new role and function of tourism (is) to reveal the felt public culture of places’ (2004: 32). As researchers in tourism he points out that we will need to be ‘informed interpreters of ‘being’ and accomplished readers of text’.

Lastly, but not least is my interpretation of kaupapa principles in this research. Kaupapa Māori informs my research methodology but does not govern my whole approach. Kaupapa research influences the way I position myself as a Māori researcher and who I am in relation to those I study. Thus, identity forms a critical part of the research agenda from within and without. The research agenda needs to be responsive to expressed Māori needs (Te Awekotuku 1991) and thus emanates from the kaupapa of Māori tourism representatives. It is this perspective that guides interpretation of data and how I present material in a way that respects the input of Māori research participants.
4.2 Review of the Research Question and Objectives

My research question was framed in a general context to enable temporal and spatial discussion of Māori Pākehā relations from a postcolonial perspective. This revealed a bicultural relationship that contends with contemporary Māori aspirations of self-autonomous development and the need to recognise the multiplicity of the Māori subject. Thus the notion of a homogenous Māori culture is being contested. The underlying aim of study therefore was to examine the difference of tribal identity in relation to the representation of Māori culture within New Zealand tourism. How did tribal identity affect the way Māori tourism operators presented regional differences of tourism product. Did this counter a homogenous image of Māori culture as constructed by the national tourism body? Consequently this provokes discussion of hegemonic colonial practice and the construction of the Other as a tourism commodity. Renegotiating this position relies on presenting Māori culture as dynamic and changing but also raises paradoxes and tensions in relation to issues of authenticity, identity construction, cultural integrity, and a desire to present Māori culture as a ‘lived experience’. The research question focuses not only on the representation of Māori tribal identity as a distinguishing feature of regional and thus national product development but also as a means to challenge colonial discourse of the homogenous Other.

How do Māori tourism operators negotiate the representation of their image, tribal identities, and cultural difference within the socio-political context of New Zealand tourism? In what ways does this renegotiate notions of the ‘Other’ as inscribed by (colonial) tourism practice and ascribe notions of Māori self determination and autonomy?

There is growing rhetoric of a ‘one people’ regime that makes up New Zealand’s cultural identity but flawed in that it speaks to a fictive homogeneity of New Zealand subjectivity and fails to recognise the plurality of differences, not just Māori, but all ethnic within New Zealand. It also ignores the notion of hybridity as a concept that promotes difference and renegotiates binary constructs such as biculturalism. Cultural identity can be seen as a mode of production that re-frames the colonial condition and thus offers a
form of postcolonial resistance through a process of interchange and inclusion (Meredith 1998). By examining how Māori tourism operators re-present their culture in diverse ways asserts an autonomous and decolonised sense of Māori subjectivity that re-inscribes the homogenous identity constructed by the national tourism body. This homogenised conception of Māori culture has emerged through socio-political processes of dominant and oppositional discourses, occurring both within, and outside of tourism. According to Bell (2004) failure to engage with the politics of representation of Māori tourism is a failure to address the complicity of Pākehā/Crown in the politics and practice of colonialism. The intention of my research therefore is one of progressing Māori tourism toward a more equitable engagement as collaborative partners in the New Zealand tourism industry.

4.3 Research Design and Methods

The research design is guided by the research question and one which I thought necessitated a varied approach to meet its stated objectives. First and foremost the research design situates me as researcher in the empirical world it seeks to study (Denzin and Lincoln 2005). This connects me to specific sites, persons, groups, institutions, and bodies of relevant interpretive literature including documents and archives. This strategy also entails deciding what specific methods of collecting and analysing data best suit each situation for both the researcher and research participant. Due to the dynamic development of Māori tourism in the past few years I felt it necessary to allow the research design to be unstructured in order to respond to the field setting and ongoing changes in the tourism environment. Therefore the research design emerged in the course of planning and participating in fieldwork.

Methods used for research data collection included literature reviews, in-depth and semi-structured interviews with Māori tourism operators and key personnel involved with the promotion and policy development of Māori tourism, and direct observation and participation at selected cultural attractions. The research was undertaken in two distinct
stages. The first stage focused on examining historical and contemporary textual material in relation to the colonisation of New Zealand that included Māori tourism imagery. This entailed reviewing a wide range of secondary literature in various archival locations in New Zealand. Analysis of this data was then juxtaposed with historical and contemporary literature pertaining to the ‘political discourse’ that informed New Zealand’s national tourism development such as government and tourism industry reports. Much of the former literature involved my interpreting the ‘visual’ context of imagery which also includes looking behind the ‘meanings’ of the text/image and how this translated to more contemporary discourse involving policy and development of New Zealand’s tourism industry. As such, I placed particular emphasis on the post 1980s period following the 1984 Hui Taumata and emergence of the 1987 Māori Tourism Taskforce Report which I deemed benchmark documents for progressing Māori discourse at national level. This was also a time when ‘bicultural’ relations were elevated through government policy, influenced by wider international relations and as new generations of urban Māori were asserting identity politics that were at times in conflict with ‘traditional’ Māori views. An in-depth literature review also contributed to ascertaining ‘gaps’ in Māori tourism research and made visible established research topics. This enabled me to then focus on ‘other than’ what I considered mainstream products that had been the focus of earlier research.

The second stage of analysis involved site visits, interviews with Māori tourism operators and associated Māori tourism stakeholders in national and regional organisations. A ten day fieldtrip was undertaken in April 2006 to the Rotorua/Taupo region, Northland and Auckland regions. The justification for choosing these locations was that Māori tourism was ‘well established’ in both Northland and Rotorua and had strong historical links with New Zealand’s early colonial settlement. They were also regions where more ‘traditional’ forms of Māori tourism were established – often utilising kin group resources such as marae, geothermal activity, heritage sites housing pre-colonial pa settlements, waterways and natural landscape. Auckland also had strong links with colonial settlement but it was New Zealand’s largest city with over one million people and as such, represented an ethnically diverse and vibrant location which I felt offered a
more contemporary ‘face’ to the research agenda. The urban dynamics of non-tribal Māori established in Auckland for some generations was therefore targeted as one that would likely reveal hybrid characteristics that differed from more ‘traditional’ locations such as the former. Therefore tourism operations in a city environment might yield different perspectives and thus different ‘identities’ in comparison to the rural context which was still often associated with ‘real Māori’ culture. Overall, I was keen to include new businesses within each of these areas that were emerging as new players in the market and whom might provide insights as to how contemporary Māori tourism products were being developed and represented. Thus, there was the need to recognise both the ‘old’ and ‘new’ perspectives informing current promotion of Māori tourism and from both rural and urban contexts.

During both stages of data collection a number of less structured interviews were conducted with tourism personnel from organisations such as Tourism New Zealand, Ministry of Tourism, NZMTC, MRTOs, and Te Puni Kokiri when opportunities arose. These interviews were a combination of face-to-face meetings and telephone calls that focused on specific themes and issues relevant to Māori tourism at the time.

Attendances at conferences also provided avenues for further data collection. These provided opportunities to meet with, and listen to, experts in their field of tourism and indigenous research. I was fortunate to receive funding via an Otago University initiative for Māori and Pacific Island research students to attend a three-day conference at Te Papa National Museum titled *Matauranga Taketake: Traditional Knowledge Indicators of Well-being, Perspectives, Practices, and Solutions* for indigenous peoples. This conference provided me with a valuable outlook on my research. The strong nexus between traditional and contemporary cultural perspectives articulated by many speakers at the conference related to issues of representation and identity and I was struck by the diversity of discourse from many ethnic groupings that resided under the collective identity of ‘indigeneity’. Māori rhetoric revolved around ideas of a world-view that is still being ‘constructed’ by Māori and, more importantly, advocates the control and management of its practices by Māori and for Māori. This parallels current strategies by
Māori within New Zealand tourism hence, links are drawn with many different disciplines that strive for autonomous development *within* the boundaries of a multi-ethnic nation and that recognise the special place of Māori as Tangata Whenua. The sustainability of traditional knowledge was a strong facet of Māori cultural identity and as such relevant to my research about regional diversity and product development of Māori tourism. Discussion on indigenous decolonising practices at the conference was also insightful and the opportunity to listen and learn from such key authors in this field was beneficial (e.g. Moana Jackson, Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Ranginui Walker). These authors have informed the cultural perspectives of my thesis. The holistic perspectives on indigenous peoples and their wellbeing in a wide range of contexts were thought provoking and I gained insight to many cultural issues that interact and intersect with tourism and the wider global arena of identity politics.

I will now discuss analysis of textual material and key themes and issues that arose from the first stage of data collection. This influenced the context of study as ‘postcolonial’ and the need to view culture as a context whereby temporal and spatial happenings dictate the nature of its process. Thus I viewed narrative as an integral part of its *lived* experience.

### 4.4 Analysis of Textual Material

My historical analysis of the representation of Māori culture in New Zealand involves investigating cultural texts to understand how they help to create and reproduce meanings which in turn shape our knowledge of the social world (Barthes 1986; Pritchard 2000; Wodak and Meyer 2001). A critical study of texts produced within the period of New Zealand’s colonisation show how discourse has both informed and shaped Māori and Pākehā identities and constructed Māori as Other (Bell 2004; Hokowhitu 2001; Pawson 1999; Rountree 1998; Wevers 2002). This analysis is achieved by deconstructing representation on various levels: image, its symbolic representation, the ‘nature’ of messages – what they directly and indirectly communicated, the historical, geographical
and cultural contexts and their relation to the ideological fields in which they operated or from which they emerged. Hence it is concerned with deconstructing issues of power and knowledge, and the way cultural meanings are embedded in both text and narrative. This temporal analysis of literature provided the context in which to examine the representation of Māori as Other in relation to such discursive practices.

During the first year of research (2005) I examined historical literature and imagery of Māori in both a generic and a tourism context. Two trips to Wellington in May and December 2005 were undertaken for this purpose. This was in a sense an evaluation of Said’s *Orientalism* whereby the “truth” is represented through mechanisms of power and superiority (of the colonial) that essentialise the image of the ‘Oriental’ (in this case, Māori). It seemed apparent on examination that the positioning of Māori as Other in such literature was reproduced through a hegemonic discourse of colonisation (Pawson 1999) formulated initially to facilitate a colonising mission on the part of the West and perpetuated through a wide range of discourse and policies that gave lip service to a ‘bi-cultural’ ideology. This analysis identified the significant role of discourse as social practice. By this, I interpreted what I viewed as ‘colonial discourse’ contributing to constructing the “Māori” as tourism “product” rather than as equal participants in managing tourism. Thus deconstructing this material revealed that political processes and power structures have imposed a dominant colonial ideology on the development of tourism. Wodak *et al.* (1999: 3-4) comment social identities are ‘produced and reproduced, as well as transformed and dismantled, discursively’. Thus, language is a powerful construct that has an essential role in asserting and preserving prevailing social structures; such as the language of tourism.

Examination of colonial textual material such as brochures, pamphlets, postcards, photographs, prints and cartoons, stamps, fictional and non fictional works, and works of art representing early Māori of New Zealand cannot be viewed without considering the ideological components and their relations with the ideology of colonialism. It must be acknowledged that such texts are ‘products of specific historical practices on the part of identifiable social groups in given conditions, and therefore bear the imprints of the ideas,
values and conditions of existence of those groups, and their representatives’ (Bell 1992: 3). History carries within it the values and assumptions imposed by narrative and is a discourse which constructs rather than reflects, invents rather than discovers, the past (Currie 1998). Thus, discourses can be conceptualised as the everyday social and cultural means through which people and agencies achieve action (Fairclough 1992). These actions include the construction, display and ascription of identities, social relations, and knowledge, as well as the construction of the contexts in which actions can occur (Van Dijk 1993, 1997).

Specific tourism data such as national tourism organisation brochures, tour guides, pamphlets, posters, photographs and postcards from national archive collections were deconstructed for recurrent use of stereotypical images of Māori. These could be grouped in to common images such as ‘haka’, ‘hongi or Māori greeting’, ‘Māori maiden’ or ‘beauty’, ‘mother and child’, ‘child/urchin’, the ‘noble warrior’, ‘a dying race’ concert party groups, and scenes that juxtaposed Māori as an inherent and often static ‘feature’ of the natural landscape. Such images represent the exotic Other and serve to perceive Māori tourism as a commodity to sell rather than as a cultural experience that offers enormous personal and spiritual significance (Hall 2007). These images were often grouped in periods such as 1920s, 1930s, 1950s and gave insight to changing attitudes over decades. The temporal span of this tourism material mainly ranged from a post war period of the 1920s through to the beginning of the twenty-first century. However, some promotional posters and postcards dated from the late 1800s and often depicted scenes that juxtaposed the ‘progression’ of colonial settlement against the ‘static’ image of the indigenous native. Thus a disjuncture of ‘time’ was made obvious – one of an industrialised and changing settler nation against the backdrop of ‘timeless’ and ‘exotic’ native culture.

This literature was then reviewed in light of more recent tourism research regarding the representation and imagery of indigenous peoples (see Albers and James 1983; Dann 1996; Hollinshead 1992; Pritchard 2000; Selwyn 1996; Spencer 2006; Wall 1997; Whittaker 1999, 2000) and revealed similar practices that fell within the realm of
‘colonial discourse’. The representation of Māori culture as Other coincided with similar portrayals of indigenous peoples in countries such as Australia, Canada and the USA. Images often mirrored the same ‘native’ characteristics, in that Māori often ‘looked’ like North American Indian because of the artist’s interpretation of ‘native costume’. No doubt this was an illusion of the artist’s view of the Other than the reality of the lived experience. Cultural traits such as costume or performance (e.g. haka) acted as symbolic markers for defining Māori as a-part (I intend a dual meaning) of New Zealand’s colonial progression.

Analysis of literature from national institutions such as Te Papa Tongarewa Museum, New Zealand Archives, and Alexander Turnbull National Library in Wellington provided valuable sources of New Zealand’s historical and cultural development and held a wealth of secondary data detailed in Table 4.1. Given the breadth of such data (for instance, one resource I viewed from Te Papa had over 2000 pictorial images) my intention was not to produce quantitative data based on content analysis but to gain a holistic perspective of the overall representation of Māori in a socio-political and bicultural context; one that encompassed the discourse of tourism as an inherent part of New Zealand’s cultural development. This may be called a form of discourse analysis in that ‘discourse’ is conceptualised as the everyday social and cultural means through which people and agencies achieve action (Fairclough 1992). These actions include the construction, display and ascription of the contexts in which actions can occur (Van Dijk 1993, 1997). Loomba (1998) comments that discourse analysis allows us to see how power works through language, literature, culture and the institutions that regulate our daily lives. The problem here was containing the desire to ‘take off’ on different tracks – for instance to focus on ‘representation’ within a museology context. At one stage, I seriously rethought this approach for my thesis – but was uncertain if this would appropriately address the research question and objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 4.1</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of Historical Literature / Imagery</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alexander Turnbull Library</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Zealand Archives</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Papa Tongarewa Museum</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Alexander Turnbull Library housed a comprehensive collection of NZ tourism ephemera including brochures, posters, postcards and various other pamphlets and provided a historical perspective of national tourism promotion literature from the early twentieth century until present day. This was especially helpful in examining images of Māori within the broader context of New Zealand tourism. I found recurrent use of stereotypical images; the stock stereotypes were evident in a wide range of travel brochures promoting New Zealand for most of the twentieth century and substantiate previous tourism literature about stereotyping of indigenous people (Albers and James 1983; Cohen 1993; Maxwell 1999; Mellinger 1994; Pearce and Butler 1993; Sutton Beets 2000; Taylor 1998). In terms of representing Māori these could be divided into themes such as: gender, family groups, settings – such as village scenes, actions and performance (e.g. poi, wero and haka), dress/costume, and the juxtaposition of nature and culture; all of which construct a Māori ‘identity’ according to the trope of colonial discourse. What was evident in many images was the ‘close to nature’ depiction of the ‘native’ when promoting images of Māori culture, especially in the geothermal region of Rotorua. Images of Māori amongst native flora were also typical. Invariably ‘cooking pool’ scenes with Māori women also dominated here, or those of the (attractive) female guide – often juxtaposed with a Pākehā tourist grouping that served to lend an ‘exotic’ connotation to the image. Gender roles do not escape the discourse of colonialism and
Othering. Sexual imagery used in the tourism marketing of certain postcolonial destinations such as the South Pacific tends to be a continuation of the Western representations of a sensual, sexually available and subservient female oriental Other that began in the seventeenth century (Hall 2001). Hall (2007: 316-17) has reiterated the ‘image of the attractive wahine (Māori female) in traditional dress kneeling beside the pool of boiling mud or participating in a poi (traditional dance) … is seen by some Māori as being degrading and racist’. It is nevertheless ironic that the national tourism body Tourism New Zealand still retains many of these stereotypes in its promotional material – even as recent as the ‘100% Pure New Zealand’ campaign released in 1999.

The Archival Library at Te Papa also proved a valuable source of early photographic material and housed a substantial postcard collection. Photographic collections of late nineteenth and early twentieth century’s by Burton Brothers, Muir and Moodie and the American Photographic Company (APC) were particularly evident of a practice that established and perpetuated colonial imagery of Māori culture. In 1863 John McGarrigle of the APC advertised they had the largest stock of Māori ‘celebrities’ in New Zealand (Te Papa 2008). The form and representation of Māori images viewed reflected the ‘dominant ideologies of the time’ (Ateljevic and Doorne 2002) when analysing the dichotomy of the Other in colonial literature. During these visits to Te Papa I also took advantage of meeting with the curator Māori who assisted me in gaining a better understanding of how Māori are working collaboratively with Pākehā within the administrative structures of the museum environment. This was evident in exhibitions promoting Māori culture and heritage and the initiation of a bi-annual exhibition representing each iwi. These exhibitions sought to represent iwi ‘stories’ and how Māori culture was made of ‘multiple voices’ rather than perceived as a ‘single culture’. The role of Te Papa as a national museum that gives voice to the differences of Māori tribal identity is important for visitor education in that most international tourists experience Māori ‘culture’ per se in traditional contexts such as staged cultural performances or museum settings (Ryan and Aicken 2005).
Another significant archival resource was the Hocken Library in Dunedin. The Hocken houses a wide range of published collections, archives and manuscripts, reference material and pictorial collections. They also have an extensive collection of Muir and Moodie photography of Māori during the late nineteenth century as well as Muir and Moodie stamp cards. Additional secondary sources of data included videos, the Internet, CDs, feature films and documentaries. These all represent a form of discourse analysis; that is they are treated as negotiated texts, sites where power, gender, race, and class interact (Pritchard and Morgan 2000). This earlier stage of my research focused on historical imagery and predominantly used a textual-discourse analysis to analyse the position of Māori in a cultural tourism context.

4.5 Identifying Research Participants

From my past experience as a retail travel agent I was familiar with the ‘iconic’ Māori tourism attractions in New Zealand. However, a broader perspective of the issues affecting Māori socio-economic and cultural development was influenced by media representation that often presented Māori in very stereotypical roles and images and perpetuated a ‘them/us’ dichotomy within New Zealand’s socio-political environment. I also gained further knowledge of the breadth of Māori tourism product from the 2004 research project mentioned earlier which examined nature based tourism enterprises. A substantial database of 316 nature-based owner/operator tourism businesses of which 37 were owned and operated by Māori revealed an 8.5 per cent involvement in just one sector of the market (Carr 2007). This was further substantiated by examining the newly created website Indigenous New Zealand representing Māori tourism operations nationwide. This was the first ‘dedicated’ website to represent Māori tourism enterprises and was initiated by Poutama Trust, a nationwide business development organisation that fosters the growth of Māori-owned micro and small New Zealand businesses (www.poutama.co.nz). Promotion material from operator websites and brochures was compiled and reviewed to identify cultural themes and content that would inform
qualitative interviews. What these searches revealed was that Māori tourism was a dynamic construct offering a diverse range of products that juxtaposed cultural ‘difference’ alongside and as part of ‘mainstream’ product.

Māori tourism has generally been associated with traditional areas such as Rotorua. However, the growth in the number of Māori tourism operations in the past few years prompted a need to examine the diversity of product development that was occurring in other regions and how these may differ from the established attractions of Rotorua. The decision to include Māori tourism businesses less than three years old hoped to reveal how these newer operators were presenting ‘contemporary’ Māori culture and what initiatives were being used to deliver this message. Given the urban setting and associated influences that impact on changing cultural production would these newer enterprises exhibit conflicting or differing values from those of rural-based kin groupings whose activities are often associated with local marae and communities? How would I interpret this juxtaposition and would I myself associate with a more urbanised identity given my own upbringing rather than one connected to more intrinsic aspects of Māori epistemology. I needed to be aware of any bias on my own part to what I felt more ‘comfortable’ with versus one that was ‘foreign’ albeit intrinsic to my own cultural identity as a Māori.

My aim would be to compare these newer enterprises with more established products for any similarities and differences that would inform key findings of the research. I considered urban based operations as potential key variants in this choice and was interested to identify what strategies of business management or product delivery I interpreted as representing postcolonial hybrid identities. That is, what values, beliefs, practices and attitudes contributed to creating ‘difference’ – a shift in the ‘them’ and ‘us’ binaries and thus represented critical sites of postcolonial resistance. Urban-based products may provide opportunity for promoting a cultural experience that renegotiated previously held notions of ‘traditional Māori’ whereby Māori living in the city represented a cultural translation of rural/urban Māori culture. Given the high percentage
of Māori now living in urban centres this would allow a critical analysis of identity
disjuncture from a ‘tribal’ vs ‘non-tribal’ perspective. There are a number of kin groups
whose ancestral territories are located in urban areas but the notion of Māori ‘city
dwellers’ from a Pākehā perspective is often one that considers them ‘less’ tribal than
their rural counterparts. Again, this relates to the stereotyping of the Other embedded in
colonial discourse.

I had initially been reluctant to focus on Rotorua given that several studies had already
been undertaken on Māori tourism in the region (see Edwards 1996; McIntosh et al.
1998; Tahana et al. 2000; Te Awekotuku 1981) and I felt the Māori tourism product ‘well
worn’. However, on reflection the importance of the region’s cultural reputation as the
‘heartland of New Zealand’s Māori culture’ (www.rotoruanz.com) and ‘home of Māori
storytelling’ coupled with the large number of operators in the region could not be
ignored as a crucial part of my research investigation especially as I wanted to view it
from a more contemporary perspective. The motivation to also include Māori operators
‘on the periphery’ sought to contrast regional Māori products that were developing from
the established Rotorua image. I had intended to include the East Cape region in the
North Island because of personal connections. My own iwi affiliation and birthplace
were located nearby. However, the unsettled ‘politics’ of the Māori Regional Tourism
Organisations in the East Cape at the time alluded to some difficulty in obtaining
information that would correspond with other regions, coupled with local operators who
were much ‘less established’. Several tourism operations in the East Cape were in the
embryonic stages of tourism development which may have caused difficulties
maintaining a sustainable relationship for the duration of the research process. The issue
of accessibility was also a factor and the need for sites to be visited by enough people to
get relevant feedback from operators regarding their business operations was important to
my research findings. Choosing main centres of Auckland and Rotorua provided well
established gateways and infrastructure for tourism; therefore diversity of tourism
product was assured.
I took a dispersed case study approach in order to obtain a cross section of Māori cultural product (Eisenhardt 2002) that reflected current marketing and promotion. I was also influenced by current literature promoting the entrepreneurial and innovative attitudes of Māori tourism development emanating from the newly formed New Zealand Māori Tourism Council. By taking a dispersed approach I also expected the diversity of tourism product in the regions to provide insight into the regional identities of both the destination and the people. A total of 15 tourist operations were selected as potential case studies and were initially contacted by email and telephone for their willingness to participate in the research. This resulted in 11 confirmed respondents plus two tourism personnel I considered key representatives of national and regional Māori tourism strategic development. These two representatives also had a long history of family involvement in Māori tourism in the Rotorua region and thus provided a ‘dual’ perspective to the data results. Upon confirmation correspondence outlining the research project and in accordance with University of Otago ethics protocol was forwarded and appointments made.

I had also received positive support from the NZMTC from prior meetings with council members and email correspondence. This support was established early in the research agenda and a letter of support from the CEO of Council supported my research. Thus the mandating of “representation” was prescribed from a position of ‘power’ in terms of the institutional structures of Māori tourism. I was also aware that I would need to gain the same support from the “grass-roots” sector of Māori tourism once fieldwork began. I considered these aspects very important to aligning my research with kaupapa principles. Qualitative research is grounded in building and keeping relationships (Bernard 1988; Glesne 1999; Hammersley and Atkinson 1996) and there was an onus on me to contribute back to those who mandated my research.
4.5.1 Case Study Sites and Operators

The relevance of the North Island regions selected in terms of ‘resources’ for Māori tourism are evident in Māori population statistics. The relevance of Māori kin groupings are detailed in Figure 4.1. Both Northland and the Bay of Plenty region have some of the highest density of Māori ethnic population (Ministry of Culture and Heritage 2006).
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**Figure 4.1  Iwi Map of New Zealand**

Source. [www.library.auckland.ac.nz/subjects/Māori/guides/iwi_map.htm](http://www.library.auckland.ac.nz/subjects/Māori/guides/iwi_map.htm) (2009)

The largest iwi grouping Ngāpuhi is located in Northland whilst iwi in the Bay of Plenty region such as Te Arawa, Tuwharetoa, and Tuhoe have historically been strong voices in advocating Māori assertion of self determination and Treaty restitution. These areas included important cultural and natural features of significant value to Māori such as
Mounts Tongariro, Ruapehu and Ngauruhoe gifted to the New Zealand people in 1887 by the local Tuwharetoa tribe. The vision behind the gifting of these sacred peaks grew out of the sanctity of the mountains to local Māori and the desire to ensure that their sacred nature (tapu) would be protected for all time (www.visitruapehu.com). In 1994 the area became one of the world’s few dual listed World Heritage Sites for both cultural and natural significance. Nearby Urewera National Park protects the largest area of native forest remaining in the North Island and is also deemed one of the last untouched bastions of Māori culture. The park is the ancestral home of the Tuhoe people. Legend traces the parentage of the Tuhoe to Hine Pukohurangi (the mist maiden) and Te Maunga (the mountain), which is why the Tuhoe are known as 'children of the mist' (www.newzealand.com).

These close links with identity and landscape were aspects I thought offered potential for not only product differentiation amongst Māori operators, but also the integration of Māori values and identity within tourism product development (see Carr 2007). Connecting resources with Māori cultural identity intended to show how tribal differences contributed to specificity of the tourism experience and reveal the complexities inherent in Māori tribal identity whilst operating in a contemporary/ westernised economy. This would also likely incorporate issues such as environmental values, conservation, storytelling – myths and legends, personal family or tribal history, changes in traditional land use, and not least the importance of marae as an integral part of community and personal identities. How would these issues impact on authenticating individual Māori access to any particular tourism opportunities? And how and to what level were these once exclusively kin-controlled resources being accessed or renegotiated and how are they being balanced against associated constraints within or beyond arguably the most important Māori kin-institution of self determination of all: the marae. These issues are relevant to both rural and urban settings for Māori and findings would no doubt contribute new insights for Māori tourism research.

The area of Northland was of particular interest due to my involvement with the 2004 research project mentioned earlier. That project had given me the opportunity to examine
small scale nature-based tourism enterprises including Māori in three regions of New Zealand including Northland. I thus established kōrero with key Māori industry representatives as well as meeting local operators at the grass-roots level. I realised this was an important factor in my own research agenda as I needed to not only forge new relationships with research participants but to foster those already established. Such persons were pivotal to developing Māori tourism and it was important to consider how the contribution of my research would benefit them.

There is an intangible quality to the area of Northland that connects Māoritanga inextricably to the land; my knowledge of the area was sparse but I recognised it to be an intrinsic part of New Zealand’s colonial heritage and early Māori/Pākehā interaction. For me, I felt a special connection with this region influenced by my own kin’s connections to Ngāpuhi and the commonality we shared of early ancestral migration on the Mataatua canoe. It was also an area with a well established Māori tourism organisation that had strong relationships with other Northland tourism agencies, District Councils and economic development agencies in the region. Thus it represented a well established and integral ‘voice’ for regional Māori tourism. Indeed, recent media attention had highlighted tensions amongst local residents and tourism developers in the region that conflicted with Māori cultural and spiritual values. Land settlement claims between local Māori and the Crown were also contentious, thereby providing ‘fertile ground’ for issues relating to tribal identity and the impacts of tourism for the region.

Criteria for site selection included such aspects as location, age and size of tourism operation, ownership of the business, kin group affiliation, product, marketing and promotional material (Table 4.2). Not all kin group affiliation was noted (e.g. operator number 8) in which case I interviewed the business marketing manager as opposed to the owners. I also deemed it important to choose some well-established attractions with successful management structures, as well as young emerging players whose businesses were less than three years old. New operations were attracting considerable media attention for their successful and innovative products. As such I could compare representation of products within a temporal framework. Proximity to international
tourism flows was also a factor in site selection along with being recognised sites of Māori culture from an international visitor’s perspective.

Table 4.2  Selected Māori Tourism Operators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Years operating</th>
<th>Business ownership</th>
<th>Kin group affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Urban walking tour</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iwi</td>
<td>Ngati Whatua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Cultural tours/packages</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Ngati Whatua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Adventure/culture/arts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Ngapuhi, Ngati Kahu, Te Rarawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>Horse trek</td>
<td>20+</td>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Ngati Wai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>Culture/Heritage tours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Ngapuhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>Cultural performance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Ngapuhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>Eco-culture/heritage tours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family Trust</td>
<td>Ngapuhi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>Cultural performance</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Taupo</td>
<td>Eco-culture tours/camp/trek</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Partnership</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Turangi</td>
<td>Cultural tours/guided</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Ngati Tuwharetoa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Urewera</td>
<td>Trek/camping/fishing/culture</td>
<td>30+</td>
<td>Whānau</td>
<td>Tuhoe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Selection resulted in a mix of some long-term operators with more established ‘traditional’ products such as cultural performances in ‘staged’ settings, some who had developed tourism alongside rural lifestyles such as farms, and new emerging urban and rural operators who promoted more ‘contemporary’ approaches to presenting Māori culture as a tourism experience. Three of the businesses were owned and operated by women with two being rural farm based operations and the other urban-based. I was strongly influenced by recent statistics from NZMTC stating that 37 per cent of Māori tourism product was guided tours. Contrary to the ‘expectation’ that Māori tourism constituted more stereotypical experiences such as cultural performance including hangi and haka, this statistic proved Māori were offering a wide range of products. Thus, a diverse range of resources was being drawn on in ways that showed the difference of Māori culture within the regions.
From the selection of 11 Māori tourism operators I then chose four newer Māori tourism operations located in Auckland (n=2) and Northland (n=2) for more in-depth analysis of the operational aspect of their businesses. Each of these operations were between 1-3 years old and had received recent media attention for their innovative and entrepreneurial business characteristics. They were also owned by relatively younger Māori – thus representing a generational emphasis that might contribute to research findings. Of the two Auckland operations one business was operated by two females and the other by local kin group Ngati Whatua. With regard to the Northland operations one was operated as a family Trust and incorporated a number of whānau although was managed by two males, and the other was a solo male owner and a totally whānau-based operation. I felt these different ownership structures would likely add to the complex nature of ‘defining’ Māori tourism as diverse but “inclusive”. My objectives for these four operations focused on their business management strategies, network relationships with MRTOs and other tourism stakeholders, promotional and marketing material, kin group affiliation and personal identity. Methods used to collect data entailed examining documents (e.g. newspaper articles, travel industry publications and newsletters, trade media, websites and travel guides) about the business. I also intended to focus on the owner’s use of storytelling as a regional resource for their products. What ‘point of difference’ did this offer visitors and what aspects of individual and collective identity contributed to the representation of the product within the rubric of ‘Māori tourism’. As such, these objectives aligned with objectives of the research question and sought to determine how tourism constructed cultural hybrid identities.

These four operations offered contrasting products in eco-tourism, eco-culture, heritage, adventure activities, wine tours, arts and crafts and urban experiences. Thus, an overall portrait of the differences and similarities of operations was constructed which may have implications beyond the specific case that has been studied. Case studies are deemed to be a useful method of providing a number of contrasting but in-depth examples when more than one site is studied in a similar manner (Ryan 1995). As a research strategy that focuses on understanding the dynamics present within single settings this approach can be disseminated by the researcher in a relatively simple framework. Case studies provide
a systematic way of looking at events, collecting data, analyzing information and reporting the results. I hoped my sharpened understanding of Māori tourism “representation” within a postcolonial context would result in new insights for other indigenous tourism experiences. It may also provide further issues to look at more extensively in future research.

4.6 Interview Process

I view interviews as a form of ‘text’; they are produced, shared, and used in socially organised ways. Interpretation is derived through the process of transcribing the ‘talk’ between researcher and research participant which then becomes an integral part of the research design and thus research findings. My use of the interview method sought descriptions of identity, knowledge and social relations from a specific point of view – that of Māori. Thus, I hoped to negotiate the ‘insider/outsider’ position in a way that recognised my embeddedness in the research process and that my ‘marginal’ position did not hinder my seeing nuances from the perspectives of the research participants. Understanding the cultural nuances of these interactions was a critical consideration in the interview process. Undoubtedly I would be poised between familiarity and strangeness, that of participation and that of research (Hammerley and Atkinson 1996).

It was also important for me to be aware of the cultural practices of tikanga and kawa when research involves Māori participants. The narratives that operators provide may not only construct new identities and forms of cultural meanings but re-negotiate previously constructed identities of Māori per se. Thus identity is seen as relational and socially constructed in its ability to mediate affinity and difference within a dynamic of exchange and inclusion. Individuals construct past events and actions in personal narratives to claim identities and construct lives (Archakis and Tzanne 2005; Braid 1999; Elliott 2005; Fulford 1999; Galani-Moutafi 2000). Speakers make narrative choices in order to display a particular portrait of themselves constructed for a particular context. In other words, narratives are not simply mirrors of past experiences, but designed products
for particular ends and are thus political. The selected participants in this research represented various community voices. They were individuals, business operators, part of a wider whānau and community, and members of a regional and national organisation that represented their tourism interests.

I undertook a ten day trip to the North Island in April 2006 to conduct interviews in Auckland, Northland, Rotorua, Taupo and the Urewera regions. In order to keep within a Kaupapa Māori approach the importance of kanohi ki te kanohi (face to face) meetings were arranged. These were generally at the workplace of the research participant although a couple were conducted at urban café locations, as well as participants’ home. A total of 13 interviews, including four site visits, were conducted during this time. Eleven of these were Māori tourism operators and two were Māori tourism personnel involved with regional and national co-ordination and development of Māori tourism. The latter two interviews were based around issues of significance to national and regional Māori tourism development and focused on the ‘political discourse’ of Māori tourism, that is, the current promotional strategies affecting representation of Māori culture both nationally and globally and its future development. Semi-structured interviews allowed respondents freedom to expand, elaborate or diversify their discussion. In this way interview responses are treated as giving direct access to ‘experience’ and whereby individual identities intermingled with those of kin group and/or a collective notion of ‘Māori’. Operator interviews were designed to elicit information about:

1. The historical development of their operations and structure of their business
2. Age, gender, kin-group affiliation
3. Motivation for starting the business (economic/social/cultural)
4. Product development
5. Marketing and promotion
6. Networking
7. Business attitudes and aspirations
8. Issues regarding cultural integrity and kin group accountability
9. Authenticity
10. Sustainability
11. Tribal identity and the complexities of incorporating Māori identity as an integral part of the business operation
12. Relationship with regional tourism structures (e.g. RTO/MRTO) and national tourism bodies (TNZ, NZMTC, ITOC, etc)
13. Regional and national dichotomies of Māori tourism discourse
14. Views on historical and present imagery of Māori tourism as promoted by the national tourism body and Māori
15. The use of storytelling and issues surrounding ownership, authentication, and authorisation of those stories. How did these link with landscape and identity from a Māori perspective
16. Future issues for the business

Operators were questioned specifically about their use of storytelling as a resource that distinguishes Māori tourism product from mainstream (non-Māori) and promotes regional/tribal identities within Māoridom. Discussion about the representation of the Māori image, past and present, was also a focus of these interviews as relevant to the first stage of data collection and ultimately research findings. These were followed by subsequent emails/telephone calls on return to verify and extend the interview process where necessary. Research participants were very willing to provide further information as requested which indicated to me an acceptance of my research as valid and important to the overall kōrero of Māori tourism. Follow up communication primarily required details about ongoing product development and promotion strategies, changes in regional dynamics that might affect their operation or, in some cases contact was made again to discuss recent media attention about their products. For example one operator had just won a prestigious New Zealand tourism award and another operator’s product was chosen for a specialised international travel guide. Both operators were young, entrepreneurial and had achieved such business success in less than three years of
operation; a sign of the creativity and innovation emerging in ‘new players’ in the marketplace.

Preceding the interview each respondent was guided through the University of Otago’s consent process and was given an information sheet on the purpose and aims of the research study. This process concluded by respondents being asked to sign a consent form; a copy being kept by the interviewer. Where applicable they were also asked permission to tape-record interviews. The interviews typically lasted for about an hour, although some were longer (e.g. one operator took me on a personalised three hour tour of his tourism experience which elicited a much more in-depth perspective of both owner and product). The majority of interviews were tape recorded and transcribed for ease of disseminating the collected information. Others relied on hand-written field notes. The advantage of tapes is their repeatability – frequent replaying of conversations tends to draw out utterances more clearly and offer different interpretations. A more nuanced reading of the ‘text’ can be elicited by this technique and analyses can take off on different tacks from the original transcript. However, not all interviews were taped (e.g. one interview in an Auckland cafe setting was too noisy) and reliance on written field notes and personal recall was also necessary. Overall I found the research participants very accepting of giving their time and sharing knowledge and stories with me. The personal dynamics certainly differed amongst the operators, often depending on the length of time they had been associated with the tourism industry, with most having strong views on their own business enterprises, the regional context as it directly affected them and also on Māori tourism as a ‘whole’. Consequently I perceived a sense of “collectivity” in terms of Māori tourism as an entity working to secure its place within the national collective of the industry, but underlying this was a multi-layered makeup of Māori identity that spanned the personal, local, regional, national and global spectrums.

During the period 2005-2006 I also conducted ten additional interviews by phone/face to face with personnel from government tourism agencies, associated organisations as well as tourism industry stakeholders involved in promoting and marketing Māori tourism (Table 4.3). These less structured interviews enabled comparison of regional and
national discourses and could take advantage of the changing dynamics and issues of current interest. Both groups provided a dichotomous view of Māori tourism development and contributed to constructing a picture of the socio-political environment within which Māori operate. The former were chosen for their input to regional and national strategic development of Māori tourism and their ability to ‘shape’ the political discourse surrounding its representation. The latter contributed to a more market-based knowledge around aspects such as storytelling, identity and representation of Māori culture. A schedule of these interviews is detailed as follows:

Table 4.3 Interview Schedule with Māori Tourism Agencies/Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Te Puni Kokiri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 December</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>StoryInc!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 December</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>NZMTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 February</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Tourism New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 June</td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>MRTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09 August</td>
<td>Tauranga</td>
<td>MRTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 August</td>
<td>Christchurch</td>
<td>Interpretation NZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04 September</td>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>Tuia Consulting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 October</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>MRTO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06 December</td>
<td>Dunedin</td>
<td>NZMTC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I was fortunate to establish a relationship with a representative at Te Puni Kokiri (TPK), the Ministry of Māori Development, who was also a NZMTC member and active in promoting Māori tourism policy at both regional and national level and who frequently worked alongside Māori tourism operators. TPK offers mentoring, guidance and support to Māori tourism businesses from a centralised base in Wellington and regional offices around the country (Carr 2007). This offered insight to current issues and strategies that were directing Māori tourism forward within the broader political context of New Zealand tourism. Thus, I was kept up to date with key issues as they emerged. It was important to establish mutually beneficial kōrero with such people in regard my position.
as a researcher and my contribution to Māori tourism. Interestingly, the TPK representative was Pākehā albeit one with a very ‘Māori-oriented’ character. By this, I felt she had a sense of “Māoriness” in her knowledge, respect and adherence to Māori culture and protocols, and the ability to converse and interact with many Māori tourism stakeholders at local, regional and national level. These interviews sought to match the rhetoric of personnel with that of recent policies and reports emanating from government and national tourism bodies (eg TNZ, Ministry of Tourism and TPK). This may determine if such ‘cultural brokers’ perpetuated the ideologies of colonialism in order to cater to the tourist gaze or if they reflected a postcolonial shift from the political and socio-cultural context from which tourism originated and thus contributed to the discourse of postcolonialism and hybridity.

The interview process can yield a great deal of useful information: operator feelings and motives for being in business, tribal connections to land resources, personal identity and kin relationships within Māoridom, perspectives about local and national representation of their product, and the wider global issues they faced as Māori tourism operators. The open-ended nature of the interviews often yielded information I hadn’t planned to ask for which, in some cases, created difficulty in ‘filtering’ out issues that could have side-tracked the investigation. I viewed research participants’ answers in this process as cultural stories; my participation in this culture includes participation in the narratives of that culture. Thus, I was keen to ‘see’ the world from the perspective of interviewees, that is, sharing the same assumptions about the “authenticity” of “experience” (Silverman 2003). Taking responsibility to engage with the text and context hopefully creates a more embodied and reflexive interpretation of meanings. Jamal and Hollinshead remind us this involves tensions between ‘engaged interestedness’ in the topic and demonstrating this complicity in such a way that neither the topic nor the researcher’s voice is privileged over the other (2001: 73).

Overall, qualitative interviews were viewed as the most appropriate technique for research involving Māori. This approach results in meanings being negotiated and co-constructed between the research participants within the cultural frameworks of the
discourses in which they are positioned (Bishop 2005). Bishop uses the analogy of a spiral to describe this outcome – the image of a koru or fern indicates that discourse is always reflexive, returning to the original initiators, where control lies (2005: 125).

4.7 Direct Observation

Direct observation and participation in Māori tourism products was undertaken to engage with the host/guest encounter when representing Māori culture as a tourism experience. The primary advantage of conducting observations is flexibility for the researcher to shift focus as new data comes to light (Jennings 2001). However, it is important to not confuse my actual observations with my interpretation of them, as these interpretations are subject to change over time. Hall (2004) has commented that participant observation has led to the very questioning of the objectivity of the researcher and the ontological standing of social research. It also involves a personal evaluation of feelings about what is being researched and how the process of ‘Othering’ takes place, especially when the researcher may also be viewed as Other. Hall states: ‘the process of giving voice to others is never neutral and works itself through power structures’ (2004: 150). The risk of perpetuating existing stereotypes – especially with regard to indigenous imagery must be taken into account with such a technique.

I visited four high profile Māori tourism attractions in the Rotorua region during the interview period in April as listed in Table 4.4 for the purpose of observing the Māori cultural product from a tourist perspective. These four site visits were selected for their intrinsic long-term representation of Māori cultural tourism and as ‘icons’ of quality tourism attractions. Participating in guided tours at these sites provided insight to how Māori guides used stories to portray identity from both a tribal and individual perspective and was relevant in examining how subjectivities of Māori identities are articulated in everyday life. It also relates to the concept of power. Hall states ‘power is always present in relationships between individual and institutional actors and is exercised every time a group or individual is dependent upon someone else for carrying out a role or task.
This ‘relational power’ is exercised by the tourism guide through the forms of cooperation and conflict they enact. Thus, Māori tourism guides act as ‘powerful’ cultural brokers that may engage with postcolonial discourse and hybridity through their interpretation of place and identity. The notion of Other in relation to the tourist experience can be renegotiated in such interactions.

Table 4.4   Guided Tours at Selected Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Guided Tour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te Puia</td>
<td>Guided Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whakarewarewa Thermal Village</td>
<td>Guided Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wairekei Terraces</td>
<td>Guided Tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotorua Museum</td>
<td>Tour/Interactive Exhibition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I also visited eight other Māori sites and attractions during this time that I felt were beneficial in obtaining a ‘feel’ for Māori tourism in the regions (Table 4.5). These sites not only presented opportunity to observe Māori cultural product as a ‘tourist’ but to examine the interpretive material that supported these products. I was able to compare approaches to product presentation and to examine the imagery and promotional material at each attraction. I could then question research participants in the same area as to how these attractions benefited (or not) their own tourism operation and what networking relationships existed between local stakeholders. For example, one Northland operator visited two of these sites as an intrinsic part of the heritage product he shared with visitors. Some of the sites were of significant cultural and historical value (e.g. Waitangi Treaty Grounds, Ruapekapeka Pa, Te Waimate Mission House) in relation to Māori/Pākehā colonial interaction. As such there was a rich cultural and political narrative that existed between Māori and non-Māori in these regions and which has been recognised as offering potential opportunities for expansion of Māori tourism product (Colmar Brunton 2004). Others were natural and spiritual resources valued by Māori (e.g. Ngawha Springs, Whakarewarewa Thermal Reserve) that represented more intangible
elements important to Māori identity. Most sites were significant points of early tourism development between colonial settlers and Māori and feature in both regional and national tourism promotion literature.

Table 4.5 Additional Sites and Attractions Visited During Fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Auckland National Museum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waitangi Treaty Grounds, Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruapekapeka Pa, Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Te Waimate Mission House, Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngawha Mineral Hot Springs, Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kororipa Pa, Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewas Village, Northland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerikeri Mission Station - Kemp House and Stone Store, Northland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These additional sites provided context for regions where Māori tourism operators were located and gave valuable insight to presentation of regional Māori cultural product. It was not my intention to become intimately familiar with all sites visited, but to gain a rich familiarity with each one which, in turn, assisted with cross-case comparison. This could then be analysed in light of the broader spectrum of national tourism discourse and how “grass-roots” Māori operators were adapting, implementing or deviating from strategies that coincided with national tourism objectives for Māori tourism. What points of difference would be apparent in how operators were constructing regional identities and would these differences correlate to representing a counter-narrative to the homogenous image of Māori culture as previously promoted by the national tourism body? What impacts would these have for sustainable and inclusive progression of Māori tourism?
4.8 Summary

Some critics of tourism research have called for a greater level of self-awareness and self-reflexivity within research agendas (Feighery 2006; Goodson and Phillimore 2004). According to Dupuis (1999) reflexive methodology demands the conscious and deliberate inclusion of the full self (i.e. the researcher self and the human self) throughout this process. This commences even before entering the ‘field’ and continues as we gather, disseminate and analyse the data and throughout the writing of the research story. I did not view my position as fully reflexive however my subjectivity within this research experience influences my own construction of reality and how I interpret these experiences. As an active participant in the research process I am also implicated in what MacBeth (2001) terms positional reflexivity. That is, my ‘self’ and my ‘place’ in relation to research participants are inextricably connected to how I shape the analytic process of my research. Hence, I needed to reflect on the way in which research would be carried out whilst being conscious of the ideology, culture, and politics of those I study. Reflexive analysis was therefore a critical aspect of my intention to represent Māori tourism and ensure transparency.

This chapter has outlined the methods employed in this research in line with the thesis research question and objectives. I have justified the use of a qualitative approach as one that interprets, transforms, and gives meaning to how we view the world. Diversity is a key aspect of my methodology, and thus, aligns with the purpose of my research to examine the diversity of Māori culture in a tourism environment. It is also deemed an appropriate methodology when research involves indigenous people. The underlying critical analysis of the management and promotion of Māori culture by both Māori and Pākehā seeks to highlight a discourse of collaboration and contestation that arises from colonial relationships and the need to recognise the complexities of multiple Māori identities.

Discourse is open to different interpretations and thus open to resistance. Hence, my use and interpretation of ‘discourse analysis’ to examine historical and contemporary literature is one that aims to push narrative form to offer up fresh notions of identity.
through new accounts of the Other’s ‘talking back’. This engages with postcolonial theory and its emphasis on resisting and re-negotiating colonial discursive practices. Thus, discourse can be deconstructed and re-constructed through different value systems and forms of knowledge that have previously been marginalised. This places Māori in a more meaningful role as participants in the research process, allowing them to select, recollect and reflect on stories within their own cultural context and language rather than that of the researchers. Māori tourism operators use such systems of discourse to create contemporary tourism experiences. This has implications for determining ways in which Māori reinscribe notions of the Other and create new subjectivities in the process. Determining if these processes are occurring in third spaces that produce cultural hybrid identities will be analysed in the following chapters.
CHAPTER FIVE

Re-imag(in)ing the Māori Other

Introduction

As sources for information about the past, photographs contain many layers. They are ‘story containers’ which can speak of the connections between national, local and individual, and major social change and personal experience (Dalley 2006). It is important to place the interpretation of the images studied in my research in context: photographic images are made for particular purposes. As Dalley states, they “create a record of an event for official or personal reasons, capture a likeness of an individual or place, or tell a story or stories” (2006: 170). Thus, intention underlies a photograph.

After 1901 and the establishment of the Department of Tourist and Health Resorts the New Zealand government employed photographers to create images for tourism purposes (Dalley 2006). This work was closely aligned with the promotional aspects of other government agencies at the time in the institutional drive for progress and productivity in what was a ‘newly colonised’ country. Images of Māori during the early part of the twentieth century idealised Māori as the Other reinforcing a Westernised view of civilizing (native) cultures and served to highlight the dichotomous nature of social and economic development within a young nation. Photographs such as those taken by the National Publicity Studio (NPS) established in 1945 to create images for use in tourism and general promotions of New Zealand represented a ‘social reality’ context. They displayed an “official” view of New Zealand and its peoples, and one that was carefully constructed. Māori featured in these photographs – more often than not part of the ‘scenery’ as opposed to a distinct ‘people’ in their own right. They were naturally included in photographs promoting the geothermal region of Rotorua – often placed beside noticeable cultural markers such as a wharenui (meeting house), or beside an elaborative carved gate (Whaka) or in traditional cultural performances such as the
concert party photographs. Māori lent an (already) exotic flavour to the (natural) image portrayed. But according to Taylor (2001: 20) what was being presented is the “personality” and lifestyle of all Māori, of all time. There are no regional or tribal differences portrayed, nor are there individual personalities. Photographic subjects were never named, nor are they identified in terms of kin group affiliation. The prolific amount of official NPS photographs that included snow-covered mountains, big-game fishing, sheep, and picturesque coastal areas such as the Bay of Islands are evident of the emphasis of landscape and nature in defining New Zealand’s touristic image to international tourists. Photographs were also often accompanied by textual messages or captions. Such additions work to ‘load’ the image – directing us (the viewer) to a particular ‘gaze’ that may include some features and not others. Thus the power of textual messages works to construct not only a visual image, but a dually linguistic one as well.

Representation of historical images used by tourism agencies during the twentieth century has had both positive and negative effects for Māori. Dissent voiced by Māori in the past two decades over stereotyping and control of imagery as previously discussed are evidence of this. However, it must also be reiterated that the image of essential “Māori-ness” has not been an entirely non-Māori construct. Nor has it simply been imposed upon Māori from the outside (Taylor 2001: 21). The ‘value’ of stereotype is often capitalised on by many Māori enterprises – especially those established in highly commercial touristic centres such as Rotorua. But images are also a means of identity construction and thus subject to re-inscription; hence they work within the narrative of postcolonial resistance. Māori now have the opportunity to (re)present their culture based on such ‘traditional’ imagery or the integration of contemporary elements of their culture that may cater to present tourist motivation, demand and desire. As Hollinshead (1998: 124-125) reminds us ‘ethnic populations are frequently far from being as distinct and singular as the brochure designers and travel promoters would have it’. The medium of photography will continue to play an important part in how images are (re)presented within a tourism context and to help previously silenced ethnic populations towards new representations of themselves which confidently contest mainstream or established
delineations of them (Hollinshead 1998). Photographs open doors into New Zealand’s rich social history – Māori are part of that history.

5.1 Re-Imaging Māori

The purpose of this chapter is to draw on results from case study examples to address the core focus of my research question ‘how do Māori tourism operators negotiate the representation of their image, tribal identities, and cultural difference within the socio-political context of New Zealand tourism?’ The re-appropriation of indigenous images and cultural property by indigenous peoples not only unsettle narratives of settler nationhood, they (re)define new futures for indigenous people through shifting discourses and (re)imaginings (Sissons 2005). But Sissons reminds us that:

Indigenism is the ‘taking back’ of these things, a reclaiming, not of past lives, but of the present conditions for future lives within post-settler states. The processes of colonial appropriation and indigenous repossession are always also transformations: what is appropriated is never the same as that which was lost, and in the process of re-appropriation meaning and significance are further transformed (2005:140).

From a postcolonial perspective the concept of hybridity is therefore played out within these new transformations if we reconsider the notion of hybridity as layered in history. The mixing that occurs with new (re)presentation of Māori images is intrinsic to cultural evolution and provides new ‘spaces’ where cultural difference and new cultural identities continually open out performatively to realign imposed boundaries.

Firstly, I will draw on new promotional material released in 2007 by TNZ in conjunction with NZMTC for international media that highlights progress for Māori tourism to control and therefore reappropriate their image as a marketing tool. I will then examine how local Māori tourism operators perceive, promote and present their cultural products in the marketplace. What is revealed is that image and identity are key components in
promoting regional distinction of Māori tourism experiences as well as cultural differences between tribal groups.

The new promotional images released by the national tourism body are contemporary by nature and depict Māori living their life ‘day to day’. Gone are the stereotypical images the tourism industry has consistently promoted throughout the twentieth century. Traditional ‘native costumes’ have been replaced by cycling helmets, white water rafting jackets, tramping boots, surfboards and fishing rods. Cultural practices such as weaving and carving are seen in contemporary settings; mixing old and new to create modern designs and displayed in modern galleries. This new (re)presentation shifts the centre/periphery dichotomy of previous tourism marketing by making global interconnections central rather than subordinate to a story of European development (Hall 1996).

These new images represent collaboration between TNZ and Māori tourism stakeholders and aligns with goals set in the NZTS 2010 to “ensure that unique elements of Māori culture reflect in New Zealand’s brand positioning” (NZMTC 2006: 4). Ryan commented in 1997 that stereotypical and traditional images denied the concept of ‘modern’ Māori in the twentieth century – much less the twenty-first. Challenges had been instigated by the AMTF in 1995 to persuade the then New Zealand Tourism Board (NZTB) to take photographs of Māori in contemporary dress doing conventional activities. It has taken 12 years for such images to be produced by the national tourism organisation (now TNZ) and readied for international media promotion. Tourism New Zealand has taken steps to update Māori images for ongoing marketing campaigns. In consultation with the NZMTC a photographer was commissioned to help with selecting cultural themes and criteria for new imagery. I spoke with this photographer who had been involved with several assignments to photograph in ‘Māori settings’. He was very aware of the cultural sensitivity that accompanied such interactions and the need to respect Māori values as attached to any (mis)representation. As a person of Māori descent he identified with the need to ‘re-image’ Māori tourism and negate many of the stereotypical images that had prevailed over time. He took approximately 3000 images.
for TNZ in late 2006 with a selection of 50 kept and used for promotional material; the remainder of images being returned to the NZMTC who will distribute amongst MRTOs for local use. The 50 chosen images will be used in a variety of promotional contexts: websites; posters, events and conferences, print media, video, etc and will also be made available on TNZ’s image library; an important tool for the international trade and media partners when creating brochures or magazines.

I visited the launch of these new images at the inaugural Māori Market exhibition held in Wellington in April 2007. This event showcased the largest assembly of contemporary Māori art, Māori fashion, food and wine, displays of Ta Moko (Māori tattooing), weaving, storytellers and tourism. Nine MRTOs were present at the event. A joint presentation by TNZ and the NZMTC highlighted the fusion of tourism and art and the desire of Māori tourism to represent ‘the many faces of Māori tourism’. The event presented work from over 100 Māori artisans, many who have participated in high profile international exhibitions. CEO for NZMTC Johnny Edmonds commented Māori art plays a critical role in the new tourism – where visitors are wanting to experience the culture and engage with the people:

“Māori artists draw on their cultural background, their traditions and their ancestors when they produce their art, and in doing so they are sharing something of themselves, that enables visitors the opportunity of understanding the nature of Māori culture”


Linking this comment with tourism he also states “Māori tourism is about whānau who have made a deliberate choice to share something of themselves and their culture with visitors”. Thus, the portrayal of “grass-roots” Māori identity as intrinsic to whānau is an important factor in creating an inclusive national image of Māori tourism.

I was personally amazed at the diversity of Māori art and culture on display, which also included visiting indigenous artists from overseas – eg Canada and the USA.
There was a feeling of ‘collectivity’ and ‘connectivity’ in this indigenous presence and a
desire to promote the creativity and innovation of culture to visitors. Niezen states that
indigenous identity is ‘part of a shifting continuum or *bricolage* of identities ranging
from the individual actor to the family, clan, tribal group, language group, village, region,
province, nation, and, not least of all, international affiliation (2003: 11-12)’.

The global/local link is an important aspect of indigenous peoples’ movements, where for
elementary, organisations such as the UN are forums where indigenous rights are asserted
(Nyseth and Pedersen 2005). The Māori Market was another example of indigenous
peoples as a significant cultural force, promoting their collective interests on a national
and international scale. The global economy has for many indigenous people enabled
them to re-produce their cultural needs in ways that sustain distinctive indigenous values
and interests. In its representation of specific cultures, histories and communities, beliefs
and practices, indigenous tourism is part of this global/local nexus, which in turn counters
the representational effects of globalisation. The practice of identity in this process both
constitutes and transforms the actors in the system and is the dynamic behind the creation
of specific meaning (Friedman 1994). Thus, contemporary Māori infuse their cultural	

their cultural tourism product with values and meanings that reflect their individual identity and which
are shaped by the post-modern context of an inter-connected world. Comments from one
MRTO to me reflect these views:

We are trying to break a cliché impression of what Māori tourism is about …
these new images are about Māori doing ‘everyday’ things … the new images
show engagement from a Māori perspective.

The MRTOs I spoke with at the event all felt ‘excited’ about the new imagery and by
association what was happening in their own regions and the diversity of Māori tourism
experiences being developed. These new promotional images reflect Māori tourism
representatives’ desire to portray Māori as similar to Pākehā New Zealanders, thus
negating binaries of ‘them/us’ that previously existed in promotional material although
aim to showcase the cultural differences between them. Otherness is (re)framed in a
particular way which obscures certain “truths” (Scheyvens 2002). These representations
indicate that Māori are part of and engage with the global economy. One comment made
to me was that past images of Māori tourism represented by TNZ had been ‘static’, with an emphasis on people/activities (e.g. haka, poi dances, hangi). ‘These were not connecting with the whenua’ (land) one MRTO said…these new images ‘show an affinity with the landscape – the inherent connection Māori culture has with Papatūānuku (Earth Mother)’. This is illustrated in images presented in Figure 5.1. What is most evident in tourism’s construction of ‘Other’ is a propensity to separate nature and culture for their resource values. The production of place representation has significant influence on tourists’ choice of destination and their motives and behaviour. But these representations are not static – they constantly evolve with time, changing to meet new trends, fashions, and practices. Saarinen (2004) notes the tourist industry and destinations are creating products that conform better to the new structures of motivation, tourist segments, and trends in general consumption. Consumers are demanding more differentiated experiences, mixing both culture and nature and engaging with the tourism product in a more personal way. This new imagery reveals that the combination of both nature and culture are under (re)view as an integrated component of the “new” face of Māori tourism.
Images depict scenes of white water rafting, canoeing, trekking in national parks, cycling and walking through rainforests, Māori carvers and weavers in contemporary gallery settings. There was only one image of a Māori warrior and although it stood out for its more traditional representation it portrayed quite a different interpretation in its construction (Figure 5.2). The image was father and child (this was actually one of my case study research participants) as opposed to many images of mother and child found in earlier tourism literature which I placed under the heading of ‘colonial discourse’. This new image was somewhat ‘passive’ and personal in its representation. I would call it postcolonial as it *re-inscribed* the typical warrior image as ‘fierce and aggressive’ by its re-negotiation of stereotypical imagery. I had not come across any such image in the historical literature I had previously examined and upon meeting this particular operator in person I understood the meaning behind the images as one closely related to his kin identity and whānau.
In my view another image stood out for its hybrid nature. The theme was based around the close association Māori have with the sea and fishing. Two males stand side by side on rocks facing the sea – one with bare torso, buttocks and legs adorned with ta moko and holding a traditional flax kete (basket); the other wearing long ‘surf shorts’ holds scuba fins and snorkel. Ta moko is also visible on his torso. Both men are shown with their backs to the camera, both represent the old and the new – Māori fishing methods have adapted and evolved within the culture due to western influences. This can be seen as initiating new signs of identity and presenting a *third space* (Bhabha 1994) in which Māori culture is articulated as postmodern. Deconstructing the image reveals regimes of new power/knowledge; the power to define social situations (1998) has shifted. The nature of the image promotes cultural pluralism, tradition and modern intertwine as both males look in different directions. In relation to the ‘Circuit of Culture’ Hall (1997) asks us to look for the ‘meanings’ behind the representation and importantly re-construct meanings from different perspectives. Thus, language, meaning and representation do
not exist as isolated concepts but are entwined in a circuit of production, representation, identity, consumption and regulation.

The theme for the Māori Tourism exhibit presented by the NZMTC was “Māori Tourism … Sharing our Stories” as shown in Figure 5.3. One MRTO drew a dichotomous discursive difference between the national tourism body and Māori tourism saying, ‘TNZ promote the ‘telling of our stories’ … we (Māori) promote the ‘sharing of our stories’ … there are connections – mana – whakapapa … telling stories about your place’. This highlights the intrinsic nature of ‘site identity’ attached to the various ways Māori operators integrate storytelling within the tourism experience. Thus, Māori cultural product is narratively ‘layered’ in its contemporary construction that draws on traditional Māori epistemology. It could be said that it represents Māori culture in a post-traditional dynamic ‘where traditions are not given, but they are instead, forced to declare themselves to justify themselves and re-invent themselves in the face of multiplicity of alternative practices, mores and identities’ (Havemann 1999). Thus, tradition is not in ‘demise’ but seen as the co-existence of the old with the new.

Figure 5.3 NZMTC “Sharing our Stories”
The NZMTC and TNZ have both been proactive with the development and promotion of products that encourage the use of storytelling skills by tourism operators whilst also upholding the need to protect such stories as intellectual property (Carr 2006, 2007). There is a growing awareness of the potential for specific kin groups to differentiate their tourism ventures by delivering unique values or traditions particular to their kin group to visitors. This echoes the discourse of the MTTF (1987) whereby it stated ‘the need to recognise that: ‘Māori culture is tribal ... this diversity needs to be positively encouraged ... any attempt to homogenise Māori culture in the name of tourist consistency must be resisted’ (1987: 47). Māori tourism operators were urged to think carefully about issues such as cultural integrity and representation of Māori culture within their tourism products. Each area differed in its resources, tikanga and kawa, thus Māori were urged to understand the demands and supply of tourist options within the wider socio-political context of its development.

TNZ is taking a more strategic approach with how they represent Te Ao Māori in all mediums throughout the organisation. A marketing representative for TNZ stated to me ‘where possible, they will supply not only the location of the shots that appear in the tourism section of the website, but also the story/legend/myth that goes with it’. Thus Māori culture is being‘re-framed’ at national level in a way that highlights kin group identity within the New Zealand Māori tourism experience. These stories can then be interpreted by regional Māori operators from their perspective, reinforcing and promoting cultural differences amongst Māori to visitors and the range of possibilities now being offered by Māori tourism operators. These changes reflect the need to ‘re-evaluate’ Māori tourism to better reflect the diversity and contemporary nature of change affecting not only Māori, but many indigenous people in relation to tourism representation.
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5.2 Negotiating Image, Identity and Cultural Difference: Case Study Analysis

“All visitors, and especially our target market, want to get a sense of the way people from different cultures live”, says George Hickton, CEO of Tourism New Zealand (TNZ Tourism News 2005: 10). Tourism New Zealand’s report The 2003 Demand for Cultural Tourism revealed the culture and heritage sector in New Zealand was not performing as well as it should. Many visitors were simply not aware of what New Zealand had to offer and some of our cultural and heritage products were not delivering quality experiences and thus satisfaction levels. The report indicated that it was some of the basic services and facilities that let the sector down, but that more specifically visitor satisfaction levels could be enhanced with more care in explaining, educating and stimulating visitors to gain a fuller understanding of our cultural tourism products (2005:10).

Māori are well poised to meet these objectives through increased capacity and diversity of cultural products in the regions. The Māori tourism sector has matured to the point where it can deliver a wide range of quality experiences. By departing from the image stereotype that has been a hallmark of a Eurocentrically defined representation of Māori culture, the ‘point of difference’ now resides in promoting regional and tribal identities of Māori culture. This could be called ‘reinscribing the local’; Māori have taken versions of history and reinterpreted them from the ‘Other’ perspective, thus catering to the modern tourist who is constantly appropriating and constructing new experiences and places. Places take on new meanings, inscribed with individual and collective values that shape a less homogenised image of Māori tourism.

This section draws on qualitative interviews to describe how Māori tourism operators negotiate the expectations of tourists, how they portray their culture as a tourism product, and how tribal identity forms an integral part of this process. Key themes emerging from the interviews with Māori tourism operators are summarised as follows:
• Marketing and Promotion. The need to promote contemporary images of Māori tourism and move away from stereotypical / homogenous images
• Regional differentiation of Māori tourism product
• Kin group and community improvement through business management
• Tribal identity as an integral part of business operation (attachment to traditional lands, relating personal family or tribal history to visitors)
• Storytelling - myths and legends
• Authenticity and cultural integrity of the tourism product

I will present data analysis based on these themes. Firstly, I will discuss marketing and promotion by examining operator websites and promotional brochures, then follow with linking regional differentiation with community improvement and issues of identity in relation to attachment to working on traditional lands. The following chapter will then discuss the inextricable link between personal and tribal identity and storytelling. This will be concluded by discussing issues of maintaining cultural integrity and authenticity within what is essentially a commercially-driven environment (i.e. tourism) that often conflicts with indigenous cultural value and belief systems.

5.3 Marketing and Promotion

Research participants were asked for their views on past imagery of Māori tourism. Many commented that more dynamic notions of Māori culture are available and should be promoted by the national tourism organisation. Operators saw a need to move away from stereotypical images that continued to create a homogenous impression of Māori culture to visitors saying ‘once visitors interacted with Māori tourism experiences in the regions they were often surprised by the diversity of both product and people’. Although there is a need to maintain ‘iconic’ images of Māori culture, not least in regions such as Rotorua that heavily promote more ‘traditional’ images, there is a desire to ‘move away’ from ‘poi and haka’ and reflect modern ‘everyday’ images of Māori doing ‘everyday
things’. This point was emphasised by urban-based operators whose product was tailored to meeting the needs of visitors wanting a ‘city experience’ with a cultural flavour.

A review of the 11 Māori tourism operator websites and brochures revealed that images strongly reflected the ‘product’ as a whole (e.g. horse treks, urban walking tour, heritage, eco-tourism, adventure activities, cultural performance, etc). Nine of these products offer guided tours with an emphasis on ‘personal and intimate interaction’ between host and visitor. This reflects the Māori concept of manaakitanga as an important component of the product and may well contribute to the growth of this sector for Māori tourism (37 per cent) as noted by the NZMTC. The two remaining products were both cultural performance experiences – that is ‘staged’ shows located in Rotorua and Waitangi. As expected these two locations attract a high percentage of international visitors to New Zealand looking for a ‘traditional’ Māori experience and in general would be perceived by many visitors and local New Zealanders to be the main ‘type’ of Māori tourism product on offer. Hence, they represent the sorts of products specifically created for commercial ends (McIntosh 2004). However at only 5 per cent of the total Māori tourism product range the other nine case studies support the misrepresentation of such views. The guided tours offered by these operators were diverse and included eco-based nature walks, forest treks, marae experiences, a city walking tour, meeting Māori artists and musicians, wine and cuisine appreciation, history and heritage interpretation, waka tours, horse treks, fishing, camping and personally tailored packages. Figure 5.1 provides examples of written excerpts from websites and brochures that inform visitors of cultural aspects of the businesses. These operators will be referred to by the relevant number in the below table for further referencing purposes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Op</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Summary of website/brochure references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>You now have the opportunity to become part of this tribe for the day and learn how Ngati Whatua discovered Tamaki (Auckland), why it was so fiercely fought over, how the people co-existed with the land and the arrival of foreign vessels to Tamaki shores. Guides from the Ngati Whatua tribe re-tell these ancient and sacred stories on the (operator name) - a walking tour through Auckland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>At last a tourism company that understands and represents the indigenous view of “Nature, Culture, People and Place” in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Bringing you the world of the Māori people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Auckland</td>
<td>You will gain a unique perspective as we introduce ‘our Auckland and our Aotearoa (New Zealand)” through local eyes. Most importantly as well as teaching about traditional life, we showcase Māori culture as alive, vibrant, evolving and relevant in mainstream society. (operator name) are an unhurried and deep exploration of a living, breathing culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Auckland (rural)</td>
<td>Ride the trails of our ancestors. Visit the ancient Pa site of a paramount Māori chief, high above the Pacific Ocean. Experience a breathtaking view that reaches far and wide to the horizon. Tread the paths of his people. And enjoy the company of us, his descendants, and the stories and food we will share with you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Northland</td>
<td>Welcome, Journey with me into the past as we journey through the sacred and ancient house of my Ancestors, The House known as Ngapuhi. (Operator name) will take you on a personal journey of his unique Māori culture, awe inspiring Northland scenery and fascinating historic places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Northland/Waitangi</td>
<td>(operator name) provides a wide range of Māori cultural experiences giving visitors the opportunity to experience Māori as a living, vibrant culture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Northland/Hokianga</td>
<td>'Step into our World' and let our local guides take you on a memorable journey through nature's stages of evolution, whilst providing a mythological and interactive interpretation of life in the forest. Join us for an intimate encounter to learn how these trees are inter-twined with the lives of local Māori and the important role they play in the eco-system that is the Waipoua Forest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Rotorua</td>
<td>(operator name) .. gateway to the world of ancient Māori, provides a journey back in time to a Pre-European lifestyle of customs and traditions. The evening’s festivities include a banquet of succulent food cooked the traditional Māori way as the Māori village comes alive to the sound and activities of tribal songs, dances, myths and legends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Taupo</td>
<td>Join us on our unique treks &amp; experience nature as it was meant to be. Discover Te Urewera - the land of Tuhoe, children of the mist - renowned for its incredible wilderness landscapes &amp; diverse native plants &amp; birds. Our experienced local Māori guides enjoy sharing their culture, knowledge of the bush, &amp; local history.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Turangi</td>
<td>Stan's authentic Māori guiding offers a fusion of fresh new experiences and insights unique to (operator name), the Ngati Tuwharetoa people and this region.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Urewera</td>
<td>(operator name) take you into the heart of Te Urewera, following the Whakatane river through untamed wilderness. Options include hiking, horseback and fishing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the whole, I would comment that most operator’s imagery aimed to promote a highly visual tourism product and portray Māori culture as ‘living culture’ in both a traditional and modern sense. Images commonly included visitors interacting with Māori guides and the landscape in ways that showed the ‘intimacy’ of the experience. All three Auckland urban-based operations promoted very contemporary images of their businesses on websites and brochures. Two were more generic in terms of promoting ‘Māori culture’ as a whole, whereas the other one significantly promoted their iwi because the business is owned and managed by them as a tribal venture. The former two tended to refer to ‘our Māori world’ as a holistic concept that catered more to defining Māori tourism within a wider realm of cultural production. Images of Māori in each of them were dynamic and modern and engaged with ‘day to day life’. One operator’s website plays a video ‘window’ alongside textual and photographic information and uses a prominent (and pretty female) Māori personality as narrator. On this website imagery includes iconic aspects of Māori culture such as whaikairo (carving), a wharenui, and a Māori warrior performing a wero whilst other images include beaches and city scenes, Māori musicians, Māori ‘socializing’ in urban settings, and scenic forest/nature vistas. The website opens with the statement:

At last a tourism company that understands and represents the indigenous view of “Nature, Culture, People and Place” in Aotearoa-New Zealand. The enjoyment of a visit is based on three key elements: Māori people, Māori places, and Māori hospitality

This discourse links with other indigenous cultures via aspects of sense of place and attachment to the natural environment and promotes Māori hospitality as a key component of a New Zealand cultural experience. Their product is based around themes such as Māori experiences, enrichment, Kiwi luxury, and New Zealand journeys and they stress the ‘many settings’ within which Māori culture can be experienced but with an emphasis on meeting Māori people as key to the experience. My interview with this business owner was directed by him to focus on the relationship of Māori within the wider (political) arena of the New Zealand tourism industry. He had over 30 years experience at both regional and national development levels therefore opinion as to who
were the ‘power players’ in NZ tourism was plainly evident. He was supportive of and instrumental in developing ‘collective structures’ for Māori tourism that promoted product as ‘export ready’.

The generic use of the term “Māori” used in operators two and three’s promotional material is based on a political and social construct that also places “Māoriness” within the ‘discourse of ethnicity’ by its reference to other indigenous cultures (Meredith 1998). McHugh (1998: 145) states that ‘ethnicity is concerned with those processes of self-definition and self-identification which give the group its cultural distinctiveness’. The overall portrayal of Māori culture in the latter operator’s website was one that is modern but infuses traditional aspects such as whaikairo, marae and manaakitanga as inherent cultural values as integrated facets of how urban and rural Māori people live within the wider society of Aotearoa New Zealand. In its dynamic and innovative use of visual imagery this portrayal does not perpetuate an “essentialist” view of Māoriness albeit the generic use of the term, but does contribute to maintaining a certain degree of homogeneity by its use.

Products promoting forest and eco/nature based products focus heavily on such imagery and often use spiritual discourse to describe the experience. In particular this often linked with ‘myths and legends’ as a component of the product and a desire to ‘share the knowledge’ of the land as a cultural asset. The significance of land resources as collective and intergenerational reflects important links to ancestral ties, and thus matauranga Māori is also inherent in this link as the basis for knowledge creation.

Operator number five stood out for his ‘traditional’ imagery but personal interaction revealed a complex and passionate character that adhered strongly to his tribal identity. His product promoted traditional images of a Māori ‘warrior’ and was primarily based on heritage and historical interpretative tours in Northland, personally guided by him. Aspects of heritage tourism is representative of many contemporary travellers desire to directly experience and consumes diverse past and present cultural landscapes (Berg and Kearns 1997; Bowes 1989; Hall and McArthur 1999; Pearce 1993; Uzzell 1996).
This particular research participant had very ‘passionate’ views about his own tribal identity, product development, and issues regarding the wider tourism industry in terms of Māori Pākehā relations. One product he offered was waka tours in which visitors partook as ‘active players’ in the guided tour to an outlying island near Paihia in Northland. These tours are geared to the ‘mainstream’ market and most people ‘book onsite’ as the product is advertised by a free-standing billboard on the Paihia waterfront where the waka is seen visually by passing tourists. Website imagery shows Māori warriors in various settings including forest and beach locations, and also one image ‘transposed’ them on the sky above a waka (Figure 5.5). I felt these images reflected more of the operator’s own personality, but they also catered to tourists’ expectations of what Māori culture is ‘about’. These images reflect the same stereotypical images that many Māori operators want to change. The owner did agree that the national tourism organisation had created a homogenous image of Māori. The possibility of this representation being a parody of the pre-colonial Other is therefore raised but also countered through a form of cultural hybridity that re-asserts the Other through acknowledging the past to produce something ‘new’ in the present.

Figure 5.5 Operator website images
The rural/urban dichotomy is prevalent when comparing cultural differences between case study operators and products. For instance, operator number three, an urban-based Māori product, used markedly different imagery in line with their desire to show Māori culture as ‘alive, vibrant, evolving and relevant in mainstream society’. This research participant felt that tourism promotion images in the Auckland region did not reflect ‘modern’ Māori. My analyses of generic tourism brochures that promote the Auckland region substantiate this; most images of Māori were stereotypically traditional and static in nature. Settings such as museums and concert performances were typical images used in these local brochures.

Adventure activities were a large component of this operator’s product hence imagery depicts outdoor scenes and/or people interacting with the landscape such as walking along beaches, abseiling down cliff-faces or sea kayaking and horse treks. They also incorporate a mix of vibrant images that depict Pasifika culture as their urban experiences offer customised art tours whereby visitors ‘meet the artist’ in their homes and workplace. This provides visitors with the opportunity to meet ‘real’ Māori and gives an insight to contemporary Māori art design and creativity in other locations such as museums. It also helps break down stereotypical images of Māori as only ‘cultural performers’. Connecting resources to product development is evident with an emphasis on Māori perspectives being critical to the interpretation. The owner agreed that international marketing by Tourism New Zealand of Māori culture has represented Māori as a collective image, stating: ‘But not in a good way, I think that they lump us all together which does not do us any favours’. She agreed that TNZ should promote more regional/tribal images of Māori in current tourism marketing and the need to ‘modernise’ these images. This was reinforced when viewing one of their images released at the Wellington Māori Market I attended that represented a very hybrid depiction of Māori culture as shown in Figure 5.6.
Of note in this picture is the graffiti artist holding a taiaha (traditional Māori weapon) made out of clear perspex – a very modern adaptation of a culturally significant taonga. The representation of such taonga in non-traditional materials could be construed as hybrid in its mix of old and new forms to creative an innovative symbol of cultural expression. The co-owner stated other images were taken for the TNZ campaign in settings such as an office environment, a home-ware and art store, and of an artist ‘doing a moko on a young guy at his studio’ but thought these images may have been ‘a bit too contemporary’ for the national advertising campaign as they were not chosen as ‘representative’. However, it is an example of Māori tourism operators wanting to depict Māori as contemporary and with multiple identities. Such images re-inscribe previously homogenised images and expose them as limiting the richness and diversity of Māori culture. As such they challenge dominant discourses that have (mis)represented Māori and (re)present them from a Māori and hybridised perspective. As Gandhi (1998: 22) notes some postcolonial representations will still unavoidably stem from old/colonial narratives while other postcolonial representations will stand as bright new counter-narratives.
Examples such as this tourism operation highlight new dimensions of Māori cultural politics played out in the urban setting. Namely, the cultural politics of the resurgence of an identity rooted in the tribe bifurcated against those who have sought to construct the new tribes of the urban “Māori” Diaspora (Meredith 1998). The contested nature of this “new tribalism” has been promoted by government policies and the Treaty of Waitangi claims process, as groups pursue a representative voice and access to resources. The rural/urban dichotomy is not as ‘clear cut’ as this, but points to the differences amongst tribal and non-tribal Māori. Other factors such as gender, class, employment, religious affiliation, etc are often also at play within such processes; contradiction and negotiation of positionality all vie for expressing ones subjectivity (Hall 1996) and ones sense of Māoriness. The cultural dynamics of Māori representation must then include cultural hybridity within its ‘positionality’ if we are to ‘authentically’ represent Māori culture as diverse rather than homogenous.

Tourism brochures promoting Rotorua had a high proportion of Māori cultural images. Given the historical development of tourism in the area this is not unexpected. Many of these images cater to the tourist ‘gaze’ (Urry 1990) in their desire to portray Māori culture as exotic, timeless, traditional, authentic, and are dominated by traditional motifs. The overwhelming image presented of the Māori as tourist attractions in these brochures is that of a traditional people found predominantly at sights but may also be encountered at a local scene or on stage as entertainment. This representation is one in which spatial and temporal arrangements uphold the differences between the modern and the image of the indigenous Māori (Olsen 2008: 176). Māori can be encountered in traditional settings – such as the next case study I discuss and, simultaneously, as they are in everyday life.

In traditional Māori settings such as Rotorua these ‘stereotypical’ images persist in tourism marketing material that reflect the same type of images promoted by the national tourism body for over a century. But they also reflect the current input by Māori in terms of ‘packaging’ their culture in recognisable ways. Selected traits of Māori culture are still used in highly visible ways to sell culture to overseas visitors however, the increased
control of these products by Māori alters the ‘how’ of presentation, determined by power-related concepts of rights, ownership, and consent (Robinson 1999).

The branding of the Rotorua Visitor Guide emphasises the ‘spiritual’ nature of the region (and by association Māori culture) with the theme ‘Rotorua Feel the Spirit’. This theme is carried forward in various sub-sections of both website and brochure advertising, including ‘Spirit of a Living Culture’ for Māori culture or ‘Challenge your Spirit’ for adventure activities. The website describes its brand identity as follows:

The brand identity was designed to reflect every unique facet of Rotorua. 'Feel the Spirit' encompasses it all - our cultural diversity, our stunning natural environment and awe-inspiring earth forces, our sense of adventure, our people, and the spirit of a progressive community (www.rotoruanz.com).

Two of the front covers of visitor guides I viewed used images of a Māori wahine - one traditional and one modern. In the traditional setting she was sitting on the ground in piupiu costume framed behind with a Māori village scene. The modern image was a female standing under a flowing waterfall in quite skimpy and seductive “beachwear” with arms extended and palms facing up to the falling water. The latter image highlights the continuing use of the ‘erotic’ female in such advertising of which postcolonial discourse is highly critical as a continuation of Western representations of a ‘sensual, sexually available and subservient female other’ (Tucker 2004).

The paradox is that Māori are striving to present ‘contemporary’ images of themselves therefore we could read the image as an empowering form of cultural hybridity as opposed to the passive submission to the tourist colonial narrative. Hollinshead (2004:36) points out ‘in such contexts new ambivalent and indeterminate locations of culture are generated, but where that new celebration of identity consists largely of problematic forms of signification which resist discursive closure’. As such tourism studies that adopt critical postcolonial analysis can probe and generate new insights into the newness of identities and aspirations of cultural ‘difference’. Research agendas that focus on the ‘Bhabhian restlessnesses which in-between populations have to countenance’ can serve
as fertile ground for the development of emergent identifications of Selfhood (and of Otherness) (Hollinshead 2004).

Operator number eight was a well established business in Rotorua employing more than 120 people with a turnover of $8.5 million a year. It is an internationally recognised product that has won major New Zealand tourism awards and could be said to represent a highly commercialised operation that is entrepreneurial in intent and outlook. Their imagery is also very traditional and reflects the intention to present a product of pre-colonial Māori culture. This involves a three hour tour to a Māori ‘village’ created in a forest setting on the periphery of Rotorua township, whereby visitors experience a wero/challenge welcome, walk through a ‘living pre-colonial village’, are entertained in a theatre-style venue with song, music and dance, and seated for dinner which includes food cooked in a traditional hangi. Following dinner guests are free to wander through a range of outdoor ‘whares’ and browse or purchase Māori arts and crafts. The business is 100 per cent whānau owned and the owners have ‘grand designs’ to create an international indigenous concept that traces Pacific indigenous histories that link with the development and migration of Māori culture and settlement in New Zealand. This aims to present a ‘storyline’ that progresses from pre-colonial, colonial, and contemporary development of Māori as part of a wider Pacific ‘collective’ identity promoted to tourists as undertaking a ‘tourist trail’.

Over the course of my research the operator’s website has undergone dramatic change in line with this concept and their expansion into new products based on Christchurch and Auckland. The textual nature of the website has become much more detailed alongside imagery that coincides with the ‘story’ depending on location. There appears to be a strong emphasis on the ‘visual’ and ‘creative’ in what I would describe as a ‘film-like’ setting aimed at attracting an international audience. The following excerpt from their website illustrates this notion:
Each experience has been developed with faithful attention the smallest of details resulting in authentic, inspirational sets. There are Pre-European villages, forests, colonial townships, pacific waterways and islands, railways and tramways. Once complete, there will be over 100 actors delivering re-enactments of each story every night across the country.

Source. www.Māoriculture.co.nz

The research participant I interviewed commented to me that international exposure through internationally acclaimed films such as Whale Rider and Lord of the Rings and other media has not been used to full advantage to portray Māori in a contemporary way and that ‘TNZ need to be responsible for national image building for Māori’. They felt that quality was spread ‘too thinly in Māori tourism product’ as a whole and should be clustered around ‘heroes’ in the regions (such as themselves) and that there were too many ‘fragments of the pie’ in Māori tourism. This was reinforced by the comment ‘we are the most expensive in town because we are the best’ and that the ambition to ‘grow the pie is quality’ – but needs iconic ventures such as (ours) to build around. This comment reveals a drive to be commercially and economically successful, but without ‘genuine’ recourse to accountability to the Māori ‘collective’ in New Zealand.

Discussion following fieldwork with colleagues involved in Māori tourism research substantiated my view. Apparently there had also been issues regarding the business’s initial set up and ongoing operations between the owners and local iwi over ‘boundary crossing’ – that is, not operating in their own tribal ‘space’ and undertaking correct ‘protocol’ regarding kin accountability. There are also issues over recourse to rangatiratanga of the local tribe and accountability to their own neighbouring kin group. The controlling mechanisms of the owners have also impacted on staff and thus, caused some tensions between owners and staff members that could be viewed as a form of ‘neo-colonialism’ – a term describing the reinforcing of colonial relationship through existing economic structures, cultural representations and exploitative relationships that were previously based in colonialism. The research participant I spoke with stressed the philosophy of the business was that staff and owners operated as a ‘family’ and that each
operation (Rotorua, Queenstown and Christchurch) focused on a ‘sense of place’. For instance, the Rotorua operation centred on pre-colonial Māori culture whereas the Christchurch one focused on the colonial encounter with Pākehā. Hence, these interpretations of ‘place’ are not tribally specific as they do not connect with the owner’s own kin group’s ancestral areas, although they do work with local Māori regarding the commercial development and content of stories used in the product in each region. In my view and based on the extensive brand positioning created over time and enterprise expansion throughout New Zealand it could be said this venture functioned like any other non-Māori tourist operator. The products could be viewed as regionally diverse by way of ‘concept’ but not diverse in terms of reinforcing kin identity as specific to the region.

Whilst in Rotorua I participated in this product’s three hour evening tour as a ‘tourist’. In my view it was a ‘well oiled machine’ operating in a very slick, professional and highly organised manner. I viewed first-hand the ‘generic’ interpretation of Māori culture that visitors were presented with; given the broad spectrum of nationalities of visitors and high number per tour (approximately 100-200 people) this was understandable as many would not fully understand a more culturally in-depth interpretation. Talking with visitors at dinner revealed that many of them accepted the ‘commercialised’ nature of the product but felt overall they had been ‘authentically entertained’ and had learnt something about Māori culture. The outcome for visitors I spoke with seemed more concerned with ‘value and enjoyment’ of the experience and coincides with findings by Urry (1990) and McIntosh and Ryan (2007) that tourists are frequently seen to consume products out of their search for novelty, spectacle and gazing on difference, rather than the search for formal understanding. Māori staff mingle with visitors during dinner, thus visitors are given a chance to mix more ‘intimately’ with the ‘actors’ one to one and to perceive them as contemporary and individual subjects that are part of a collective identity of ‘Māori’.

An interesting issue that arose in my interview with the research participant of this business was a jealous ‘tension’ between this venture and the other performance-based case study in Northland’s Waitangi. Both targeted similar markets with the product
based on a pre-colonial and colonial ‘story’ that is enacted for visiting tourists. These products could be viewed as representative of Bhabha’s ‘performative hybridity’ whereby culture ‘as practice’ is demonstrated and whereby identity operates in a *third space* in which the ‘signs’ of culture can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricised and read anew (Bhabha 1994: 37). However, there were obvious tensions in that the Rotorua operator accused the Northland one of ‘copying’ their storyline concept. The Rotorua business was also developing a shorter one hour experience in central Rotorua. This performance was theatre style and presented as a story told by a grandparent to a young child based around a legacy passed on through generations. In this respect these two ventures’ performances were identical. However, the Rotorua venture has not been successful for the operator and in a market quite ‘saturated’ with Māori cultural tourism experiences, it may have been ambitious to lever off their already successful and highly marketed existing product with a new enterprise that visitors could actually experience in similar form at Waitangi. It would be highly likely that international visitors would visit both places but possibly only choose to experience ‘one’ Māori cultural product. Thus, competition between the regions obviously exists but could be alleviated with varied marketing strategies to differentiate the product.

Overall I found the businesses that had been operating two to five years to be more dynamic in their imagery and marketing styles with frequent updates and changes happening in line with their own business development. They were also relatively younger in age. In particular operators one, three, five and eight made a number of website changes during my research period and reflected more entrepreneurial characteristics than more existing businesses such as operators four, nine and eleven who were a generation older. Granted these latter operations are rurally based and their experiences based on a ‘set’ range of outdoor activities which are unlikely to vary much over time. In my view diversity of imagery was prevalent amongst all operators and revealed a desire to be regionally distinctive in representing their product.
5.4 Regional Differentiation of Māori Tourism Product

As discussed and justified in the Methodology Chapter the aim of my research was to present a dispersed case study analysis and cross-section of Māori tourism product. I will now expand on these regions in order to give a fuller description that attempts to highlight the use of traditional lands and resources Māori tourism operators are utilising to develop tourism businesses and which inextricably link with issues of identity and community wellbeing. As such, they are important sites of personal and kin group representation.

5.4.1 Tamaki Makaurau - Auckland

Auckland is New Zealand’s largest city with a regional population of over one million people. It is also the largest Polynesian city with around 20 per cent of the population either of Māori descent or migrants from Tonga, Samoa, the Cook Islands and other South Pacific Islands (Tourism Auckland 2007). It occupies the rohe of Tamaki Makaurau and local iwi consist of Ngati Paoa, Ngati Te Ata, Ngati Akitai, Kawerau a Maki, Ngati Mahuta, Ngai Tai, Ngati Tahinga, Ngati Wai and Ngati Whatua (Ministry of Culture and Heritage 2006; Taonui 2006). Auckland is also commonly referred to as the ‘City of Sails’ due to its location on the Tamaki isthmus between the Waitemata and Manukau harbours and the landscape includes dozens of dormant volcanic cones, islands, and nearby rainforest covers the surrounding hills (Tourism Auckland 2007).

The landscape offered early Māori plentiful resources from the two harbours, rich volcanic soils and a wealth of highly defensible volcano-top sites. The land became a site of numerous battles over the years between Māori tribes with the Northland tribe Ngāpuhi launching several successful raids on the Tamaki Māori which left the region almost uninhabited. The name “Tamaki Makaurau” means “the maiden with a hundred lovers” – a place desired by all and conquered by many (Tourism Auckland 2007).

The Ngati Whatua people are acknowledged as Tangata Whenua of the Tamaki isthmus. The establishment of pan tribal marae in cities such as Auckland reflects the urban shift
that affected Māori people during the 1950s and 60s in response to government policy. The large Māori community of West Auckland established the Hoani Waititi Marae in 1980 to cater to the needs of a diverse mix of kin groups living in the city. There is also an area known as the urupā, a burial site for ‘all’ who can trace their Māori ancestry. This is an example of creating traditional cultural structures within an urban setting to accommodate both collective and individual needs of contemporary Māori. Although not primarily promoted as a Māori cultural location, the local Auckland Regional Tourism Organisation’s strategy is to encourage tourism products around multi-cultural tourism and cultural heritage and ‘telling the story of Auckland’. There are currently about 20 Māori tourism businesses in the city (NZMTC 2006) including contemporary art galleries, culture and heritage performance, outdoor adventure and customized group tours. Māori tourism in the region is promoted on the MRTO website as follows:

You can immerse yourself in the history of Ngati Whatua (the local tribe), experience real Māori culture, learn about Māori legends, visit Māori Pa and Reserves, enjoy contemporary Māori Art and see ancient Māori treasures (taonga).

5.4.2 Tai Tokerau Northland

Tai Tokerau Northland is situated to the north of Auckland. This northern region of New Zealand is known as Te Hiku o te Ika a Maui, the ‘tail of the fish of Maui’ (NZMTC 2008). According to Māori legend their demigod ancestor, Maui, fished the North Island up from the depths of the ocean. Northland is a 350km long thread of magnificent, subtropical, beach fringed landscape and perhaps the ‘most Māori part of Aotearoa’ with a total of 43,527 Māori within a total population of 148,470 (Statistics NZ 2007). The tribal area incorporates a number of iwi including Ngati Wai, Ngāpuhi, Ngati Kahu, Ngai Takoto, Te Aupouri, Ngati Kuri, Te Rarawa, Te Roroa and Ngati Whatua – whose origins and development are both separate and related. These iwi occupy a region extending from the very tip of Northland at Cape Reinga down to Auckland (Figure 5.7).
Tai Tokerau Northland is also associated with the great Polynesian explorer, Kupe, the first Polynesian to discover the islands of New Zealand for his people. The arrival of Kupe is of great importance, and many tribes are at pains to cite a relationship to him. Like Maui before him, Kupe’s arrival is a foothold in the land for Māori (Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal 2006). Kupe set off back to his homelands in Hawaiiki from the Hokianga Harbour; sometime around the fourteenth century. Kupe’s descendents set out again in ocean-going canoes, many of which made their initial landfall in Tai Tokerau Northland (Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal 2006). The Hokianga Harbour area is a gorgeous backwater where Māori culture ‘beats strongly’. Nearby is the Waipoua Forest – home to the largest and oldest kauri trees in the world. Northland is also home to the Bay of Islands and the Waitangi Treaty Grounds. Waitangi remains an iconic site of colonial settlement and reminder of the struggle for land and power between Māori and Pākehā in the nineteenth century. Northland has several heritage sites associated with the ‘War in the North’ between the Crown and local Māori – sites that hold specific significance for Māori identity and examples of historical narrative for both settlers and Māori. Northland is commonly marketed in tourism publications as the “Birthplace of a Nation” because of these colonial connections. Since 2002 tourism marketing of the region has
built on a brand image as “First Region of New Zealand”, seeking to sustain the historic and Māori cultural heritage strengths of Northland (NTS 2003).

Māori in Tai Tokerau have been identified as one of the most socially and economically disadvantaged groups of people in New Zealand (Statistics NZ 2006). Data from the latest New Zealand Census in 2006 stated Northland region had the highest unemployment rate for Māori at 13.9 per cent; tourism potential therefore plays a key role in strengthening the growth of Māori economic development in the region. The lack of progress on Treaty of Waitangi settlements between the Crown and Northland Māori concerning iconic Northland tourism locations, e.g. Waipoua Forest and Cape Reinga lands is however restricting tourism development for Māori and for Northland (NTS 2003). The complexities of balancing tourism development and Treaty negotiations is recognised by local stakeholders, however there is also a desire that significant development of Māori tourism continues and is not stalled until Treaty settlements occur (NTS 2003). Research undertaken in the late 1990s on sustainable opportunities for Māori development in the region identified a particular type of tourism with a cultural and ecological emphasis as being the most appropriate commercial option (see Cloher and Johnston 1999). There is a strong emphasis on community and kinship within the social structure of the region and it was deemed that tourism reflect these value systems and the traditional reverence for the environment. A survey of Māori indicated a desire to develop tourism in an ‘alternative’ way – they did not want to see the region as a mass tourism destination like Rotorua (see Cloher 1998; Cloher and Johnston 1999).

The Northland Tourism Strategy identified eco-tourism as the largest product development opportunity for Northland (NTS 2003). It was felt that eco-tourism needed to be defined in a Northland context that sought to position eco-tourism as an approach rather than content. There have also been notably ‘anti-tourism’ attitudes by some locals who have disrupted infrastructure (such as roads) in an attempt to hinder tourism development in the region. However, there have also been hostile encounters between local kin groups in the region that fuel these issues and create obstacles for economic progress. This has been the result of negativity over the impacts (such as environmental)
of tourism in the region by locals who do not want tourism development. Given that Northland is more isolated, and with limited infrastructure and tourist facilities, the likely path of development for the region will be conservatively driven anyway. Sustainability was a key issue not only for the environment but also to their preferred way of social organisation, economic management and cultural presentations (Cloher and Johnston 1999).

Northland tourism is characterised as being a developing tourism destination with a strong domestic tourism base. This activity is based upon its proximity to Auckland that generates a high level of summer season visitor activity with a coastal and recreational focus (Commons and Page 2001). Thus the domestic market is not motivated by a desire to experience Māori culture. International tourism has growing importance for Northland. In the year ending 2004, Northland attracted over 1.6 million international and domestic visitors, contributing $637 million to the region’s economy and employing one in nine Northlanders. By 2011 total visitor expenditure in Northland is forecast to increase by $247 million (38.8 per cent) to $884.3 million (NTS 2003). In the period from 2001 to 2008 international visitor nights are expected to increase from 25 per cent to 30 per cent of total nights. The faster growth of international tourism highlights where the potential lies for the development of the Northland tourism industry. This is further reinforced by the growth in international expenditure in Northland which is forecast to increase from 44.9 per cent of total visitor expenditure in 2001 to 53.2 per cent in 2008 (NTS 2003). For tourism marketing purposes the Northland region is best divided into 5 main sub areas: Far North, Hokianga, Kauri Coast, Bay of Islands and Whangarei.

Māori tourism operators in Northland are typically small with several medium to large non-Māori operators based in the Bay of Islands. The majority of Māori operations are whānau based. Overall, visitors are attracted to the region for its natural environment, beaches, forests, wide open spaces and scenic beauty, culture and history (Carr 2007). Many of these attractions are ‘free’, therefore the need to develop income generating product to support the region is of concern to local communities and local Regional Councils. Strategies for activity product development primarily focus on extracting extra
value from and leveraging off the free natural environment which bring visitors to Northland.

5.4.3 Rotorua / Taupo / Urewera Region

The Rotorua region is synonymous with Māori tourism and still the most highly promoted and recognised destination for international travellers to experience Māori culture. I have already discussed the significance of Māori tourism development to this region in a historical context in Chapter One therefore I will not elaborate further albeit to say that Rotorua is often referred to as the ‘Māori capital’ in terms of cultural tourism with a number of well established operations offering a diverse range of Māori experiences. Nearby Taupo and the Whirinaki Forest capitalise on outdoor activities due to the area’s reputation of prime fishing, skiing, camping and hiking offered by way of its natural resources of Lake Taupo, Tongariro National Park and nearby mountains.

Te Urewera is one of the most remote wilderness areas remaining in New Zealand. Colonial ethnologist Eldson Best is quoted as saying:

“the Urewera country, the snow wrapped peaks and mighty ranges, the vast forests and rushing torrents, the lone lakes and great gulches, which form the leading features of Tuhoe land, engender that strange sensation of vivid interest and pleasing anticipation which is felt by ethnologist, botanist, and lover of primitive folklore” (Best 1897)

This region is still described as ‘untouched’, ‘pristine’, and as one research participant noted ‘the most “Māori” part of New Zealand’. Indeed, local Tangata Whenua Tuhoe have called themselves the “Tuhoe Nation” (Taonui 2007) and Tuhoe people have a reputation for their continued strong adherence to Māori identity. Crown confiscations in the colonial era left Tuhoe isolated and marginalised as a result of being ‘accused’ of being involved in my own iwi’s colonial conflict resulting in the death of Anglican priest Rev Carl Volkner. As rural Māori, the structure of land ownership, community and the sociocultural history of the area impact on contemporary aspirations to self sufficiency
Tourism has been long established in the region. As early as 1909 there was a Government Hostel at Lake Waikaremoana, and construction of a highway through the region in the 1930s opened up access (Landcare Research 2008). The establishment of the Whirinaki Forest Park, Te Urewera National Park, and more recently the Great Lake Walk, recognised the intrinsic value and beauty of the vast tracts of indigenous forest, the crystal clear lakes, rivers, and waterfalls in the region. It is popular with the domestic market for tramping, hunting and fishing, with a growing number of FIT’s visiting. Over the past decade there have been a number of tourism organisations in the region that has lead to varying levels of activity and success. However, its isolated position, lack of infrastructure and tourism skills, MRTO representation, quality accommodation, and as an area largely unknown to international visitors, create obstacles in creating a sustainable and viable tourism ‘industry’ in the region. A newly developed strategic plan called the Te Urewera Rainforest Route Incorporated has become an officially registered society to foster support for tourism in the region among key stakeholders. As such, Te Urewera can be deemed a ‘new’ tourism region in contemporary times.

5.5 Identity and Sense of Place: “grass-roots” Māori Tourism

Negotiating identity within Māori tourism is closely related to contemporary issues in New Zealand society as well as traditional connections to sense of place as attached to kin groups. Thus, the varied notions of space and the political concept of place as it plays out in identity, heritage and the “lived experience” are implicit in the host visitor touristic encounter (Jamal and Hill 2008). This has important implications for tourism planning and marketing of destination image (Hall 2000; Mackay 1997) as Jamal and Hill note a ‘destination’s sense of place is not one that is static and objective, but is one that is constructed, contested and lived within a performative space’ (2008: 23). The production of ‘local’ identities is becoming a more distinctive part of cultural tourism development. Regional differences amongst local culture are often expressed in terms of local history,
heritage and folklore. These are increasingly being sought out by tourists who are searching for experiences of cultural exchange whereby people define identities and cultural relationships through embodied encounters with other people (Jamal and Hollinshead 2001; Silverman 2003). This process contributes to regional differentiation of tourism products and also promotes the existence of regional identities within cultures. Making this distinction creates unique selling points for Māori tourism operators.

Much of the politics of tourism is invested in attempts to draw the visitor’s attention to particular interpretations of a place or region (Chambers 2000: 54). People and cultures vary considerably in the ways in which places are occupied and the ways in which they relate to such places. The notion of Māori and many indigenous peoples as close to nature is a feature continuously promoted as part of the “essence” of culture. The nature/culture dichotomy is twofold: it represents the ‘traditional’ whereby contemporary tourists often transcend the conditions of modernism in order to enter the identity space of the ‘primitive’ and thus interacting more fully with nature (Taylor 1998). It also provides Māori with the ‘resource’ to develop region tourism products as attached to land spaces. There is growing pressure for indigenous people to capitalise on the resources inherent in their lands and Māori are becoming increasingly open to non-traditional uses of the land. Many Māori are influenced by the same external factors in contemporary society structured around Western economic ideologies. This may realign some of the basic values that are reflected in the way Māori relate to the land as they increasingly engage in entrepreneurship and the global economy.

The close genealogical tie that many Māori have to the land provides opportunity for tourism product development through interpretation of place. Carr (2004: 31) has also noted indigenous knowledge systems for natural resources could provide alternative, sustainable approaches to human use of the natural environment (Hinch 2004; Pfister 2000; Shackley 2001; Timothy and Boyd 2003; Zeppel 1998, 2006). Tourism has become one avenue whereby seeking a balance between conservation and the financial rewards of development results in the maintenance and reaffirmation of indigenous control (Hinch 2004). In particular, western paradigms of environmental sustainability used in New
Zealand treat people and the natural environment as mutually exclusive. The CEO of the NZMTC states ‘Māori make no such distinction but link people and the natural environment in a genealogical manner and treat landscape as cultural phenomena’ (Edmonds 2006). Hall reiterates this in his comment ‘For Māori, heritage is an everyday lived experience… the landscape is imbued with symbolic, personal, cultural and spiritual significance’ (1996: 160).

Taking “landscape” as a central perception point, Māori draw on natural and cultural resources as extensions of their individual, kin group and/or collective identities to develop tourism products. As a tribal people boundaries have defined relevant kin groups specifically to land spaces; they might be physical spaces, but they might also be more experiential spaces, such as emotional or sacred. By using the resources of landscape as a cultural commodity – authorised through connections such as whakapapa, Māori tourism operators create an authentic experience between host and visitor. One Māori tourism operator I interviewed commented that ‘sharing ‘our’ stories carries with it the added dimension of connecting with ‘our manuhiri’ – it’s how we compete’. Connection to the land is the key to variation of the product, and thus, visitor satisfaction. This internalisation of land and cultural identity enables operators to capitalise on their individual resources in a variety of ways. The continuing challenge for Māori is how to reflect different cultural experiences in the regions and promote such differences to visitors. This may be reflected by how Māori attach to a national ‘collective’ identity that is promoted as ‘Māori’ and yet respect regional differences exist in the specific application of the concept Tangata Whenua as attached to kin groups and regional locations.

Regional differentiation as attached to working on traditional tribal lands was most notable in case studies who have developed nature and eco-adventure type products. For example, the Taupo research participant who operates guided walks in the nearby Whirinaki Forest did so because they recognised it as a ‘unique area – on a global scale and the fact that Māori attachment to environment was special’. The most popular product was a one day guided walk (4-5 hours) which was developed due to visitor
demand but with limited time. They also offer a three day multi-walk with camping and visit to a local marae. The owner calls the one day walk ‘a window look’ at Māori culture for the 95 per cent of international visitors that constitute their market. There is ‘little or no domestic growth for our product’ although the owner was initiating a domestic campaign at the time of my interview. The owner commented that the business idea originated from advice in the mid 1980s that the South Island ‘Great Walks’ (e.g. Milford Sound, Routeburn Track) would reach saturation point and that visitor flows were predicted to double in the next 10-15 years from then. This proved sound advice as visitor numbers on these walks have grown immensely and alternative options such as Whirinaki are capitalising on their ‘uniqueness’ as offering different experiences with a cultural flavour. Interestingly, this was the only research participant who was Pākehā; however his upbringing in nearby Māori communities had instilled a sense of “Māoriness” in him that was very evident in our interview. The passion he held for the landscape that was also part of his heritage reinforced the notion of “sense of place” as cross-culturally significant to identity construction.

One particular issue for the operator was the ‘balancing act of tikanga’. Marae stays posed a problem in this respect - how to ‘fit into’ a commercial business is sometimes at odds with Māori tikanga. An example being a pre-booked itinerary for international passengers that was disrupted because a tangi cancelled their visit. The issue of quality and restrictions such as no alcohol on marae were also issues saying ‘this is not acceptable to international markets’ but difficult to resolve when cultural values and beliefs interact with commercial enterprise. The owner commented that most visitors wanted to talk and interact with the local Māori guides and wanted ‘in-depth knowledge about the culture’. He said ‘visitor satisfaction derives from the conveyance of oral history versus written means … the information is infused in generations – very specific to the Urewera/Whirinaki region’. In his view tribal differences needed to be promoted more at a national and international level by the tourism industry. He sees hapu as the strong element in tourism development for Māori (more than iwi) especially in the Taupo region – ‘this has changed from the traditional ‘one voice’ of iwi (i.e. Tuwharetoa).
There is not enough effort as a sector (tourism) in determining regional differentiation through promoting “grass-roots” Māori tourism at the hapu and whānau level’.

The increasing ‘fractured’ nature of iwi may be a contributing factor to this comment as past decades have seen the emergence of a multitude of Māori ‘collectives’ that cross traditional tribal structures organized on bases other than kinship. These are highly political changes in response to Crown reparation processes and Māori representation in Parliament and other places (Sharp 2002). Multiple affiliation to iwi is also common amongst many Māori and it may well be that the ‘terminal identity of many Māori actually lies in their hapu rather than their iwi’ – iwi merely being a more convenient structure for governments to deal with than the ‘multitudinous hapu’ (Sharp 2002: 23-24).

Another operator in the nearby town of Turangi was very new and had spent several years away from ‘home’ before returning to set up his outdoor oriented tourism business. Like many Māori brought up in more rural areas he had ventured to the city for further education and work opportunities. His goal was to increase ‘visitor flow’ to the area targeting ‘high end international FIT’s’ (free and independent travellers). He was particularly concerned with offering a ‘contemporary’ view of Māori culture and negating the “grass-skirted” image of Māori. He referred to his initial marketing and brochure publication as a “shotgun approach” – which he has since changed to suit market demand. He felt visitors were keen to interact with Māori based on culture from a Māori perspective and wanted to provide visitors with more ‘off the cuff’ responses to questions such as “what’s your perspective of the Treaty of Waitangi?” That is, local knowledge and stories originating from a grass-roots foundation and a lived experience of being local Tangata Whenua. He felt the national image of Māori was still homogenous and wanted to see change.

One main issue for this operator was conflict over requiring a DoC\textsuperscript{33} concession to take guided tours on ‘his land’. The government agency DoC issue about 1500 annual

\textsuperscript{33} Department of Conservation
concessions to commercial ventures operating on sensitive conservation land. For this operator, the land linked his own personal identity and that of his kin group with their tūrangawaewae; guiding visitors in the natural environment and cultural traditions of his ancestors reinforced a sense of cultural pride and he felt this requirement was ‘unjust’. The tension between operator and DoC in respect of concessions is not uncommon with Māori operators and often derives from colonially imposed policies and historical grievances over confiscated land by the Crown. A similar issue was raised by the Urewera adventure tourism operator. Past tensions with DoC over access to ‘their land’ had fuelled much discontent between local Tuhoe and the Crown as concessions were required to ‘cross parts of land between Māori land’ in the Urewera Forest. This has since been rectified between the two parties. However, there were ongoing issues with DoC not ‘maintaining tracks in the area’ thus affecting the Urewera business operation that needed access to remote campsites and fishing areas for their guided tours.

In these two case studies operators considered the opportunity to operate their businesses on tribal lands as a privilege and birth right. This is inextricably linked to the ‘kin relationship’ which brings with it certain very specific rights and duties according to Sharp (2002). This notion is explained by the eminent Māori scholar Professor Hirini Moko Mead as deriving from the act of whakawhānau (giving birth) whereby a whenua (placenta) and pito (umbilical cord) are buried within the land of the whānau and that establishes a spiritual link between land and the child. The child inherits a number of rights called a birthright such as the right to use the marae, the right to an identity and whakapapa as a member of the whānau, the hapu, the iwi and the waka, the right to share in the tribal estate and any benefits of any settlement to the hapu or iwi. These rights are seen as ‘automatic’; property and authority within the group follow the kin principle which can be construed as a ‘fundamental group’ (Sharp 2002). Thus, it is the ‘group’ rather than the individual that bears self-authenticating authority – what is called ‘mana’ in Māori. Terms such as mana whenua and mana tangata are concepts of the ‘group’ as the fundamental particle of social life.
In terms of younger operators such as the Turangi one, the decision to ‘return home and work on my land’ could be considered a reversal of the ‘urbanisation’ of Māori as I also received the same comments from the Hokianga heritage/eco-tourism operator. They were of a similar age and had also made the decision to ‘return home’. This was an interesting counter to comments made by operator number four who operated horse treks north of Auckland. This was a whānau based business and the owner commented she had ‘problems with Māori guides with no stickability … they cannot take the pressure’. She has tried to support the local community through employment of local people but ‘most young (Māori) want to head to the city’. In the latter two cases, there has been a reversal back to the home region and obviously an attachment to kin accountability. It may also reveal generational and hybrid changes within Māori culture that incorporate previous urban experiences and skills ‘back’ to traditional kin areas. As such, the ‘fusion’ of old with new creates new forms of Māori identity.

The motivation behind the Hokianga business was largely community based. They wanted to enhance the Hokianga region and improve living standards for residents and whānau and promote a sense of community identity. They realised the limited infrastructure in the area hindered development of not only tourism, but other economic ventures as well. They recognised visitors want ‘quality’ experiences, and this included such basic things as a decent café and food outlets, atm machines and banks, suitable parking, toilets, etc which were lacking in the main towns of the region. They have been strongly supported by Enterprise Northland (EN) in their business set up and conducted a joint feasibility study of the region. This provided the impetus to create the new tourism venture and they retain strong links with EN for ongoing promotion and marketing assistance. They commented that the ‘Northland approach is collective and collaborative with a focus on working together’ and that ‘this is a key strength in comparison with other regions’. There were, however, ‘obstacles’ in their initial set up with some of the local community resisting change and development. As they have progressed local support has changed immensely with the realisation that benefits are flowing back to the community. One co-owner stated ‘it’s about providing options and involving the communities to provide options … it’s about building commitments’.
In an urban context I found the notion of contributing back to community existed in a more holistic sense and was connected to pan-tribal affiliation. Operator three had a strong interest in working with at risk Māori youth hence the business has facilitated programmes for schools and community marae. Indeed the logo for the business uses the Māori mythical figure of Maui as representing ‘self determination for young people’. The motivation behind this side of the business is a firm belief in the ‘importance of building a strong community of future Māori leaders’. Hence, the notion of self-determination underlies this desire. The co-owner comments: ‘my aim is to re-connect them with their culture and sense of place and to use the outdoors as a means to do this’. Thus, she also demonstrates the fluidity of cultural identity by adapting to situations whereby young urban Māori who, often, are more interested in ‘rap music and baseball caps’ than ‘myths and legends’ of Māori creation are provided with tangible elements of cultural expression. Cultural capital is thus sustained through such relationships relayed through the living and contemporary aspects of day to day life. The co-owner stated, ‘as a Māori business it is vitally important for us to contribute back to our communities. It’s just part of who we are as Māori’.

The generic signifier of ‘Māori’ here may represent identity of a collective nature derived from colonial practices that marginalised Māori and caused socio-economic disparity between Māori and Pākehā. Emphasising a common ethnicity rather than tribal affiliation/differences in such circumstances is sometimes necessary as a strategy for postcolonial resistance. This focus on a common ethnicity illustrates Spivak’s notion of ‘strategic essentialism’ however, Meredith (1998) warns that such ‘moments’ are temporary; put in place to serve a strategic project and thus should not naturalise the “Māori” subject. This appeared to be a strong feature of this young operation reiterated by the following comment regarding motivation behind the business setup:

We wanted to run tours from a Māori perspective, to introduce visitors to the beauty and relevance of today of Māori culture. We also wanted to work in a company that was positively Māori, and able to provide employment for other Māori where they felt comfortable being Māori.
This comment reveals identity construction as both personal and collective. “Māori” subjectivity is influenced and stratified by a multiplicity of mediums in a continuous struggle of contradiction, stress and negotiation for positionality (Meredith 1998). That is, identity is relational and part of a series of different positionalities that express ones “Māoriness” and not bound to a single notion of what it means to be Māori. I would contribute such discourse to the two owners of this business being not Tangata Whenua to the lands on which they operated albeit the importance of land as an identity ‘signifier’ for them as Māori and noted in the following comment:

the resources are the whenua (land), the people and the moana (sea) … our product is all about contemporary urban culture, the way that Māori living in a city incorporate and understand their environment and history.

This describes the use of land resources for their adventure activities such as abseiling, kayak trips, beach walks, etc and the connection with resources and product development is evident with an emphasis on Māori perspectives being critical to the interpretation. The co-owner sees merit in distinguishing between Māori culture as collective and tribal. Their acknowledgement of being Tangata Whenua from ‘another region’ enables visitors to make distinctions that different iwi inhabit particular places, but also represents mobile identities and tourism experiences. Being able to distinguish between these differences enables tourists to appreciate aspects of Māori culture that are specific and relevant to that place. This is re-iterated by the following comment:

Otherwise visitors think that all aspects of Māori culture are the same, and that if they go to a hangi in Rotorua, they have ‘done’ Māori culture, seen all there is to be seen … showcasing regional differences is fine as a marketing strategy, so that people want to experience Māori culture in each area, but there needs to be reference to the diversity of experience found in each area as well.

A point to be raised here is the concept of kin accountability. Aspiring entrepreneurs such as operator three are a burgeoning ‘new face’ of Māori tourism that challenges some of the traditional mores of Māori epistemology. Although there is recognition that Māori
culture is a ‘living, breathing, contemporary’ entity, it is still largely underpinned by traditional values that link to ‘layers’ of genealogy. As a consequence if aspirations to benefit Māori society are to be sustainable these may require checks and balances within and between younger and older generations that ultimately derive from kin accountability. But, urban-based non tribal entities complicate such issues. Classed as ‘derivative groups’ by Sharp (2002) the claim by such groups as ‘iwi’ are contentious within Māoridom. This of course relates to the Crown’s recognition of iwi as the ‘legitimate’ recipients of Treaty claims and resource reparation. The issue therefore is ‘what legitimates a Māori non-kin group?’ and by association raises tensions within Māori epistemology. As noted by Sharp (2002: 25) it is ‘tikanga that prescribes the kawa of the particular marae – the protocols that express, among other things, relationships with visitors. In sum, it is tikanga…that provides the detailed working-out of the more general implications of the whakapapa mode of kin connection’. The leadership or rangatiratanga in non-tribal entities such as Urban Māori Authorities has been deemed a ‘dynamic relationship’ that is held by ‘consent’ which can ‘wax and wane, ebb and flow’ (Sharp 2002). Nothing is absolutely stable, thus the continuity of the group’s existence cannot be guaranteed. The contrast with the kin group principle therefore is markedly different.

Based on all interviews I would state the over-arching concept of attachment to land for Māori tourism operators is contextual and situational. By this I refer to the fluidity of culture within a context that describes lived experience. Taking narrative (Chase 2005; Ricoeur 1984) as central to identity formation one of my main findings from interviews reveals storytelling within Māori tourism product as representative of a localised and tribal attachment to place and lived reality. A quote from James Clifford expands this notion:

Indigenous forms of dwelling cover a range of sites and intensities: there are “native” homebodies, commuters, travellers and exiles. But a desire called “the land” is differently, persistently active (2001: 481)
At the local level, cultural identity appears to affect the development of the tourism product by the individual or kin group in ways that reveal rich regional distinctions. Local, regional and international marketing of Māori tourism products increasingly incorporates operators’ delivery of ‘unique’ cultural traits such as the inclusion of cultural values for landscape as central to the visitor experience. In respect to Māori / tourist encounters we can apply Clifford’s argument that one of the “enduring constraints” in the changing mix of “differently articulated sites of indigeneity” will always be “the power of place” (2001: 475).

In a more socio-political context of Māori Crown relations “place” also denotes the complexity of its colonial origins. While Māori seek to assert their specificity and retain a distinct and historical relationship to place (Bell 2004), Pākehā New Zealand, in the form of Crown representatives has historically denied such aspirations through strategies such as assimilation, integration, and biculturalism that bear the hallmarks of colonial ideology. If we are to move past these ‘duelling discourses’ (O’Sullivan 2007) a greater understanding of identity politics is required. Sameness and difference intermingle to create new spaces in which new meanings emerge. Māori seek more choice and control over their future through self-determination. This process can be supported by institutional arrangements set in place by governments (but not delivered or imposed by them) but must arise from Māori people themselves. This is a prime factor that makes bicultural relationships with the Crown inadequate thus, thinking beyond biculturalism to self-determination progresses Māori aspirations for greater autonomy (O’Sullivan 2007). I argue that Pākehā authority must accept the notion of Māori autonomy as a necessary condition for equal participation in society. This requires dissolution of entrenched colonialism and recognition of cultural pluralism.

5.6 Summary
Tourism New Zealand have recognised that many traditional images depicting Māori from decades ago are out-dated, hence many of our international visitors have
expectations long past their due by date (TNZ 2003, 2005). Throughout the twentieth century the national tourism organisation has promoted such images in a desire to define a particular New Zealand identity. As Dann (1996: 69) notes ‘in spite of the attractiveness of open landscapes and seascapes, many tourists still need to be convinced that they are travelling somewhere and that destinations have identifiable characteristics’. The introduction of ‘natives’ in such scenes has tended to symbolise these characteristics. Thus, objects and persons become interchangeable stereotypes (Albers and James 1988).

Māori tourism stakeholders have continually challenged the representational nature of such tourism imagery in New Zealand and by association the socio-political colonial context in which this practice originated. The desire for more autonomous and self determined representation of tourism images inherently places discussion of contemporary Māori tourism representation within the context of postcolonial critique. It has been said that the issue of control, not wealth are at the heart of Māori tourism development’ (Hall 1996). Although economic benefits are important to most Māori operators interviewed in this research, there are often more intangible cultural factors underlying the motivation to develop tourism ventures and to present culture as a tourist ‘commodity’. Power and discourse are inherently linked to the representation of Māori tourism which operate to both constrain and promote Māori culture through the relationships it formulates.

My methodological approach to this research has attempted to produce a postcolonial critique that offers up fresh notions of ‘talking back’ and reclaiming identities and histories that have been subsumed by the progressive trajectory of western development. By critically engaging with such discourse creates new spaces on which to inscribe indigenous representation. The complexities of identity construction necessitated a research focus on a relatively small number of cases in order to provide an indepth comparison and analysis of cultural interpretation. This sought to present a contemporary and ‘lived experience’ to Māori tourism today juxtaposed with the historical context of Māori tourism development within which this thesis has been framed.
The analysis of website and brochure material of case studies revealed numerous examples of Māori operators who incorporated references to their sense of belonging through landscape affiliation, tribal identity, or more generically as a ‘collective’ Māori identity when marketing their products. Although many Māori live outside their traditional tribal areas there is still a strong ethos of recognising the significance of landscape as part of Māori identity. As such, landscape resources become infused with cultural values and meanings that are transferred and translated into tourism products for commercial ends. Case studies examined in this chapter focus on interactive and educational objectives in which to represent and share Māori culture and incorporate stories as a means to promote not only tribal diversity but also attachment to land spaces. Management structures reflect different approaches to business development and several operators embrace western business practices to gain competitive advantages. Collaborative marketing strategies with MRTOs, NZMTC, and RTOs are also apparent in both rural and urban contexts and that ensure Māori are ‘ahead of the game’ in New Zealand’s dynamic and competitive tourism industry.

Tribal identity plays a role in marketing and promotion of tourism products, but to varying degrees. In some cases it forms a strategic part of ownership and representation of the product in a local sense (eg operator one and five) whilst others promote more of a ‘bicultural’ identity (such as operator three) by promoting both Māori and Pākehā heritage. This illustrates a relational context whereby resources provide the opportunity for diversified offerings in an urban setting. However, there is also recognition by Māori operators for the need to be ‘cross-culturally’ conscious and stems from not only a desire to cater to international trends and demands but also the potential to expand marketshare of New Zealand’s domestic tourism sector. The rural urban shift in the twentieth century has, for many Māori, affected traditional tribal identities and as such, ‘urban Māori’ have integrated tribal and self identities to create contemporary tourism operations that showcase the changing nature of Māori culture. This illustrates the realities of interactions between people and places, and the fluidity of culture as contextual and situational. As such, this demonstrates how Māori tourism operators negotiate the representation of their image, tribal identity and cultural difference.
CHAPTER SIX

Storying Identities

Introduction

Results from the previous chapter reveal rich regional distinctions of Māori tourism are evident and that tribal identity plays a major role in how operators (re)present Māori culture as diverse and contemporary. The multiplicity of Māori culture is reflected in media imagery that promotes a variety of tourism products such as eco and nature tourism, heritage interpretation, cultural performance, urban tours, and adventure and outdoor activities. Underlying the motivation of Māori business setup are issues such as community wellbeing, conservation and attachment to traditional lands, economical benefits, cultural sustainability, entrepreneurial attitudes and a desire for self autonomous representation of the Māori tourism image.

Māori epistemology governs how many operators define their ‘sense of place’ within New Zealand’s wider socio-political environment and transferred to the cultural tourism experience through aspects such as whakapapa and tūrangawaewae. However these concepts are fluid and dynamic, operating in third spaces that constantly re-inscribe notions of Māori as the homogenous Other. Māori tourism operators challenge previously embedded myths of colonial discourse by drawing on a genealogy of oral narrative and stories that (re)present other ‘versions’ of history and cultural identity. Storytelling is a way of representing truth and allows the diversities of truth to be heard, rather than just one dominant version. This gains legitimacy and validity through a postcolonial discourse of resistance. As such, stories are an integral part of constructing Māori identity and by association how Māori tourism is presented to visitors. Tribal diversity is thus a key element in the development of Māori regional tourism product. A research participant from Te Puni Kokiri commented that ‘tribal – is the best way that
Māori ‘organise’ and drive business … stories link the land and the people. They are the key to variation of the product/experience. The source of this is in the regions’.

This chapter discusses themes of storytelling, identity, authenticity and cultural integrity as identified in Chapter Five. Each of these themes intersect as ‘layers’ within Māori epistemology and which are continually being re-aligned within the forces of local and global appropriation. As an industry tourism creates processes of acculturation and value change which impact on notions of place and identity. The role of government and private enterprise not only define social reality but also recreate it to fit those definitions. This process is both interactive and dialectical (Papson 1981) and one in which indigenous peoples are constantly re-negotiating from a position of marginal power. Thus, the domain of tourism is clearly inseparable from cultural politics. In its dynamic context tourism processes contend over definitions of what is “traditional” and “authentic” of which the meanings are also constantly being re-aligned. As such, hybridity calls attention to globalised persons and cultures and the condition of formerly colonised peoples (Stoddard and Cornwall 1999: 332) and the ever-changing processes of cultural production.

I will place emphasis on operators one, three, five and seven for a more indepth analysis of business practice and product representation including the aspect of cultural hybridity as a determining characteristic of tourism and cultural change. Findings examine the aspects of tribal identity that underlie the management and representation of the product and how culture as ‘substance’ shifts to culture as practice. This connects with the notion of Bhabha’s hybridity whereby the discursive strategies used by Māori tourism operators makes them ‘free to negotiate and translate their cultural identities in a discontinuous intertextual temporality of cultural difference’ (1994: 38). Discussion examines the nature of storytelling as a resource that ascribes tribal identity to a tourism product whilst also representing a form of post-colonial discourse. As a resource story-telling diversifies Māori culture at a regional level and strengthens the collective identity of Māori at a national level. Thus, visitor perception of a homogenised Māori culture is
(re)framed through discourse. Regional representation of Māori tourism shows complex subcultures exist that contribute to the overall national tourism identity of New Zealand.

The boundaries between themes identified from operator interviews are porous, and thus intersect at various junctures of my research results. Discourse and power have been highlighted as central to colonial practice, and as such, become central components of my postcolonial critique. Discursive contexts are fluid; constantly refigured and recreated through individual utterances, actions and texts (Foucault 1980; 1989); discourse is now open to different interpretations and thus open to resistance. This merges with postcolonialism and its emphasis on resisting and re-negotiating colonial discursive practices. Thus, discourse can be deconstructed and re-constructed through different value systems and forms of knowledge that have previously been marginalised. Māori tourism operators use such systems of discourse to create contemporary tourism experiences and storytelling is part of this reconstruction process. This has implications for determining that narrative:

1. is an identity-forming concept for Māori
2. differentiates tourism product at a regional level
3. (re)presents Māori tourism from a “grass-roots” perspective that also melds with a collective ‘inclusiveness’ of Māori culture that is constantly evolving

### 6.1 Storytelling – Myths and Legends

Numerous writers have acknowledged that mythology and legends entwine communities of people to the landscape and that narratives are an important aspect of collective heritage identity and the cultural landscape (Pfister 2000; Shackley 2001; Uzzell 1996; in Carr 2007). Contemporary Māori tourism operators draw on mythology to relate the deeds of their ancestors and as a way to explain Māori epistemology (Carr 2007). The analysis of case study promotional material typically found comments which mentioned that visitors are able to hear ‘myths and legends’ or ‘sacred stories’ relevant to Māori worldviews. This tended to divide into two realms – one that is directly attached to
personal or kin group identities and one that is ‘generic’ in terms of a collective relationship to ‘all’ Māori, such as the Maui or Kupe myth. Operator number seven located in the Hokianga is one such example. This tourism venture had only been operating for two years prior to my interview but was already making a substantial impact on the Māori tourism ‘scene’ in terms of its successful business marketing and unique product. The two co-owners I interviewed were relatively young and were both originally from the Hokianga. There is little full-time employment in the Hokianga and many locals leave the region out of economic necessity for work elsewhere. One of the co-owners said he had a strong urge to ‘return home’ and set up a business that would benefit the community and his whānau. The business was formed as a limited liability company with primary interest held in a family trust that owns and operates two hotel facilities in the area. Local ownership provides a controlling mechanism for tourism development and the trust saw value in the strength of combining with other Māori tourism businesses in the area as an advantage of collective business growth. The added dimension of kin group involvement means accountability to the local Māori society becomes an inherent part of the business philosophy.

The main product offered by the business are guided eco-cultural tours in the nearby Waipoua Forest (with the largest known kauri tree Tane Mahuta) and also a combination of forest/marae tours which can be taken as day or night experiences. A resource inventory conducted in the Hokianga by Cloher and Johnson in 1998 revealed locals’ desire to share such resources as marae with visitors and believed that tourism is consistent with issues of social sustainability, as one elder states ‘when Pākehā come to our Marae they don’t come just to see these carvings. They come to meet us and ancestors … it is essentially a spiritual experience where people learn more about themselves’ (Cloher and Johnson 1999: 51). The inextricable link between marae and identity cannot be ignored in this comment and highlights the importance of marae as a forum for host/visitor interaction. As such, the marae is the basis from where whakapapa-layered narratives are released and whereby kin identity is entwined with associated surrounding ancestral lands, waterways and resources. Thus, the use of such
resources for tourism purposes requires the mandate of rangatira to secure cultural integrity.

The venture caters to both free independent travellers (FITs) as well as a variety of groups (schools, conferences, etc) catering to the New Zealand domestic market. The co-owners were also examining the potential of collaborative ventures to attract the Japanese market and were working with regional and national industry stakeholders to develop this further. They were also planning a second complementary product incorporating the heritage of the Hokianga Harbour when I visited. This is now up and running as a fully integrated product and the business has entered into a joint collaboration with transport operators in the region to offer full day tours from Paihia to Hokianga and return. By specifically targeting the Bay of Islands tourist market they have extended their market share of tourism in the Northland region.

Hokianga Harbour is one of the sites at which Kupe is said to have landed over a millennium ago and local tradition tells that one of his canoes is buried in the dunes at Hokianga Heads (Cloher and Johnston 1999). The harbour thus became known as Hokianganui-a-Kupe, the place of Kupe’s great return. The townships of Omapere and Opononi are popular summer spots for visitors, and nearby Rawene is the oldest European settlement in the Hokianga with a number of historical buildings dating from the colonial period. The importance of the Hokianga waterway is not only connected with the legendary Polynesian explorer Kupe, but also houses sites of Māori/Pākehā colonial interaction. The newly developed product was based around this colonial heritage taking visitors to important sites that told the ‘story’ of Māori/Pākehā settlement in the region. The owners recognised that regional knowledge (of visitors) of the Hokianga is lacking compared with other areas such as Rotorua and they wanted to impart the importance of the environment and its spiritual connection to local Māori. This was reiterated by one co-owner who said ‘the forest is close to us, it’s taught us, it’s about understanding what that land means to us … it’s my home’. In describing the product he stated ‘there are few words needed, it’s about the people and the place – we “feel” it’.
The objective of the business was to create interactive and educational experiences to ‘bring the product to life’. The co-owner felt that international marketing by TNZ had not created a ‘collective’ image of Māori but that most international tourists still perceived Māori culture as homogenous. He agreed that more regional/tribal distinction of Māori culture was required in tourism media and that more ‘modern’ images of Māori culture should be promoted. Although he felt this was already reflected in some national imagery he felt that Northland imagery and marketing did not reflect this. This may be a result of the isolation and economic disparity of Northland compared with tourist ‘rich’ centres such as Rotorua. Overall, he viewed Māori culture as made up of both collective and individual identities and his own identity as that of Māori and Ngāpuhi stating:

> The two run parallel … there is a need to be a recognisable Māori collective … but you can also identify as specific iwi – that can add another dimension to product, knowledge, etc but does not delineate between one over the other.

The co-owner describes this perspective as ‘a hook within a hook’, they are part of a larger collective and ‘themselves a small entity within this; the two are mutually dependent’. This ascribes to Meredith’s (1998) comments about the multiplicity of “Māoriness” and that the “Māori” subject, like most other peoples today, is pluralistic in character. In this case there is a tendency to view Māori culture as ‘both/and’ in terms of identification and how identity is articulated to a postmodern audience that seeks difference, diversity and differentiation. New possibilities of identity and ideologies are created in what Hollinshead (2008) terms ‘disidentification’ over essentialist concepts of identity. Identity is thus a shifting image which is ‘suturing’ itself to different articulations between discourse and practice (Van Meijl and Miedema 2004).

Disidentification is a field of expression which seeks to combat the subjective appropriation of local (indigenous) knowledge by mainstream (colonial) discourse. Viewed in the context of cultural representation in the global travel marketplace this raises the argument that there is never any ‘pure’ subject out there, waiting there
neutrally, ready to be cleanly/clearly/straightforwardly communicated to tourists (Hollinshead 2008: 294). This legitimates the view that there is no pure ‘traditional’ or ‘original’ indigenous culture. Hence, the ‘political’ narratives of storytelling that Māori impart which are multi-layered in terms of identity construction (ie whakapapa) act in *third spaces* through which ‘different’ and ‘Other’ subjects are constructed in the marketplace.

The guided forest tours fall within the boundary of another hapu, therefore the tourism owners and guides are not ‘ahi kā’. Hence, they do not tell stories that belong to that area but do tell generic stories of Māori culture that blend with the forest environment. The stories of the harbour are specifically related to that body of water and with the mythical figure of Kupe. They worked closely with the four local marae in establishing the content and makeup of the tours, with each rangatira ‘having their own objectives for which they shared their knowledge with us’. Thus, cultural authority mandates the use of narratives. Stories are a main component of both products (forest/harbour) and have been developed differently as a result of the locations and local ‘ownership’ by kin groups. Input by local kaumātua governed this process and ensured cultural integrity was maintained. This was ‘very important to the learning process’ one co-owner stated and he described the total product experience as ‘it’s all stories’; and felt that stories contributed to the authenticity of the product and, as a result, visitor satisfaction.

Both traditional and contemporary stories were told and the co-owner felt they were an important form of cross-cultural interaction between visitor/host. Guides interpret the environment to visitors through songs, proverbs, music and stories. One guide stated he used ‘enthusiasm of historical stories and appreciation of forest environment’ as means to foster appreciation of Māori culture to visitors. He also rated the component of storytelling as very important in terms of defining his own Māori identity and that of his kin group. When asked about the added value of incorporating his ‘own’ stories within his role of tour guide he revealed the aspect of individual identity formation as ‘I become

---

34 Ahi kā refers to the constant flame of domestic fire, keeping one’s title to land warm by occupation. The repositories of ahi kā are the remnants of Māori land, particularly the 500 or so tribal marae around the country (Walker 1999)
the person in the story’ and that to ‘express my feelings as a Māori about my history, heritage and our future’ was paramount to his being a Māori tourism guide. The cultural dimension to a tourism experience with a Māori guide is summed up in the comment by the operator:

It is the way that we can help visitors to gain a much more holistic introduction, or exploration of New Zealand culture and land. A knowledgeable Tangata Whenua guide can provide so many more layers of experience than any other person. Being a Māori tourism operator also means that we can make a difference to the way that Māori culture as a whole is perceived by both international and local visitors, media and society in general.

The owners see opportunities in the Hokianga for communities to develop tourism. There are ‘many different experiences and stories in the different areas … it’s for the communities to take control of that development’. This Northland operator has drawn on the region’s rich resources to develop a diverse range of heritage and eco-cultural product. There is a determined desire to promote community well-being through tourism development and a desire to nurture and promote the unique environment of the Hokianga to both locals and visitors. Both European and Māori heritage are incorporated within the product and stories told to visitors. Emphasis is given to imparting the wairua – the spirituality that Māori hold for such tangible cultural resources as ‘our ancestor Tane Mahuta’, and the intangible such as their connection with early mythical explorer Kupe. Tane Mahuta highlights the spiritual bond local Māori have with the environment and the importance of being kaitiaki35 of this resource.

The business has grown substantially in a short period of time primarily due to its holistic approach to collaborative and proactive relationships with a number of industry stakeholders. There is a constant emphasis on establishing new relationships that benefit not only business growth but the community as a whole. They also recognise the ‘fine line’ between sustainability and exploitation of the resources. They are adamant to ‘manage’ the development process as tourism opportunities are presented and recognise

__________________________

35 guardian
tourists are ‘looking for people as they are, a local telling the stories about their culture … the environment gives that – we cannot destroy that down to earth environment the Hokianga can provide’. This tourism venture draws on traditional Māori culture and their colonial heritage to impart knowledge to visitors about the connections between landscape, people and the stories that link the two. The owner stated, ‘tours aren’t about history, but the importance of the environment to people’ thus their objective is to offer interactive, educational and cultural knowledge to visitors through the telling of stories. The co-owner reinforces this notion by stating ‘my biggest lesson this year has been that our business is to tell stories, and that we all have a story to tell’.

Operator number five was also situated in the Northland region near Paihia and, like the Hokianga business was also ‘new’ to the market operating only two years. In a comprehensive article on Māori Tourism in the New Zealand Geographic magazine, the CEO of NZMTC stated, ‘Māori tourism is not only as diverse as iwi, but also as variable as the individual characters in the industry’ (Sole 2006: 93). For me, the owner of this case study exemplified this comment. My interaction with him was based on a half day personalised tour including interview, and I was immediately made aware of his strong tribal identity when he recited 700 years of his whakapapa to me soon after we met. His tribal identity was defined by particular land space boundaries that were articulated in his mihi and pepeha, symbolising his worldviews. It seemed evident to me that past emphasis of tourism promotion on nature and culture as separate entities directs attention away from the genealogical connections Māori have with the land. This represents a key feature in terms of diversifying the Māori tourism product and how each operator uses such resources in a regional context. The operator’s website promotes this connection with the comment: ‘Our Māori world view incorporates a universal esoteric system through the interrelatedness of people and culture’ which reflects Williams (2002) notion of place attachment and place identity. Place attachment is a general way to characterise the emotional ties people form with places, whilst place identity is used in a somewhat more specific way to characterise the role of places as sources of identification and affiliation that add meaning and purpose to life (Altman and Low 1992; Proshansky 1978).
In reciting his extensive whakapapa the operator articulated identification as a signifying practice (Hall and DuGay 1996). The social construction of “sense of place” revealed by kin group attachment to particular place strengthens the outcome of experience for the visitor when interpreted by local Māori that lay ‘claim’ to particular places. This claim also highlights the intangible reference to the term Tangata Whenua. Taking landscape as a central perception point, this term draws on natural and cultural resources as essential elements of its construction. The comment by this operator illustrates this connection:

We were known as Tangata Whenua, and today we are still referred to as Tangata Whenua. Now, some people have asked me what does ‘Tangata Whenua’ mean … and I know I have seen the dictionary with the European interpretation of ‘our’ language, and of course the ‘learned’ Māori’s interpretation of his own kōrero … the ones who have studied in the universities, and the ones who have translated their language of their ancestors into English, and the word … the common phrase is ‘people of the land’. Umm, I say not. My interpretation of Tangata Whenua, coming from my perspective is “I am the land – and the land is me”. There’s no separation. I have a DNA connection with Papatūānuku … I am of her … so yeah, when people want to carve her up – the pain that she feels I feel. I’m talking in a spiritual way here … which is something that I share with our customers … it’s something completely different.

This statement is connected to the problematic issue of essentialism. Often seen in a negative light, the term is discussed in different ways within the indigenous world (Tuhiwai Smith 2003). The operator’s comments about the ‘essence’ of his identity is inherently connected to indigenous concepts of spirituality, thus his ‘essence’ has a genealogy which can be traced back to an earth parent – Papatūānuku. This shared relationship with ‘inanimate’ beings is inherently connected to the significance of place, of land, of landscape, of other things in the universe. This defining of an ‘essence’ of a people, makes for a very different rendering of the term essentialism as used by indigenous peoples (Tuhiwai Smith 2003: 74). Such concepts are often problematic for western systems of knowledge to deal with or accept, hence, different cultural values ‘clash’ in the socio-political arena such as between Māori and Pākehā, especially when ownership or customary land use rights are broached in the public domain. However, such concepts are also critical sites of resistance for indigenous peoples, and offer a
measure of control and power via the interpretation of these values as shared between host and visitor.

The term “Māori” as a descriptor of being a “New Zealander” was also problematic for this operator in terms of how he wanted to define his own identity; it ignores specifics. The passionate owner/operator of this business was quick to tell me ‘I may look like a Māori, but I’m not. I’m Ngāpuhi’. He viewed his business as Ngāpuhi, not Māori, saying ‘I can only tell you from a Ngāpuhi perspective … how you do it is Ngāpuhi’. He states:

For myself as Tangata Whenua, I prefer not to be recognised as a New Zealander, because when my ancestors signed the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 they signed it as Ngāpuhi – not as New Zealanders. And no way, in no form and any way did they cede their sovereignty to a foreign power. You know, my ancestors have been ‘chiefs and kings’ since the beginning of time in their own country … do you think that in less than 20 or 30 years they would be willing to cede that to a foreign power … absolutely not … having not even met that chief. We don’t have problems telling visitors that we’re not New Zealanders, and that we’re not Māoris, you know, we are Ngāpuhi.

Within this context the operator viewed ‘Māori tourism’ as traditional and evolving (but not contemporary). He wants people to see that ‘we are traditional no matter what we do … but we change with context’. Thus, he has traded in his ‘paddle’ for a five horsepower motor for his waka tours. He sees this as ‘adapting’ … ‘we use the tools available to us to introduce visitors to our culture’. Identity is contextual and relational – it shifts according to the environment. His attire and that of his ‘warriors’ when performing various activities for tourists is very ‘authentic’ in the sense that they are modelled on the original designs and materials used by their ancestors. But he is quick to admit that his identity shifts with context, he will wear traditional clothing for tours … but (if necessary) ‘a tuxedo to a formal event’. When asked if he felt his culture was ‘compromised’ by commodifying it as a tourism product, his response was ‘it belongs to him’ therefore there is ‘no impact on cultural integrity’. 
We might argue that such practice of the ‘Other’ ‘Othering’ itself is problematic. Does it promote or re-inscribe the duality of colonised/coloniser? The use of such (warrior) images may reinforce colonial notions of the indigenous Other but the control and interpretation of how these images translate from a Ngāpuhi perspective re-inscribe colonial discourse with new meaning. According to Marschall (2004) such postcolonial agents who are empowered to speak use their heritage as a counter-narrative to assert a new decolonised identity. Thus, it demonstrates how Māori adopt colonial knowledge for their own representation and discursive practices and how new conceptualisations of Māori identity emerge from this process.

In this particular case study images and representations of the ‘colonised’ are re-presented as used by the colonisers, but placed within different discursive frameworks that result in ‘de-scribing’ the discourses of the coloniser (Ashcroft et al. 1995). It is difficult to distinguish between whether the ‘commodification’ of Māori culture for tourism versus its creation for other political and cultural ends for the colonised are at play in such examples. It could be said this operator’s heritage product is packaged for external consumption that meet visitor conceptions of the Other. On the other hand the possibility of this operator’s representation being a parody of the pre-colonial Other may be revised through a form of cultural hybridity; one that re-asserts the Other through acknowledging the past to produce something ‘new’ in the present. The role that tourism can play in transforming collective and individual values and identities is evident in this process. Thus the link between tourism and cultural identity is ‘an ongoing process, politically contested and historically unfinished’ (Clifford 1988: 9).

Stories formed an important component of this heritage tourism product and the owner stressed the contested dichotomy of ‘who tells’ stories about Māori heritage and culture. Whilst researching demand for his product the operator visited the Waitangi Visitor Centre which revealed to him there were ‘several aspects of Ngāpuhi culture that were not on offer here’. His objective was to fill this gap with a ‘quality, authentic Māori product’.
The stories we talk about are pre-European as well as first contact period – and you know how that first period contact has impacted on us – even in the modern day and age … and it’s told from our interpretation and how it’s impacted on us. Not from an industry’s interpretation on how it has impacted on a certain sector of people … know what I mean … and that is the case … for so long and still presently it is still the case.

The operator recognised the importance of the personal connection between host and visitor as part of the stories he told:

Because I know the old trails and that around here – and the old history that goes with it. No-one else knows the history I do … the local (Pākehā) operators, none of them know the stories about the place like we do (local iwi). They’re taking people out to that rock … out to those places, and telling our stories and our histories about those places and about that rock, and about that cave.

The operator also felt that Māori have a ‘unique way of storytelling, we are part of history, stories tell of our spirituality’. There was obvious tension about tourism in the region being ‘dominated by main players’ and what product ‘got promoted’. The operator felt there had been instances of prejudice and discrimination against his product versus ‘others’ (i.e. Pākehā) whereby local tourism outlets such as motels and hotels promoted the ‘mainstream’ product over his. He also felt the (New Zealand) tourism industry was dominated by Pākehā structures and there was still too much ‘packaging of Māori culture by non-Māori’:

‘He’ is the only one in Paihia that knows the stories … the others (non-Māori) tell ‘legends’… If you want ‘legends’ then ‘go for a tour with a Pākehā operator’… I will tell stories about my people and what they have done – no-one else in the Bay of Islands tells the stories that I do. This history and the stories are my stories, my tipuna.

My interpretation of this tourism product is one that fuses tradition and tribal identity into a wholly Māori-driven product that accepts change is a natural progression of culture. The owner’s self identity is a strong component of how the business is managed, valued and represented. There is a strong sense of attachment to his kin group and the need to
achieve financial independence for his whānau is a motivating factor for the business setup. He was keen to ‘show off’ his latest possession to me – a new four wheel drive vehicle he had been able to purchase for the business as his financial situation improved. The socio-economic background of this owner is no doubt a contributing factor to his aspirations of autonomous versus dependent existence. The story that underlies the motivation for business start up is one that reflects a re-historicising of colonial discourse:

(The owner) describes how the idea for (business) arose from a disagreement with his father more than ten years ago. As they watched tourist buses crossing their ancestral land, a younger (owner name) wanted to see the visitors removed. His father responded that a better idea would be to stop the buses and tell the visitors something of the land on which they travelled. Years later, (owner) set up (business) to do just that – stop the buses and offer tourists an authentic experience in Ngāpuhi culture, from a traditional welcoming ceremony to re-enacting the first contact with European settlers.

Re-interpretation of Māori culture is subject to change over time. In this case study it is reflected in how local Māori have responded to rather than resisted tourism development. This operator asserts tribal identity as inherently connected to representation of both place and culture and as being accountable to his kin. He had strong views on the interaction between colonised and coloniser and the impacts this had on his kin group. He is clearly determined to tell the ‘other’ side of the story of colonisation and this is evident in his performative act as a tour guide (Howard, Thwaites and Smith 2001; Reisinger and Steiner 2006). In this act his resistant discursive agency which, through repetition, results in disrupting colonial authority and colonial identities. Such examples also show how adopting and adapting tradition to contemporary economic growth forces shapes regional Māori tourism development whilst simultaneously defining identity.

I considered operator number six located at nearby Waitangi as representative of Bhabha’s (1994) ‘performative hybridity’ in which the enactment of revisionary expression whereby culture as ‘practice’ is demonstrated is seen as a postmodern activity.
This cultural performance presents a ‘story’ of colonial and postcolonial Māori/Pākehā relations told by a grandfather to his grandson and informed by Ngāpuhi oral tradition. The show includes a number of ‘actors’ who act out the tensions and collaborations between Māori and early Pākehā settlers as part of the process of colonisation. Such performances can provide opportunities for identity and difference to be strategically packaged and presented to outsiders as a tourism product through what Braid (1994) terms ‘interaction narratives’. This could also be said to represent Hollinshead’s (1992) notion of “counter-identification”, that is, a challenge to the master-narrative of colonialism.

The evening cultural performance at Waitangi is housed in the Te Whare Runanga, completed by Māori in 1940 to mark the centenary celebrations of the signing of the Treaty. Te Whare represents ‘all iwi’ of Aotearoa New Zealand (NZ History online 2008). Ngāpuhi are the Tangata Whenua of the region and although their stories are given prominence in the carving and weaving of the whare it is a statement of Māori collectivity as well as diversity. The following comment highlights the contrasting Māori/Pākehā views over its representation:

Many Europeans saw the Whare Rununga as complementing the Treaty House; together jointly symbolised the apparent strength of New Zealand’s race relations. The previous Governor-General, Lord Bledisloe, had seen the Māori decision to build the whare as their testimony to the sincerity of British honour and integrity, but in fact Māori saw it as a reminder to Pākehā that the agreement they had entered into had not been honoured.

Source: New Zealand History online 2008.

The Waitangi Treaty grounds are a pre-eminent historic site that represents the colonial situation from which New Zealand developed as a nation and houses one of the most symbolically important buildings in New Zealand – the Waitangi Treaty House. Hence, it is a prime visitor attraction for both international and New Zealand visitors. It is also a site of ongoing political discourse between Māori and the Crown when annual ‘Waitangi
Day’ celebrations are held. Tensions surrounding the interpretation and recognition of the Treaty as a ‘bicultural’ relationship are played out annually as Māori, Pākehā and other ethnic groups gather at Waitangi to celebrate New Zealand’s ‘national day’. The cultural performance reflects the connection between site and identity when the Cultural Director of the show states to the audience ‘we are representing our ancestors, Māori and European, and our story of New Zealand on location’.

The performance blends both Pākehā and Māori versions of early colonial settlement and gives prominence to Māori interpretation and negotiation of this process. The show is portrayed from the local iwi (Ngāpuhi) perspective and is specific in its reference to the mythology of the North’s ancestor Kupe. This connection between iwi identity and place was reinforced to the audience by the host at the beginning of the performance. As the colonial story unfolds a dichotomous view of Māori Pākehā relations is portrayed to the audience; a bi-cultural relationship that is moving from a binary of ‘us/them’ to a mutual sense of ‘both/and’ shaped through increased cultural interaction and mutual collaboration. Thus the ‘other’ is both re-constructed and re-defined. I view such discourse as challenging (colonial) discourses of power which seek to legitimate certain forms of identity and marginalise others by imposing binary oppositions. As a result new forms of identity emerge from this re-dispersal of power (McLeod 2000). The cultural performance ends with the symbolic ‘signing of the Treaty’ and leaves the audience to interpret the outcome of this encounter in their own perspective. The show’s main character concludes with comments that allude to Māori and Pākehā ‘working together’ collaboratively as the key to Aotearoa New Zealand’s future which points toward a postcolonial framework as necessary in order to reconcile and understand the complexity of both sets of identities.

The straddling of two cultures portrayed in this tourism product represents Bhabha’s (1994) third space whereby Māori disrupt the established pattern of representation of the colonial process whilst also challenging the validity and authenticity of any essentialist cultural identity. By asserting the identity of ‘Ngapuhi’ as one that “makes up” Māori culture articulates a counter-narrative to pre-defined notions of authenticity and wrests
“truth” from the hands of its creators (Taylor 2001). The process of New Zealand’s colonisation imposed a hegemonic ‘truth’ created by the Crown over the ‘truth’ created by the Māori (Bishop 1996). This is evident in how Māori may recount their histories – what they emphasize and omit, their stance as protagonists or victims (e.g. Treaty of Waitangi negotiations) and the relationship the story establishes between teller and audience. This may differ between a personalised and guided tour versus a cultural performance given to a large number of visitors reinforcing Cohen’s (2004: 113) notion that cultural diversity forms a ‘diacritical mark of their ethnic or cultural identity, a vehicle of self-representation before an external public’.

In my view this tourism product is ‘generic’ in nature as it needs to cater to an international audience from a diverse range of cultural backgrounds, however there are specific aspects that differentiate the product in terms of regional difference and kin identity. There is a distinct regional identity inherent in the production which is made clear by its Ngāpuhi origins and employment of only Ngāpuhi performers. The operator also commented to me that ‘a lot of debate and issues of what/who tells stories occurred’ when researching and developing the tourism venture. Thus, the issue of maintaining cultural integrity and ownership of stories remains an important strategy of its product development. However, there was also a ‘defensive’ attitude between this research participant and I that I felt made our encounter uncomfortable. I cannot speculate fully on this, in so much as feeling it may have been ‘ownership’ related; there may have been current operational tensions underlying this at the time of my visit. Of note were comments by operator number five who was in the same area and alluded to differences of opinion when contrasting the two products’ content, motivation behind business set up and the notion of ‘commercialisation’ of Māori culture. These opinions I felt were more personally oriented reflecting the characteristic of the individual. However, there was apparent ‘tensions’ between operators in the same area who ‘compete’ with quite different products.

But there are also porous borders within Māori culture as well as between cultures that criss-cross supposed barriers. Thus, to use Bhabha’s term ‘cultural difference’ enables a
fluid and hybridised identity to emerge. This fluidity also contributes to cross-cultural interaction in the host guest relationship whereby cultural exchange and new forms of meaning are produced through interactive experiences between performers and visitors. After the show visitors are invited to mix and talk with performers, mirroring the Rotorua performance discussed earlier. This type of personal interaction provides a more ‘real’ experience for visitors and supports the notion of experiential authenticity for the visitor with the host (McIntosh and Johnston 2005; Zeppel 1995, 1998). Such interaction may also reveal plural identities for the shows ‘actors’. It may represent an identity as a cultural ‘performer’, one of Ngāpuhi descent, or one that represents both self and a collective identity as part of a wider hapu or whānau grouping, or one of being a ‘New Zealander’. In a tourist context both the host (provider) and the guest (visitor) carry their awareness of identity with them and from the encounter of the two, something new always emerges. All in all, the host/guest interaction provides diverse interpretation categorized as (re)presenting ‘cultural difference’.

Two more case study examples are herewith discussed as representing cultural difference in an urban versus rural context. This serves to examine the disjuncture between ‘tribal’ and ‘non-tribal’ Māori that is often associated with the rural/urban dichotomy. The first has similarities with the latter Northland product in that it is strictly iwi-oriented and which influenced my selecting this tourism business as I was keen to ascertain if identity displayed more complex characteristics as played out in the ‘urban domain’. What new forms of social interaction may be apparent in an urban setting and would this reflect a more ‘generic’ portrayal of Māori culture to a global audience than counterparts in rural locations. How did factors such as location, association and commitment differ between urban and rural Māori given that over 80 per cent were now urban dwellers? If some of the symbols of rural land-based identity have been lost in the urban context (see Barcham 1998) what other symbols had been created to demarcate their ethnic and cultural identity? Would cultural hybridity manifest itself through different discursive practices?
This Māori tourism product was very ‘new’ to the market commencing only one year before my interview and represented a collaborative and somewhat bicultural venture between local Tangata Whenua Ngati Whatua and Tourism Auckland. The operation is solely owned by Ngati Whatua with Tourism Auckland under a two year contract for management of the product’s sales and promotion. It is hoped by then the iwi will be financially viable and experienced to run the operation. The cultural description of this product as detailed in Table 6.1 (operator number one) could be construed as postcolonial narrative. As Tuhiwai Smith comments ‘indigenous peoples want to tell their own stories, write their own version, in our own ways, for our own purposes’ (2003: 28). That is, the iwi ‘claim back’ their history and thus representation and identity (Fanon 1970) through providing their perspective of colonial history. However, as Lye (1998) reminds us this reclamation operates under new forms of identity and thus produces new constructions of identity in its process.

This product offers a half day walking tour of Auckland city. I undertook a personalised tour with a Tangata Whenua guide and also interviewed the local RTO representative responsible for the marketing and promotion of the product. This provided two perspectives regarding the representational aspect of the tourism experience. Although a collaborative and commercial venture, the perspective from Tangata Whenua was mandated by an epistemological basis than the more ‘marketing’ oriented approach from the RTO. The local RTO representative stated there was a need to analyse what opportunities there are for the regions to develop Māori cultural product as opposed to just getting ‘a national feeling for Māori tourism’ which often results in diversity being submerged in favour of homogeneity stating:

Because every region differs in terms of their dynamics and you have to find what gaps or you have to analyse what opportunities are for your own regions rather than just getting a national feeling for it … okay, people want Māori tourism – that’s great – we know that, but what are the implications for our businesses in the regions. If we have a regional focus you have to research who wants the story from this part of New Zealand? And who are they … and why are they coming?”
The RTO wanted to show the contemporary side of Māori tourism and the different perspectives regions convey. Interestingly this RTO representative was the son of operator number two in Auckland I interviewed and was thus, well versed in current issues and development of Māori tourism. Local Tangata Whenua Ngati Whatua saw a need to promote regional uniqueness and asked the question ‘why would a tourist want to hear stories from here as opposed to elsewhere?’ Hence by identifying their specificity as Tangata Whenua interpreted through stories that connect identity with local resources is one such avenue for promoting regional development. In discussing indigenous culture Meyer (2006) states that land is more than a physical place – it is an idea that engages knowledge and contextualises knowing; places are dynamic contexts of social interaction and memory and thus, contain overt and covert social practices that embed in place-making behaviours notions of ideology, power, control, conflict, domination, and distribution of social and physical resources. A place’s value is assigned by individuals, groups, or society and as such, places are capable of being discursively manipulated towards desired (individual and collective) ends (Stokowki 2002). Relph’s (1976) notion of “sense of place” constitutes one’s identity based on different degrees of ‘rootedness’ and also has implications for achieving sustainable tourism through the ability to maximise visitor insight, appreciation and respect for cultural meaning and a ‘sense of sharing’ in the culture presented (McIntosh et al. 1998). This mirrors the aspirations behind the motivation to develop this product in New Zealand’s largest and most cosmopolitan city and which houses a large population of Māori. In particular Tangata Whenua of the area Ngati Whatua have been subject to much land alienation by the Crown within the Auckland city region in both colonial and postcolonial times.

The walking tour incorporates Māori culture, songs, stories and tikanga in a modern setting and from the outset the ‘performance’ is well researched and complex in its delivery. It beings atop Maungawhau (Mt Eden), a dormant volcano and ancient Māori pa settlement in central Auckland – an important site of Māori settlement and pre and post-colonial relations with Pākehā. Considerable time is spent at this starting point explaining the geographic landscape and its connection with Māori mythology. There are a number of important pa sites for local iwi in the immediate city area and these are
pointed out to the visitor. Traditional Māori lifestyle is explained via the land contours of the pa site and how Māori developed the area for strategic (i.e. possible invasion by other tribes) and day-to-day use. Visitors are introduced to the history of the Auckland region from a Māori perspective relayed through Māori creation stories of how the land came into being along with stories about the effects of colonisation on local tribal boundaries and the social organisation of both Māori and non-Māori as they interacted. The highly personalised tour commences with the identity affirming mihi (personal narrative) by the guide, followed by a song with musical accompaniment. This encapsulates the Māori concept of manaakitanga (hospitality). The host/guest relationship is reciprocated by requesting a similar response from the visitor. The narrative content was designed in collaboration with rangatira of the iwi. The RTO Manager commented:

In a year preceding the actual product we worked on a narrative to ensure that we gave just enough that it didn’t go over their (visitors) heads and also that it didn’t conflict with what the tribe wanted to be told … so, it’s very much the teller who authenticates the stories.

Thus, the teller of the story sustains a balance between cultural integrity and commercialisation of an indigenous product from a position of ‘power’. There is also a concerted strategy of ‘adapting’ information so the visitor will easily relate to the content. Narrowing the content down to a workable narrative – fitting in with the duration of the tour, the interests of other nationalities, inclusion of iconic heritage sights, flexibility for tourists and other time constraints meant adapting a cultural overlay to a walking tour. The RTO commented, ‘It had to fit in with the whole mechanism of tourism; it had to fit with other booking times, sailings, etc before and after the tour’. Thus, when something is adapted or changed in order to meet expectations (i.e. visitor demand) it does not necessarily mean that in-authenticity occurs. Consumerism and authenticity are not irreconcilable (Chaney 2002). The involvement of local iwi in this process is critical to avoid commodification of the product. Involvement of local people to represent and interpret their culture and heritage are key to successful management from the local iwi’s perspective and hence preserving authenticity.
Much of the politics of tourism is invested in attempts to draw the visitor’s attention to particular interpretations of a place or region (Chambers 2000). By accepting such interpretation the visitor helps confirm its “authenticity” and to strengthen the interpreters’ claims to represent local symbols and their histories. The move from a philosophical concept of authenticity to one that is a socially constructed concept allows freedom of ‘choice’ for both recipients in the experience. Such stories of nationhood create different histories from the prevailing discourse that imposes hegemonic realism (e.g., colonialism). Cultural experiences that provide ‘sincere’ (Taylor 1998) and informative outcomes are likely to adhere to what most cultural tourists want. As Cohen (2004) argues tourists conceive “authenticity” in different degrees of strictness and most rank-and-file tourists will be content with much wider, less strict criteria of authenticity. This may also apply to the perspective of the tourism operator/hosts. By defining themselves and determining their own identity (as regional Tangata Whenua) Māori can respond to the touristic world in their own way. According to Steiner and Reisinger (2006) claiming and exercising that freedom is the ultimate expression of existential authenticity.

The tour infuses Māori culture with general sightseeing attractions of Auckland. As the walk progresses to the central city area main icons such as the Auckland City Sky Tower and harbour are noted; a stop at the Auckland University campus marae is included whereby the guide gives a ‘simple’ description of the meaning and stories attached to the carvings on the wharenui. On my tour the guide stated they were aware that ‘too much’ information about these cultural elements would ‘go over the head of most people’ hence, they simplified the content to suit the context. As the walk passes Mt Eden prison, the guide openly mentions the ‘high Māori statistics’ that are represented in such institutions. As a New Zealander and a Māori, I was well aware of such statistics and considered what effect this information would have on overseas visitors. Without directly alluding to ‘colonial’ impacts, the comment confirms evidence of the social problems inherent in New Zealand’s bicultural society and the effects of this on Māori. These comments may
prompt further enquiry from tour participants who want to learn more about contemporary Māori society but which also places the tourism product within a postcolonial critique that serves to politicise the current socio-economic status of Māori. Thus, the notion of ‘power’ is realigned by the role of Māori guide as tourist ‘broker’ and narrator of cultural identity.

The tour proceeds towards the botanical garden area surrounding the city’s museum where the guide explains to the visitor some of the traditional Māori medicinal uses of native flora. Mythical stories of the local fauna also illustrate supernatural connotations and how the Māori world evolved according to the local iwi. These creation stories of the bird life of the region demonstrate the Māori worldview of how such creatures came into being and their ‘place in the world’. Thus, the guide shares traditional knowledge handed down through multi-layered narratives of whakapapa. The nature/culture dichotomy is strongly woven into the cultural identity of the Tangata Whenua; weaving a story around a place, a tangible asset, or an intangible asset instils that asset with some meaning, bringing it to life and making it relevant (for the tourist) and creates consumer interest in hearing that story firsthand (McKercher and du Cros 2002). It also places authenticity in the ‘present’ as opposed to the past; interpretation for the host/guide was seen to reside in the delivery of providing authentic “understanding” of their culture.

Mid-way through the tour we stopped in the grassy environment of Auckland’s Domain close to the Auckland War Memorial Museum for morning tea which, on my tour, was provided by members of the guide’s whānau. This gave the tour a very personal dimension for the visitor by meeting the guide’s family in a contemporary and ‘local’ way. It also reinforced the cultural value of manaakitanga between host and manuhiri36.

This Māori tourism venture has attracted national media attention for its diversity and uniqueness. It is the first of its kind I was aware of that presented a city walking tour with a Māori dimension. There are many such heritage related concepts in other parts of New Zealand, but these walking tours tend to focus on the settler heritage of regions often with particular emphasis on aspects such as colonial architecture and cityscapes.

36 Visitor, guest
CEO of Tourism Auckland stated: ‘We have a unique Auckland story. There is no other Mt Eden. These are truthful and authentic stories… the tours succeed because they were simple but distinct’ (DaCruz 2006). Although the venture had only operated one season the RTO had been happy with its progress and a number of wholesalers have marketed the product off-shore. This supports a comment made by another interviewee from Te Puni Kokiri in Auckland who stated ‘Māori are now willing to step offshore – independently of other industry players … the ability to ‘trust’ other people in other countries is a new concept Māori are taking on board’. This also means ‘control’ of Māori tourism representation is increasingly developing within Māori-centred frameworks as opposed to non-Māori which has been a hallmark of national tourism development in the past.

The Auckland RTO stated to me ‘a lot of back office effort has gone into building on the business …it’s really something other people have to sell on your behalf – it’s not ‘just’ a walk, it needs to be seen as an ‘awesome’ experience – a very different experience’. In his view there is a need to move away from images of ‘hangi and concert party’ Māori tourism. A key aspect for the regional representation of the product is that it ‘tells the story of Auckland and teaches people about the history and heritage of Auckland’…. Tourism Auckland is keen to promote the ‘cultural fabric of the city’ (of which Māori have historically played an intrinsic part). The RTO felt that Māori were ‘ahead of the game’ in terms or producing diversified cultural product:

It’s really our national marketing that has only really just jumped on board and thought that okay … we did this big research and we found that the Interactive Travellers want different experiences, want to get off the beaten track and enjoy different interactive experiences. So, really, Māori have been ahead of the game, but have never really capitalised on that, never really been organised enough to take advantage yet. But that’s why a formation of the different MRTOs and the NZMTC has evolved. I mean there’s been a huge increase of the number of Māori tourism product at TRENZ37 and just about all of them are pushing their own unique experience – and their own tribal experience.

---

37 Tourism Rendezvous New Zealand (TRENZ) is New Zealand’s largest international tourism business event. It features New Zealand’s leading providers of visitor accommodation, transport, activities and attractions, as well as destination organisers.
This comment draws together aspects of collective and tribal Māori representation as progressive for Māori tourism within the framework of national tourism development. Recognition that ‘Māori’ in general have been ‘ahead of the game’ denotes a collective input from Māori stakeholders but a juxtaposition of tribal Māori interests has created a range of new experiences in the regions. The initiation of regional entities and a national body for Māori tourism has occurred in tandem with this development, and illustrates the collective/tribal nature of Māori culture and existence of multiple layers within its makeup albeit tensions between kin groups can and do exist. Resulting from this is recognition that the tribal aspect of Māori product development has seen strong growth and is an important strategy for the future sustainability of Māori tourism.

But the interview also elicited comments with regard to Māori tourism development at national and regional levels that were not entirely compatible. The RTO felt the national ‘narrative’ differed from the ‘reality at grass-roots’ stating, ‘the reality of local level is divorced from the aspirations of MRTOs and National Council’. This won’t work unless ‘the gap closes’. Comments from operators I spoke with did highlight such tension and several commented they had little support from MRTOs that ‘directly benefited’ them in tangible ways. The research participant saw that support and understanding the needs of Māori tourism operators was paramount for the future development of Māori tourism.

But there was a risk of ‘exhausting resources’ if development is pushed too quickly at a national level and not matched by the local level. In his view this is ‘fantasy versus reality’.

This final comment raises the issue of neo-colonial relationships if Māori tourism at national level (and as a consequence, Māori tourism regional entities) engages with economic structures, cultural representations and exploitative relationships that mimic colonial ideology. This may become increasingly difficult as both western and indigenous cultures engage in the processes of economic globalisation and capital consumerism. The checks and balances required to achieve a sustainable cultural balance
must cross all levels from local, regional, and national to ensure autonomous aspirations for Māori economic self-sufficiency occur. This means retaining elements of the Māori kinship approach to economic development as “collective” within the changing socio-political environment that increasingly promotes entrepreneurship and individualism. As such customary landscapes will be important codifiers of Māori identity but will also require strengthening political power of kin-leadership and associated cultural traditions and values at the micro and macro level (Tapsell and Woods 2008).

My interview with operator number three located in Auckland city revealed business characteristics that were highly entrepreneurial and which combined Māori and Pākehā business philosophies. I chose this particular tourism operation for its representation as a ‘contemporary Māori experience’ and because as a new tourism venture (just over two years old) it was already receiving national media attention for its business success. Another factor in this choice was that the business was run by two young Māori women; therefore adding a gender dimension to the research analysis. Hoskins (2006) has commented that Māori women have, on the whole, been written out of history by Pākehā male writers and anthropologists, and made invisible by historical discourses. Here was an opportunity to explore how the role of Māori women had shifted from ‘images’ on postcards and tourism brochures to being an intrinsic part of the entrepreneurial sector of Māori economic development. As female tourism operators, they re-framed earlier roles of Māori female guides in a postmodern context.

My interview with the co-owner took place in a busy inner city café at the end of the business working day. She was an enthusiastic and energetic person who was busy coping with business ‘expansion’ relocating from a ‘home environment’ to an inner city office location. My initial questions related to business start-up and revealed their desire to fill a ‘gap’ in the Auckland market where ‘little Māori cultural product’ was available. They drew on their personal interests in outdoor adventure and Māori art, offering urban city and art tours including carving and workshops, marae stays, wine tours, and a range of outdoor eco-adventure activities. The market for their product is both local and international offering personally designed tours for the North American market (mainly
50+ years) who ‘want authentic in-depth knowledge of Māori culture’. They describe these clients as being ‘liberal’ in their outlook and keen to learn more about New Zealand’s indigenous people in a contemporary context. As such the operators help ‘break down’ the descriptor of “Māori” to show diverse identities within the culture.

It’s about educating our clients about the beauty and relevance of Māori culture today, and you can’t do that just talking over a microphone on a bus with a group of 25 people … It’s really about intimacy and that’s hugely important for the FIT (freely independent traveller) who wants to interact in small groups.

The owners initially thought they would cater to the backpacker market, but the high-end niche market has proven to be more successful and accessible, and no doubt more profitable. They have also leveraged off Tourism Auckland in a collaborative marketing arrangement to offer ‘not so adventurous’ tours to the corporate market and they have also developed products to work with a number of school groups and Māori youth, integrating culture, education and outdoor activities in self-development programmes. The process of forming alliances and joint ventures among themselves and with non-Māori partners to create business that can compete profitably in the global economy reveal opportunistic characteristics of the economic entrepreneur (Gaglio and Katz 2001).

The owners believe in introducing visitors to the traditional knowledge and taonga handed down from their ancestors, but framing it through the eyes of contemporary Māori:

So many people seem to come to New Zealand, experience some great traditional Māori culture and leave saying – ‘Wow, Māori culture used to be really amazing!’ We want them to leave saying ‘Wow, Māori culture is really amazing, and isn’t it great how it has evolved and is incorporated into the lifestyles of New Zealanders today!

This comment reveals a cultural hybrid identity that incorporates the positive possibilities of drawing on a dual heritage and emphasises ideas of fluidity and change (Bell 2004). This also coincides with the view of culture as dynamic and evolving and that culture is viewed within a context that describes lived experience whereby culture is represented as
a category of translation (Bhabha 1994); “difference” is not so much a pre-given and static trait of “fixed” tradition but a complex ongoing negotiation. The owners aim is to not just view the landscape, but give a Māori perspective to that landscape. Thus, they use the whenua as a resource to tell their stories and make connections between place and identity. This, the owners believe gives visitors a ‘truly unique experience, and one that is ultimately more fulfilling and memorable than simply viewing a beautiful landscape’. According to the owners it is the beliefs of the Tangata Whenua attached to the landscape that is the point of difference.

Both TNZ and NZMTC consistently use the comment that Māori offer a ‘point of difference’ when promoting New Zealand culture to international markets. On a surface level we could view this discourse as ‘colonial’ in its ‘Othering’ of Māori and problematic when analysing Māori tourism representation from a postcolonial perspective. But tourism research also confirms that indigenous culture is not a primary reason for visiting destinations such as New Zealand, Australia, or Canada, albeit the indigenous encounter is often rewarding and enriching, it is simply one of many possibilities offered to visitors during their holiday (Butler and Hinch 2008; McIntosh and Ryan 2008). Many Māori tourism operators fully appreciate the ‘performative role’ they are playing and how their tourism offerings fit into the wider realm of tourism in New Zealand. In this comment made by the operator the ‘beliefs’ of the Tangata Whenua are seen as transferable. That is, they impart Māori knowledge to visitors ‘outside’ of the domain of the marae, the ‘repository of all the historical things, of all the traditions, all the mythology and other things which make up the intangibles of Māoriness’ (Rangihau 1975: 226). But in the urban context and given the mobility of Māori and the resulting hybrid ‘boundary crossing’ that occurs in globalised societies the attitude of the owners is that cultural integrity is not compromised.

Cultural integrity is retained through promotion by Māori as opposed to non-Māori and is also seen to contribute to providing a more ‘authentic’ experience for visitors. In a contemporary tourism setting, the meanings may be transformed and (re)worked to suit local context and visitor demands. Thus, in order to be consumed by the tourists, cultural
assets are modified and commodified by Māori (McKercher and Du Cros 2002). What is at issue here is that an ‘altered version of a cultural performance’ or similar activity need not be seen as ‘an act of sacrilege’ (Butler and Hinch 2008). It may well be the action of a skilled artiste/entrepreneur understanding their audience and catering to such demand. Much depends on the setting (i.e. situational) and the circumstances (urban vs. rural) and the information given to the audience before and following the performance, as well as the marketing and promotion of the product (2008:323).

The control maintained by the owners in the telling of stories and interpreting the landscape may counter cultural conflict. In the urban setting where urban marae now take the place of ‘identity codifiers’ for many Māori, it may also be argued that ‘accountability’ in some respects is still maintained. Given that change is a constant part of cultures, adaptation cannot be ruled as ‘inauthentic’. Both tradition and modern blend to create hybrid identities (Bhabha 1994) whilst still retaining essential features that are particular to that culture. Such mixing is argued to be the inevitable reality of cultural identities in our increasingly small and mobile world and, rather than being associated with degradation, is refigured to connote processes of renewal and dynamic change (Bell 2004: 125).

This also represents Wang’s (1999) constructivist approach to authenticity whereby authenticity is not viewed as inherent in an object, multiple and plural meanings of and about the same things can be constructed from different perspectives, and people may adopt different constructed meanings independent of the particular contextual situation (1999: 354). An example from a visitor’s comment on the operator’s website illustrates this:

Imagine this. We have just walked for ten minutes across the sand dunes and through the forests to Karekare Beach. It is cold, teetering on the edge of rain and the sea, whipped up by the weather, is breaking continuously against the off-shore rock island and along the flat, black sands. We stand gazing across the beach and (co-owner) asks us to close our eyes. You can hear the sea and feel the wind. Then, in Māori, (co-owner) starts telling the creation story. It sounds like a mesmerizing piece of poetry … it is a story of wind and sea and forests and
somehow, with eyes closed, it sounds both ancient and immediate. It is a story told for thousands of years and yet the elements are around us at the moment of the telling (Elder 2006).

There is both formality and subtleness revealed in this visitor’s experience. The owners shift their cultural identity according to the interests of the people they are talking to. Thus, context dictates the nature of autonomy. For this visitor the experience represents a form of experiential authenticity whereby authenticity is not about the toured objects, but rather a search of their ‘authentic selves with the aid of activities or toured objects’ (Wang 1999: 360). The contemporary delivery of stories through Māori tourism product such as this one is a mode of representation that includes the visitor in the overall experience but is also one that involves power. The construction of traditions or origins involves power and hence a social process (Wang 1999). This can be viewed as political in the sense that authenticity is seen as a struggle in which competing interests argue for their own interpretation of history (Bruner 1994: 408). Reinterpretation and meaning involves deciding which ‘markers’ of traditional Māori culture (e.g. customs, stories, beliefs, etc) they engage in and adapting those practices to new environments thus, homogenisation of Māori culture is re-negotiated by the dynamic use of identity in both a postcolonial and postmodern context.

Storytelling features as a core component of the outdoor activities offered by this tourism venture and viewed by the owners as a unique asset that contributes to the authenticity of the product. Both owners are not local Tangata Whenua; their iwi origins are from Northland. They tell generic stories (e.g. creation stories) in the local areas they visit, but when in their own rohe, stories can be drawn from their own whakapapa. Thus, they respect the ownership rights of local iwi by not telling stories that ‘belong’ to that iwi. This is summed up by the co-owner as follows:

The (business) directors decide on which stories are told as part of the experiences. We only tell stories relevant to our tribe; we do not tell stories from other tribes unless our tribe has played some part in the story. Our guides can also tell their own personal stories and tribal stories.
This is concurrent with most operators interviewed in this research in that stories should be told by the kin group that belong to the area. In this way ownership and authenticity of stories remain uncompromised. Figure 7.1 illustrates the feeling amongst most of the co-participants interviewed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 6.1 Storytelling: Research Participants Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“you need a mandate to tell stories”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“there are tribal/hapu differences in stories … need to involve all in consultation otherwise will open up a huge can of worms”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“there are a lot of Māori operating outside of own tribal areas and not asking permission to tell stories … also a lot of non-Māori telling stories”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“you cannot tell stories about ancestors without ownership/authorisation … only Māori directly linked can do this”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“tourists want to know the stories are genuine to the region … that stories come from the people who make them (i.e. local iwi/hapu/whānau) (MRTO)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“there is a risk in not involving local iwi and Kaumātua in this process”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“there needs to be a framework for MRTOs to work collaboratively with local iwi and their neighbouring regions to develop this concept … elements of history and tradition need to be agreed upon”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“it is part of us, it belongs to us” (TNZ representative)”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The co-owner notes that if these procedures are not carefully maintained it runs the risk of commodifying Māori culture. The issue here is probably more of a political ‘ownership’ between kin groups than actual ‘commodification’ in the real sense. Stories are still ‘told’ by Māori but the deeper issue may be one of inter-iwi conflict and reflects traditional boundaries formed through (mostly) inter-tribal warfare. Both owners’ profiles cite their iwi affiliations and their Pākehā heritage on their website. In this, they represent themselves as multiple subjects whose individual identity is characterised by multiple affiliations. In this tourism operation ‘Māori’ identity is acknowledged as regionally
specific through acknowledgement of local Tangata Whenua status, but nationally specific in their telling of generic stories in a local context. Identity is further confirmed by self-representation (e.g. website), ownership and control of product development.

The owners of this tourism operation have achieved major success for their business in a very short time. They recently won the ‘Best Māori Women in Business – Te Mana Wahine Tohu’ award, along with the ‘Best New Business’ and ‘Outstanding Business Citizenship’ awards at the Her Business Magazine National Women’s Business Awards. One of the co-owners also took out the ‘PATA38 Young Tourism Professional’ award at the New Zealand Tourism Industry Awards in 2006. This was recognised by the co-leader of the Māori Political Party, Tariana Turia, who stated they represent ‘the look of our future … their tourism company combines the strength of our cultural integrity, the beauty of our natural landscape and the entrepreneurial edge that Māori have come to be distinguished by’ (Turia 2008). In this comment political representatives for Māori are advocating a hybrid mix of cultural tradition, resources and global entrepreneurship as ‘part of’ Māori culture. The award recipient recognised the ‘fine line’ they tread as a ‘company that utilises a mainstream business framework, but (is) guided by traditional Māori philosophies’. She states that indigenous peoples can take the knowledge of mainstream business models and techniques and apply it in their own ways.

I feel this is a far better pathway forward than trying to mould indigenous cultural experiences and interactions into a traditional/mainstream business model. Interactive travellers are increasingly seeking authentic cultural interaction, but you need the indigenous peoples to be running these ventures for them to be truly authentic.

There are obvious characteristics of entrepreneurship inherent in this tourism operation. One of the ‘key aims’ for the business stated to me was to be ‘successful and profitable’ and it could be argued these two Māori tourism operators fall within the realm of economic entrepreneurship rather than the category of social entrepreneurship. Social

---

38 Pacific Asia Travel Association. The Award recognises and rewards some of New Zealand’s most talented and up-and-coming individuals for their leadership, their aptitude and their insights in the New Zealand tourism industry (http://www.tourismawards.co.nz/Files/PATA-Entry-Form-2008.pdf)
well-being is among the ultimate measures of effective self-determination according to O’Sullivan (2007). Thus we can define these operators creative and active players in the market process, constructing profit opportunities and finding the resources to exploit them (Tapsell and Woods 2008). There are traits of social entrepreneurship evident in their aim to ‘help at risk Māori youth’ through administering outdoor activity programmes but some may argue they are best described as potikitanga – a quest by aspiring younger individuals to be recognised by wider kin for outstanding achievement (Tapsell and Woods 2008). Given that the potiki is the logo used by the business this would aptly describe the tourism venture. The tensions that are raised within Māoridom about such structures relate to those of kin accountability and whereby individual pursuits in a commercial market fail to adhere to rangatira governance and ultimately the forum of the marae as the repository of Māori identity.

In this case study the ability to transverse both Māori and Pākehā cultures and to translate, negotiate and mediate both sameness and difference creates hybrid subjectivity. This also encodes a counter-hegemonic agency (Meredith 1998) whereby re-articulation of western frameworks by indigenous peoples is a form of decolonisation. The hybrid strategy opens up a third space of/re-articulation of negotiation and meaning (Bhabha 1994) and becomes part of the postcolonial discourse of settler societies. As Meredith (1998: 3) states: ‘here postcolonial does not mean that ‘they’ have gone home. Instead, ‘they’ are here to stay, indeed some of ‘us’ are them, and therefore the consequential imperative of relationship negotiation’. This goes beyond the realm of colonial binary thinking by initiating new signs of identity construction. The heterogeneous nature of Māori identity is reflected in the business’ cultural structures and practices and their objective to promote ‘contemporary Māori experiences’ and how Māori culture has ‘evolved and is incorporated into the lifestyles of New Zealanders today’ alongside a business philosophy that mixes both western and indigenous methods attests to a conceptual orientation of ‘both/and’ (Hall 1996). In this respect, Māori subjectivity is influenced by a multiplicity of mediums such as gender, employment, political orientation and the wider national and global environments (Meredith 1998).
This case study is a contemporary Māori tourism product; one where the past is introduced and represented in the present. The fusion of urban/rural landscapes, traditional/postmodern elements, Māori/Pākehā relations, and their collective/individual identities have contributed to creating a Māori tourism product that moves into a third space and demonstrates the ability of Māori to adopt the skills required to participate in a competitive and global environment. In doing so this operates in a wider sense of indigeneity as a product of the modern, fast globalising world and indigenous peoples’ reaction to western hegemony (Kolig 2004). As this broader world-view gains momentum, political relationships with the state become relatively less important as does the restrictive binary view of a world of Māori and Pākehā. Māori tourism operators counter the homogenous image of Māori as dominated by over a century of colonial discourse and national tourism promotion by offering products that promote the ‘lived experience’ of modern, urban Māori. In this case study, identity as such does not rely on tribal location for its contextual representation, but draws on a more generic ‘collective’ identity for its salience. Thus tribal identity does not form an integral part of this business operation, albeit an important signifier of personal identity.

The concluding question I would broach here is one of legitimately benefiting Māori society as a self determining concept. The urbanisation of Māori is not new, and many generations of Māori have adapted and adopted the necessary characteristics of living in city environments and as such lost contact with tribal identities. However, there are still strong traditional mores inherent within Māori culture that ultimately derive from layers of cultural heritage and thus links directly to whakapapa. In this respect, adhering to rangatiratanga (viewed here as kin accountability) is of primary concern to sustaining a cultural ‘balance’ that is not subsumed by non-indigenous society. Will the influence of cultural hybridity further affect these processes – or will the multi-layered nature of hybridity and third spaces work as complementary elements within the domain of Māori epistemology? Hybridity exposes layers of cultural identity and thus the Māori “subject” and thus aligns with whakapapa. As a concept hybridity is analogous to the creative and entrepreneurial characteristics as revealed by Māori tourism operators in translating/negotiating their tribal identities in a tourism context. Third spaces enable ‘Other’
positions to emerge. The role of tourism in this process engenders new possibility for cultural production and representation of indigenous peoples.

The last case study example I will discuss draws on my observation and participation of a guided tour at Te Puia. As one of the largest and most visited Māori tourism attractions in New Zealand with over 600,000 visitors a year (Indigenous New Zealand 2005) it provides a contrast to the “grass-roots” operators I chose to focus on. Te Puia was formerly known as the New Zealand Institute of Arts and Crafts and is a leading cultural attraction located in Rotorua. The Institute was set up by Act of Government legislation in 1963 (Edwards 1996; McClure 2004) that sought to encourage, foster and train students, exhibit works and restore Māori culture and Māori arts and craft that were in danger of being lost through assimilation and acculturation as the impacts of colonisation and urbanisation took effect on Māori cultural development in the mid twentieth century.

Under the Act the Institute was required to be self-supporting, hence the growth of tourism activities as part of the Institute grew and developed over time. Cultural performances are held daily; the geothermal area is of interest to many visitors who come to watch the geysers, mud pools and wander through this unique landscape, and visitors can also view carvers and weavers at work. In 2006 a redevelopment project of $17million was initiated between Te Puia and the government for new facilities such as a multi-media gallery, new visitor centre, shop, new carving and weaving schools, museum, 500 seat restaurant and enhanced interpretation. Key themes in the redevelopment include: “Think Māori” – in particular an animated audio visual experience at the point of entry as part of the new visitor centre to enable a fuller appreciation of Māori culture, and “Living Huri Huri” – how stories are alive through the weaving and carving schools (Te Puia 2008).

Previous research by Ryan and Higgins (2006) revealed the ‘core product is the thermal nature of the site’ and that Māori culture was ‘a supplementary facet to the visit’. However, the inextricable connection that local Tangata Whenua Te Arawa have with the site cannot be divorced from the site’s ‘identity’ when consumed as a tourism experience.
There is an expectation to experience Māori culture as an integral part of the visit and their study revealed a high proportion of visitors interviewed had a positive view of the Māori cultural component of the Institute. Te Puia incorporates the value of kaitiakitanga of the land and this concept is promoted on their website:

“Without history, how do you know where you come from? How do you connect back to your land? How do you belong?” says cultural advisor, Te Keepa Marsh. “Preserving the culture is preserving a people”.

“We are charged with protecting the land but we are only passing through”, says Te Puia chief executive, Andrew Te Whaiti. “All of us are guardians, taking care of it for the next wave”.

Source. Te Puia 2008

A land management team constantly monitors the geothermal valley; conservation and ecology are a priority. Coupled with the value of kaitiakitanga is the sharing of this land with visitors by way of stories. Te Arawa people of Rotorua are renowned for their storytelling. CEO of Te Puia states: ‘We are the story tellers; infinite stories are threaded into the history of Te Puia and play an important role in visitor understanding and learning about their culture’ (Te Puia 2008). It is the sharing of these stories and the connection with past and present that today offer a contemporary Māori experience in a traditional context. New developments at the complex have opened the knowledge basket (kete) that has been guarded for generations. The experience of Kōrero Tuku Iho (which means ‘stories handed down through time’) fulfils this role as the new interpretive walk designed to impart to visitors the history and heritage of Te Arawa who settled in the region some 700 years ago. This ‘story’ is the story of creation – from the Te Arawa perspective. Thus, visitors are informed by Te Arawa discourse. This perspective states:

All tribes have their own histories. In Te Arawa, this is our belief of where we came from, before life as we know it, through the heavens, into the world of mankind to where we are today. It is the answer to Ko Wai Ahau? Who Am I?
When we move into the bush we meet Tane Mahuta, God of the forest. Visitors will see what was created, hear the story, feel the elements, and learn how every living thing is connected.

Source. Te Puia website (2008)

Such discourse also meshes with the generic stories told by Māori in other regions. For example, Tane Mahuta (physically) resides in the Waipoua Forest in Northland, but by association Te Arawa draw on interconnected Māori mythology in order to tell their stories. Tourists may become more aware of the diversity within Māoridom through interpreters who tell different versions of stories that are common to different iwi. In doing so, the similarities and differences between iwi become apparent to tourists and they will learn how each story may be equally valid and useful. A Māori regional tourism representative I spoke with who had many years experience in Rotorua’s tourism industry, commented on the importance stories had to her growing up in neighbouring Whakarewarewa Village. She commented that a key aspect that people enjoyed was the telling of stories that were connected with ‘living in the village… the experiences these guides had when growing up – the connection to the land and growing up in ‘Whaka’ for instance made each guide’s tour different, but still provided the ‘same thing’ as a key component for the visitor. This research participant also stressed the value of tino rangatiratanga in the way Māori tourism was developed:

The stories made the difference – connected guides individually and tribally. So when we go to other parts of the country – that’s the key to the variation of the product. Talk about it as a family experience – a marae stay, a home stay, or a fishing trip, it’s not the money – the important thing is the support of lifestyle and community. These components are critical in Māori tourism development now because Māori operators want to determine their own way (not be a Tamaki or a Whalewatch necessarily) – not beholden to government for money. They can do that through their own business.

At a local level Smith (2001) identifies guides as part of the category of ‘culture broker’, responsible for ethnic imaging and cultural trait selection, selectively identifying segments of the cultural content to be shared with outsiders. McKercher and du Cros
(2002: 153) note that ‘whoever controls the knowledge imparted to the visitor yields a tremendous amount of power over how the cultural tourism asset is ultimately used’. Power is implicit in everyday social practices and as such closely related to identity construction. Guides can also act as gatekeepers – limiting the amount of information given about their culture and protecting traditional knowledge. They can also challenge stereotypes and misconceptions about their culture that have been constructed through dominant discourses (eg colonialism).

In regard to images of Māori females the photographer commissioned by Tourism New Zealand in 2006 to take ‘contemporary’ images of Māori tourism stated to me, ‘Those horrible images of the Māori maiden with big hair and makeup standing by a hot pool in traditional dress … are yuk to say the least. After all, we drive cars, own businesses, and travel all over the world’. As such, challenging these images is not only an important strategy for promoting different iwi identities but also in overturning the homogenous identity of Māori. This was evident on the guided tour I took of Te Puia. Our guide stressed the difference between tribes, and the fact that Māori were ‘firstly Polynesian, and that the term ‘Māori’ was not always accepted by some’. The guide also stressed the importance of Māori culture being based on ‘resources’ (i.e. land/food) before anything else (eg religion). This defined and sustained them. Visitors on my tour were genuinely interested in the tribal differences between Māori, and seemed keen to learn more in-depth knowledge about the culture from the guide. As such, power relations in these circumstances act as a productive force in the construction of personal and collective identities for Māori. In relation to Hall’s ‘Circuit of Culture’ we can view that identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse, they are constructed through, not outside difference.

Schouten (2007) has commented that cultural identity is a living force, acting as a powerful counter-trend against the global cultural domination of the West and the cultural uniformity it brings with it. This is arguably one of the driving forces of localisation in society, and the production and reproduction of the “local” for cultural tourism (Schouten 2007: 35). The representation of Māori tourism product via the representation of ‘place’
offers a “re-inscribing” of local/national representation of Māori culture. The claim of commodification of place in this example is countered by how the local hosts Te Arawa present their culture and convey Māori meanings to both place and the experience of place (i.e. the activity undertaken by the tourist). Control of this process by the iwi is the key determinant. Te Arawa has materially and symbolically constructed their community as a tourist product. In this process they reassert and reproduce their local identity and give meaning to their involvement in tourism. According to Van Meijl and Miedeme (2004:11) through their entrepreneurship in tourism, local people enter the national and even global stages negotiating the margins of their cultural autonomy and local self-management.

Te Puia is representative of Māori identity not only “becoming” but as “being” (Loomba 1998: 181). The current strategies of its redevelopment recognise the dynamic nature of culture and identity and the production and consumption of such to meet visitor demand and global trends. This is reinforced by Māori academic Ngahuia Te Awekotuku. In writing of the women of Te Arawa and their role as storytellers, Te Awekotuku notes the resilience of her people and their survival through improvisation, through adjustment, through change (1991). For Te Awekotuku, tourism is ‘part of an ongoing colonial process’ and one in which Te Arawa women have played an important part through their role as guides, interpreters, hostesses, cultural brokers (2001: 107). She states:

> Te Arawa coped with colonisation, then the neocolonisation of tourists, and finally modern entrepreneurial commercialism, and coped well (1981: 283).

> Improvisation is a vital element of cultural resilience; it determines the survival of a people, enhances the continuity of their spirit, the essence of their art – changing and shifting on our own terms, for our own reasons (2001: 111)

In this she alludes to the adaptability of Māori culture. Encounters with tourists have been commonplace for Te Arawa for more than 150 years. The fluidity of culture has retained a ‘base (that) remains true’ whilst reshaping culture to the demands of tourism. Thus, Te Arawa acknowledges Māori tourism’s ability to create new forms of cultural meaning and production and hence, challenge colonial discourse.
6.2 Nga Tangata Whenua: Diversity in Identity

Oral traditions, such as storytelling, are a vital part of aboriginal culture and the messages they convey contribute to the cultural identity of the people to whom the stories belong (King 2005; Macdonald 2005; Pfister 2000; Selby & Laurie 2005; Te Ahukaramu 2002; Te Maire Tau 2003). For Māori, these stories are related to regional resources and as such recognise the value of nga matatini Māori (Māori diversity). Individual Māori tourism operators – the “grass-roots” – tell local stories to visitors, connecting the regions with the national identity already established. This has been demonstrated by case study examples such as operation number seven who tell the story of Kupe within the context of the Hokianga. Visitors will hear the different versions and alternative creation stories from local Māori as they travel throughout New Zealand. These stories may be legendary tales, or historical, or family stories from only a generation ago. They may be current stories ‘in the making’. They may blend Māori and Pākehā perspectives in their telling. The inclusion of storytelling within cultural encounters offers Māori the opportunity to promote their regional differences whilst also protecting and managing their resources. There is already a strong ethos for iwi consultation when developing such products (Carr 2008; Ingram 1997; Keelan 1999; O’Regan 2001).

The telling of stories as attached to place/people links with Tourism New Zealand’s research that international travellers’ satisfaction levels are highest with physical and emotional encounters within tourism experiences. Interaction with local culture, especially Māori culture, has been identified as a motivating factor in their search for ‘new experiences that involve engagement and interaction and demonstrate respect for natural, social and cultural environment’ (TNZ 2003). Research by Carr (2004, 2008) identified a small but strong niche of visitor demand for personalised interpretation that provides cultural perspectives of natural areas and the landscape in New Zealand. In particular, visitors were interested in mythology, legends, stories and history that was specific to particular areas or reflective of the New Zealand cultural identity. Thus, the idea of encouraging visitors to experience more than one Māori product as they visit the regions allows for the differences of Māori resources to be portrayed from a perspective that encompasses diversity within the culture. Bishop (1996) has stated that stories are a
way of representing truth. Stories allow the diversities of truth to be heard, rather than just one dominant version. The sharing of stories amongst cultures in a tourism context thus offers an enriching and informative experience to visitors. For Māori, stories sustain cultural identity whilst accommodating and adapting to the reality of changes in cultural production.

My postcolonial critique also advocates a move beyond biculturalism. There are two partners to the bicultural relationship – both equally marketable. The desire to be ‘both/and’ moves beyond dualisms of Māori Pākehā to a third space; one that articulates modern Māori identity as part of the social fabric of New Zealand, but one that draws on specificity – i.e. as Tangata Whenua in identifying their distinctive position in this society. This concept also illustrates Pieterse’s (2004) notion of ‘layers of hybridity’ (refer Section 2.7). In this Māori culture is seen to be layered in history, including pre-colonial, colonial, and postcolonial layers, each with distinct sets of hybridity. Multiplicity and variety contribute to the notion of hybridity that varies over time, disrupting previous ‘boundaries’ such as homogenisation of Māori culture. Decolonising discourse entails going beyond dualisms and binary thinking (Pieterse 2004) and hence corresponds with postmodernism in its change in outlook. Such third spaces engages hybridity politics as a means of ‘writing back’ the colonial condition (Ashcroft et al. 2002).

Whilst the identity of all Māori is bound to the general concept of Tangata Whenua, the regional identities of kin groups illustrate differences born of particular regional adherences to Tangata Whenua; for example Māori in Northland have developed bush walks to show giant kauri such as Tane Mahuta while Māori in Rotorua have used the geothermal resources as a ‘living village’. These are important points of difference and are bound by a common concept: Tangata Whenua and can be detailed to show particular regional variations. This opens the way to diversification of particular aspects of Māori tourism. The way Māori tourism operators grasp and re-present the concept of Tangata Whenua provides diversification of product and multiple identity construction. By pointing to different emphases it is possible to distinguish cultural variations between
different kin groups. This works against biculturalism which fragments and objectifies particulars of Māori culture to present a generalised “Māoriness” within a eurocentrically defined framework that sought to assimilate tribes as one entity. Traditional tribal areas cut across contemporary provincial boundaries, thus narrating ‘against’ the colonially imposed framework that delineates land spaces. Kin group boundaries are boundaries of representation – they operate across difference – binding and marking discursive and symbolic boundaries.

The points of difference enhance tourism opportunities for Māori according to expertise in interpretation or storytelling and the conduct of experiential tours (McIntosh and Johnston 2005). Through the use of storytelling Māori tourism operators provide a holistic perspective of Māori culture to visitors; stories may be invested with the qualities of an individual or they can also be used to invoke a set of shared understandings and histories (Tuhiwai Smith 2003). Guides also act as gatekeepers, limiting the amount of information given about their culture and thus protecting traditional knowledge. Storytelling also has a symbiotic relationship with indigenous worldviews and thus cultural resistance. By recounting histories of colonialism, indigenous peoples not only create an understanding but also a critique of it (Attwood and Magowan 2001). Importantly stories distinguish within and between kin groups which contributes to affirming local identities whilst also retaining in part a national identity for Māori tourism. As a consequence, Māori tourism operators negotiate multiple identities in order to present their culture in a way that promotes change, hybridity, adaptation and that becomes charged with renewed significance through “alternative cultural frames” (Sissons 2005).

### 6.3 Summary

Māori are increasingly informing control of their tourism representation. An interest by visitors in the “genuine” and “authentic” have provided Māori a chance to represent their culture as they conceptualise it, thus undermining the “authenticities” previously
provided by a Pākehā-dominated tourism industry. Coupled with this change is the need to diversify the Māori tourism product and emphasise regional differences. Although the ‘traditional’ song and dance routine is still provided in main tourist centres such as Rotorua and Auckland Māori are increasingly interpreting and presenting their culture in ways that reflect their tribal and personal identities. This has been driven by strategies such as those incorporated in the NZTS (2010) and Mid Term Update (2015), He Matai Tapoi Māori, Demand for Māori Cultural Tourism and the emergence of MRTOs and the NZMTC to further direct, influence and develop Māori tourism. My interviews with tourism personnel have also shown how discourse at regional and national level intersects with the aspirations of tourism operators that reveal both similarities and differences.

Māori are advocating the need to reflect their cultural ‘values’ through more interactive and personal tourism activities. This recognises ‘emotional capital’ (Loomis 1999) as being an important asset for Māori social and economic development. The blending of Māori and Pākehā heritage in this process raises issues between different values and understandings related to the landscape and these are addressed by operators in various ways. Tourism settings which include cultural landscapes can be complex as they are often entangled with the values of local communities and as such local identity (Carr 2004). Operator number five is a case in point whereby stories told by ‘Pākehā’ about the local landscape caused tensions relating to the Treaty and colonisation. The blending of Māori and Pākehā heritage took a more conciliatory approach with operator number seven who was keen to promote colonial settlement as a ‘reality’ for Tangata Whenua in the North by developing a heritage based product. This was also a feature of operator number one whose guided walk in Auckland used a mixture of Māori and European place names which attests to a shared colonial past. For instance, the starting point of the tour at Maungawhau is commonly known as Mt Eden to most New Zealanders, and the region of Auckland was called Tamaki Makaurau. Visitors are told alternative histories, alternative worldviews as they gaze on the same sites. As social actors Māori guides use the conceptual systems of their culture to construct meaning, to make the world meaningful and to communicate about that world meaningfully to others (Hall 1997: 25).
Presenting culture in more personalised experiences also connects with the aspirations of Tourism New Zealand’s prime target market – the *Interactive Traveller* (TNZ 2001, 2003, 2006). The NZTS describes this traveller as someone that desires authentic engagement and active participation, is environmentally aware, seeks discovery, is interested in learning about people from a different culture, and interested in sites that are important to a country’s history and sites that are important to a country’s indigenous people (Colmar Brunton 2003). They also have high levels of sociability and discretionary income. It could be said this market segment is closely associated with the ‘experience economy’ with its increased tendency for individualisation in production and consumption (Saarinen 2004). These experiences engage individuals in a personal way as guests and are a result of the “new tourism” – a new style of production, with increasing flexibility, individuality, and hybridity (Saarinen 2004). Notions of Māori culture can be (re)worked through contemporary interpretations of how Māori live today in both rural and urban contexts. The creation of new forms of cultural meaning and production challenges entrenched colonial discourse that has previously represented Māori as Other. Critical analysis exposes this subversion and shows the way to reclaim indigenous representation. For indigenous peoples tourism constitutes an arena for cultural renewal and identity negotiations (Bhabha 1994, 1996; Hollinshead 1992, 1996, 1998, 2004; Tuulentie 2006; Viken 2006) and is vital to postmodern representation.

Analysis of these case studies reveals how identity is formed and formative by those operators and guides who participate in the tourist host encounter. Identity is one position in a matrix alongside production, consumption and regulation (Spencer 2006) as illustrated in Hall’s (1997) Circuit of Culture and whereby meanings emerge and shift depending on context. Therefore, interpretation will be multi-faceted depending on situation and context. For example operator number one were local Tangata Whenua but recognised the need to adapt Māori tikanga to fit with European knowledge systems for practicality in terms of cultural understanding between visitor and host in a city environment. In that respect the term ‘cultural identity’ is the result of these interactions. Cultural identity is the expression of one’s place in the world (Schouten 2007) and is subject to power structures that construct meaning and defines the way culture is
represented, thought about, and practiced (Hall 1997). This includes the issue of cultural sensitivity whereby Māori elders were keen to protect particular knowledge which was deemed not transferable to other cultures. An example was operator number seven’s collaboration with four different marae in mandating stories. As one operator commented to me ‘you need a mandate to tell stories…this involves elders. You cannot tell stories about ancestors without ownership/authorisation’.

Most research participants were sensitive to the content of stories; sharing those aspects of tikanga they deemed ‘public’ therefore keeping private elements of tikanga sacred to the kin group. Generic stories allowed a ‘commonality’ between regions and provided a national ‘storyline’ that transcends tribal boundaries and authorisation and thus less problematic in terms of ‘who tells’. However, the need to balance the commercial necessities of the tourism industry with cultural protection poses a challenge for sustainable Māori tourism development. For Māori tourism operators this can represent conflict between tikanga and commerce. The values are open to change just as Māori culture has adapted to change and colonisation. The application of tikanga in a contemporary context suggests new possibilities for Māori and Pākehā alike.

Results from my research show how Māori tourism operators contribute to the discourse of decolonisation and promote future growth of Māori social and economic development through self-determining practices that promote the fluidity of cultural identity. Case studies discussed in this and the previous chapter illustrate how Māori tourism operators engage with identity forming concepts such as place and culture in ways that subvert the colonial ‘Othering’ binary and which demonstrate multiple forms of identity construction. This shows that such forms of representation reinscribe notions of the Other and (re)present Māori tourism within different discursive frameworks that resist homogenisation. By defining themselves and determining their own identities as either kin groups and/or Māori, or in fact as both Māori/Pākehā, they re-cast assumptions of cultural hegemony and claim autonomous expression.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Beyond Biculturalism

Introduction

This thesis is based on the idea that biculturalism is a colonial relationship. At the same time, it argues that self-determination expresses the politics of indigeneity and thus aims to decolonise Māori Crown relations. Indigeneity draws on international endorsement from such entities as the UN and re-negotiates power structures that have affected indigenous peoples’ aspirations toward autonomy. This global/local nexus draws commonality through expression of indigeneity and, for Māori, expression of tribal identity. Biculturalism and self-determination make different assumptions about power (O’Sullivan 2007). In a bicultural context power remains with the Crown and they, in turn modify state institutions to make them responsive to Māori.

Māori self-determination provides recourse for thinking past the bicultural notion of Māori as a homogenous group, and to think about their own terms of engagement, not just with the State, but with wider society and, with increasing importance the international economy (O’Sullivan 2007). Māori tourism is increasingly engaging with a world of mobility and movement in ways that promote traditional social and political aspects of Māori culture whilst also transforming those characteristics in postmodern ways. Case studies in this research reveal that Māori tourism products contribute to the construction of Māori identities in ways that are globally contextual. This is part of a postcolonial process, one that involves the transformation of central concepts of colonialism, sovereignty, citizenship, national, ethnic and indigenous identity, and the rights attached to each of these (Fleras and Spoonley 1999: 251). As a global industry tourism will continue to be influenced by social, political and economic forces; within these forces Māori tourism will continue to be adaptable to change and new challenges. As Clydesdale (2007: 49) comments, ‘culture is not a point in time, but an evolving
force’. In the final analysis we need to recognise the identity of Māori is a complex issue and one that Te Punga Somerville (2006: 89) raises some dialectical questions in determining ‘what is Māori?’ She asks:

…how do we talk about the experience of colonisation without falling into the trap of lamenting that we’re ‘too colonised’ … how do we talk about our past, our ancestors, our cultural heritage and concepts, without falling into the trap of over-romanticising, creating a (newly) ‘authentic’ Māoriness?

She draws on filmmaker Merata Mita who uses the metaphor of the ‘taniwha’ in discussing Māori cultural production and the struggle but necessity for cultural change.

Identity at any meaningful level cannot be manufactured or manipulated … no matter what destructive processes we have gone through and are going through, eventually the taniwha stirs in all of us and we can only be who we are (2007: 90).

Taniwha are mythical creatures – associated with tribal groups and often viewed as tribal guardians. Thus, they reinforce tribal identity. Analogy can be drawn from Māori operators who are advocating that new images be promoted by the national tourism organisation stating, ‘we want images of Māori doing everyday things, in everyday ways…this is contemporary Māori – being who we are’. Māori tourism operators are thus enunciating their own narratives and cultural practices.

This thesis has examined the representation of Māori in tourism guided by the research question “how do Māori tourism operators negotiate the representation of their image, tribal identities, and cultural difference within the socio-political context of New Zealand tourism and in what ways does this renegotiate notions of the ‘Other’ as inscribed by (colonial) tourism practice and ascribe notions of Māori self-determination and autonomy?” Encased in this question are a number of complex issues that ‘make up’ Māori tourism not least of which has been the bicultural framework within which Māori must operate as Tangata Whenua and as Treaty partners in what may now be called ‘multi-cultural’ New Zealand. The contemporary reassertion of Māori cultural/tribal
identity is strongly linked to land claims under the Treaty of Waitangi and whereby Article Two of the Treaty was intended to guarantee Māori their exclusive rights and interests to collective land, resources and taonga. The effects of colonisation disenfranchised Māori society, with many individuals and iwi losing their lands (Walker 1990). The consequence was that the majority of New Zealanders with Māori ancestry live outside their traditional rohe (Carr 2008). As such, Māori have adopted and adapted to colonisation and subsequently globalisation in ways that demonstrate the malleability and entrepreneurship that have been an intrinsic part of their culture. The ability to transverse both Māori and Pākehā cultures and to translate, negotiate and mediate both sameness and difference creates a hybrid subject position.

My intention to place discussion of Māori tourism in a postcolonial framework was the need to examine the spatial and temporal dimensions of cultural production and social formation of the ‘colony’ and ‘post-colony’ of Aotearoa New Zealand. Postcolonial theory deals with the cultural identity matters of colonised societies and the dilemmas of developing a national identity. It links with tourism via the processes of promotion in that production of new politically resonant definitions of peoples, places and pasts emerge. The Māori ‘image’ has played an important role in globally differentiating New Zealand tourism from other destinations and offers a point of difference in marketing strategies. Within this global environment the ongoing construction and representation of specific spaces and experiences is played out within a touristic milieu that is transcultural, dynamic, fluid, and hierarchical. Māori negotiate their image, tribal identities and cultural difference in the global/local nexus of tourism from both intrinsic and extrinsic positions of power. This re-presents Māori as active agents of self determination as they engage and employ strategies of the existing (colonial) social, economic and political arena and open up critical spaces for new narratives of becoming. This engagement can be viewed as a third space from which new subjectivities emerge and in this sense, tourism can be seen as a means through which indigenous populations are able to develop new plural life worlds today as they forge new relationships between their present and their past (Hollinshead 2007: 292).
7.1 Tourism and Postcolonialism (Re-visited)

The idea of postcolonialism itself is located within a highly contested political and theoretical terrain, but one that has been extensively used as a means to address various forms of western domination in a number of disciplines and increasingly tourism. It is a concept by which we can re-examine the historical past and re-configure our contemporary world-wide concerns (Ashcroft et al 2002). As Ashcroft et al. note postcolonial studies ‘might best be regarded now as a term for a body of diverse and often contesting formulations of the cultural production of colonised people rather than a discipline or methodology per se’ (2002: 199). I would agree this comment best describes my use of postcolonial theory to examine the representation of Māori tourism. My research articulates the position of Māori within a framework of biculturalism that is under transformation as a result of Māori aspirations to re-present their culture from a Māori perspective. Thus the transformation of Māori culture has been reviewed through contemporary processes of cultural production.

My postcolonial critique has included a critical attention to the histories of both Māori and Pākehā relations which means attending to the cultural, historical, social and political differences between both cultures. But so is thinking between and across differences too (McLeod 2000). This does not negate hierarchies of power and discourse that has created a bicultural society that, for Māori, could be argued as unequal but it opens up the complexities of these different postcolonial contexts and their interconnections. As Nash (2002: 227) reminds us, postcolonial geographies work through the tension between understanding colonialism as general and global, and particular and local, between the critical engagement with a grand narrative of colonialism, and the political implications of complex, untidy, differentiated and ambiguous local stories. It could be described as a ‘script for change’. Accordingly, the term “postcolonial” is best left contested and provisional, constantly under review and in question.

As a Māori and a New Zealander I do not claim to say that ‘we are postcolonial’. To define ‘who is postcolonial’ imposes boundaries and by association binary oppositions. It also conflates with the concept of hybridity and its desire to blur existing boundaries.
Hybridity offers a concept by which I have examined the diversity of Māori culture to reveal that Māori tourism is multi-layered and represented by multiple subjectivities. These subjectivities draw on epistemological concepts such as whakapapa, rangatiratanga, manaakitanga and kaitiakitanga as identity forming narratives that can be transferred in a cross-cultural context between visitor and host. The forum for such interactions has traditionally been the marae, however, with urbanisation and globalisation come adaptation and adoption of new ways of doing things. As such, urban marae and non-tribal structures have emerged to cater to the changes wrought by postmodern and postcolonial influences. We cannot easily drop the term ‘colonial’ (post, pre or otherwise) from New Zealand’s socio-political discourse until such time Māori and Pākehā attach some consensus to each other’s position as Treaty partners amongst the increasingly ‘multi-cultured’ makeup of Aotearoa New Zealand.

The examination of Māori tourism imagery in this thesis has shown that Māori are taking initiatives to re-present their cultural image in modern ways and as modern people and that the mix of old and new need not be confined to rural/urban dichotomies. Māori increasingly ‘mix and match’ in ways that mimic, parody and challenge ethnocentric notions of the Other. This reveals culture as uncertain, ambivalent and open to the future (Bhabha 1994). However, notions of the exotic Other persists in both popular and institutional constructions of culture and cultural difference. My research suggests that it is not so much the ‘negation’ of the Other that counts, but the negotiation and re-negotiation of spaces and temporality between Others. By employing the notion of Bhabha’s hybridity as a critique of homogenising the Other we might encourage tourism researchers to focus upon the everyday nature of the discourse which they themselves use to research matters of ‘Selfhood’, ‘Other-presentation’ and ‘foreign-ness’ (Hollinshead 1998).

7.2 Review of the Research Process

Previous literature on Māori tourism (Carr 2004, 2007; Colmar Brunton 2004; Hall 1996; Ingram 1997; Keelen 1996; McIntosh et al. 2004; MTTF 1987; Pihema 2002; Ryan 1997,
1999, 2002; Ryan and Higgins 2006; Ryan and Pike 2003; Taylor 1998; Te Awekotuku 1981) has neglected the complex nature of Māori as *tribal* and *regional* in terms of how New Zealand “culture” is presented in a tourism context. Previous research has brought to attention a number of important economic, cultural and political issues for Māori tourism but has failed to place this in a critical postcolonial context that interrogates the bicultural relationship between Māori and Pākehā from which tourism has evolved. Hence, emergent changes brought about through new forms such as cultural hybridity illustrate the willingness of Māori to be so culturally malleable within postcolonial tourism contexts and the global/local nexus.

Indigenous peoples have demonstrated their ability to re-negotiate and re-articulate such concepts in ways that legitimate and represent their worldviews in diverse and dynamic ways. Kaupapa Māori is one such example. My adherence to kaupapa principles in this research addresses the power-knowledge issues and commits to a critical analysis of the existing power relations within New Zealand between Māori and the Crown. Fundamental changes in the Crown Māori relationship have reduced and refined the scope of government in New Zealand and provided space for the emergence and proliferation of new expressions of Māori collectivity. As a consequence the Treaty is acknowledged as a charter for power sharing and participation in the decision-making processes of New Zealand’s tourism development. Research has focused on the deconstruction of those hegemonies which have disempowered Māori from controlling and defining their own knowledge and processes (Bishop 1996). I adhere to key aspects of kaupapa in that Māori language, culture, knowledge and values are accepted in their own right. More specifically I view my position to kaupapa principles as contributing to Māori self determination of their own destiny as the indigenous peoples of New Zealand.

During the course of my study complementary research has been produced relating to Māori tourism (see Wilson, Horn *et al.* 2006) which forms part of a broader project of ongoing research on ‘growing regional Māori tourism’. However, there is a need to include and extend the “politics” of Māori economic development within a tourism context in a way that aligns with Māori aspirations of autonomous expression. In this,
the recognition of kin group identities is critical to future sustainability and creativity for expansion of Māori tourism. Many Māori tourism products are developing on a small scale (i.e. whānau based) that positions the concept of “grass-roots” Māori tourism as an important indicator of its future potential. These individual operators make key decisions on how identity is represented within the tourism experience and thus how it affects visitor satisfaction levels. The growing impetus on interactive, experiential and educational tourism experiences offer Māori tourism operators a wide range of opportunities in which to capitalise on both their culture and resources in traditional and non-traditional ways.

The varied methods used in my research design have been in keeping with the intent to produce a critical analysis of Māori tourism representation. A combination of participation, observation, discourse analysis and qualitative interviews provided a holistic perspective to the complexities of ‘selling culture’ as a tourism product. The growth of Māori Regional Tourism Organisations and a national representative body for Māori tourism also prompted the need to examine discourse at national and regional level. This approach sought to identify the multiple Māori voices contributing to policy-making and strategic development; that is the “politics” of tourism discourse. This highlights inter-connections between these levels in terms of who is ascribing/proscribing/prescribing Māori tourism and who represents. A focus on “grass-roots” operators then offered a more diverse view of Māori culture and how this diversity contributes to developing the national Māori tourism product. In particular the focus on storytelling as an identity-forming resource for Māori operators draws on traditional aspects of Māori culture to inform postmodern identity politics and considers how indigenous people adapt aspects of their own culture in the face of global tourism development.
7.2.1 Reflections on Research

Simply defined, methodology is about how research does or should proceed (Porsanger nd). Research that includes indigenous people should be carried out in a respectful and ethical manner and I believe my qualitative approach in this study has achieved this objective. By advancing the kōrero of Māori tourism practice my research extends the current field of academic literature pertaining to Māori tourism and brings clarity to issues of representation and identity in a postcolonial context. Overall my method of analysis is concerned with the socio-political and socio-cultural development of Māori and Pākehā relations within tourism. I interpret the qualitative interviews in terms of the varied expressions and discourses produced by research participants that draw together commonalities and differences between kin groups and individuals. From this my research then determined how Māori tourism operators discursively construct their own identities in relation to tourism. A key finding here was the personal identities of Māori tourism guides act as powerful cultural brokers that may engage with postcolonial discourse and hybridity through their interpretation of place and identity. As a consequence the notion of Other in relation to the tourist experience can be renegotiated in such interactions.

I commented earlier in the thesis about the complexities of “insider/outsider” research and my position as being “marginal”. At the conclusion to this research my feelings remain relatively similar, albeit with a shift to more of the “insider”. During the course of this research I have always made a distinction of ‘living simultaneously in two worlds, that of participation and that of research’ (McKinley Brayboy and Deyhle 2000). As a person who identifies as Māori, this is an ongoing identity which I hold to. There remains however an intellectual distance in that I am conscious of needing to perform a proper data analysis but also aware that being part “insider” is of value and enhances the validity of the research process, data collection and analysis. Māori culture and by association the representation of Māori tourism is a politicized subject in New Zealand and cannot be viewed in a distant manner. Taking seriously what participants tell us of their world allows for a more critical examination of the research topic. Research conducted in ways that fit the context, situation and circumstances allow for the
researcher to be flexible and adaptive to the ‘moment’. Although my interviews were structured in the sense of what information I wanted to cover I often found the interview process turned out quite differently. Questions became more reflexive in that they flowed from a conversational style and my position of “power” tended to shift as I realised my “identity” as a Māori person did not always feel comfortable with a probing and inquisitive attitude that might not be culturally appropriate. Thus, the “insider” position was fraught with some tension as I interacted with the subject matter.

Asking questions is a key part of qualitative research however, adapting to cultural differences and circumstances is also a necessary part of the research process when research involves indigenous peoples. An important consideration for me as I moved between study sites was to ask “what am I learning?” and “how does this case differ from the last?” Impressions and reactions were deemed important contributors to the discourse that would emerge between myself and research participants. I needed to reflect on the assumptions and preconceptions I was making during the research and the possible impact of these on results (Hannam and Knox 2005). I also found several research participants knew each other within the domain of “Māori tourism”. This brought with it a sense of kinship as I interacted with each one and which I felt unlikely amongst Pākehā operators. This made me question this assumption. I can only say I felt an intangible element of kinship existed within the concept of being Tangata Whenua that inherently linked land and resources with the tourism operations and by association with the operators’ identities.

7.3 Key Findings of the Research

The key findings are summarised below in Table 7.1 and will be discussed under headings of image, identity, cultural difference and hybridity. These findings derive from my intention to examine the representation of Māori tourism in New Zealand from a historical (and colonial) to contemporary (postcolonial) perspective.
Table 7.1 Key Findings Of This Research

- Māori tourism is not a homogenous entity. Māori tourism operators offer a range of diverse products that reflect the multiplicity of Māori culture.

- Most Māori tourism operators agreed that the image of Māori needed change to reflect more contemporary images.

- Tribal differences are seen as key to variation of the Māori tourism product and ascribe rich regional distinctions of Māori tourism. Points of difference are related to regional resources and how Māori tourism operators translate and interpret these to visitors. This provides New Zealand tourism with a point of difference that is multi-layered rather than homogenous.

- There are multiple Māori voices within local/regional/national levels of New Zealand tourism that prescribes Māori tourism discourse. There also appears to be an “inclusivity” of Māori tourism that ascribes the differences amongst Māori whilst recognising a collective desire to self determination and autonomy. This acts within a power regime that is still largely Eurocentric in outlook; often contested but seeking and gaining cooperation and collaboration.

- Storytelling is an inherent part of Māori tourism product and a clear indicator of identity construction (personal, tribal, collective) and cultural capital. This is manifest at three levels: local (grass-roots), regional (MRTOs) and national (NZMTC).

- Stories link Māori identity with land resources and by association the concept of whakapapa. Multi-layered narratives underpin both traditional and contemporary approaches to representing culture and thus intersect with the concept of hybridity. Hybridity exposes the layers of cultural identity i.e. provides a window on diversity of (regional) Māori tourism.

- Storytelling and ‘performative identity’ are means of re-negotiating colonial practice and therefore also re-negotiate bicultural relations between Māori and Pākehā. The double/hybrid identity resultant from a ‘mix of ideas and practices’ (Bhabha 1994) creates a postcolonial subject that re-inscribes notions of the colonial Other.
7.3.1 The Postcolonial Māori Image

The promotion of Māori culture by the National Tourism Organisation for most of the twentieth century has been guilty of neglecting diversity in favour of promoting a generalised homogenous Māori cultural product. Images such as haka, hongi and hangi have predominantly represented elements of “Māori culture” subsumed under a generalised notion as “New Zealand culture”. As a result “Māori culture” is assumed to occur elsewhere in some sense, even somehow outside history (Webster 1998). The prolific amount of photography promoting New Zealand’s natural landscape (e.g. 100% Pure) has defined the country’s touristic image to international tourists as a destination with beautiful scenery and a ‘unique’ indigenous people. This binary has to some extent constrained the opportunity to combine and promote nature and culture as an integrated product.

Most Māori tourism operators and industry personnel interviewed in this research agreed that images of Māori in national tourism media need updating and traditional stereotypes need to change. Interviews revealed that tourists were keen to learn about the diversity of Māori culture however, this was not being recognised by tourists until they interacted with Māori tourism products/experiences in the regions of New Zealand. Regional Māori tourism operators have the potential to capitalise on both natural and cultural components to develop cultural products that are more recognisable as “Māori tourism products”.

Thus, there is a need to portray this diversity through imagery before visitation in promoting New Zealand tourism overseas and whereby future research could examine new marketing material targeting inbound travellers and through which distribution channels (such as airline videos, travel guides, and internet) these are being exposed. How effective and what impact are these having on the choice of visitor participation in attractions/activities that are ‘defined’ as Māori tourism? How is Otherness being (re)constructed in such processes to posit the lure of difference that destinations continually strive for?

Discussion over the Māori tourism image is still a topical issue in current rhetoric between Māori and Pākehā industry stakeholders. Results from fieldwork highlight the
fine line in balancing cultural integrity with demands of a visual global culture. Tourism New Zealand has struggled at times to capture the ‘true essence’ of the Māori culture in its still imagery. As one TNZ marketing research participant said to me, ‘Māoridom is about storytelling – how do you capture that in a single magazine image with very few words and without resorting to clichéd set-up images?’ But comments from marketing personnel also indicate the complexities of capturing the distinctive traditional symbols and imagery that distinguishes a culture while at the same time make it feel ‘living, breathing and contemporary’. While indigeneity is of increasing importance for travellers it does not register at the moment as a major reason why people visit New Zealand. This is rather paradoxical as research has shown that contact with indigenous people and their culture is one of the most rewarding and satisfying experiences of tourists’ visits to New Zealand (Colmar Brunton 2004). This disconnect requires further research in order to understand why visitors are not initially motivated by this desire. Has the Other become too domesticated, known and familiar? And does the Other require “re-exoticising” towards a need to market not only products but even nations for difference despite a growing awareness of the dangers of such marketing? Thus, “exoticist” discourse may become a means to (re)create the Other from within different discursive frameworks.

I have also commented in this thesis on the use of the term “authentic” by Māori themselves as being a form of postcolonial critique. Prideaux and Timothy talk of a metamorphosis of the authentic into a new authenticity (2008: 3). Thus, ‘traditional’ uses of cultural expressions (tangible and intangible) may have completely different uses from their traditional purpose and therefore take on new meanings of cultural expression – both for the host and the visitor. In this respect, the process of commodification (from the old authenticity to the new) is not necessarily seen as a negative force as it ‘refashions elements of culture to provide a new symbol that can be used as a marketing icon’ (Prideaux & Timothy 2008: 8). Thus the fluidity of culture represents a translation, a hybridizing act and the possibility of developing something new. In a highly globalised world where culture is rapidly changing and transforming societies, commodification offers such societies/cultures a mechanism via which they can control these processes in
ways that retain value as ascribed by those stakeholders. Consequently, traditional
culture and heritage can be incorporated in ‘new’ culture and heritage in ways that are not
subsumed by modernisation and ‘its passengers of uniformity and conformity’ (Prideaux
& Timothy 2008: 8).

Analysis of Māori tourism operations has revealed the postmodern sensibility that exists
in current promotion of Māori culture. Examination of operators’ promotional literature
reveals “authentic” is a commonly used term to describe the tourism experience on offer.
To some extent this is used in a way that reflects an essentialist cultural position but only
to the extent that it caters to mainstream discourse. Overall I believe the particular
values incorporated in the cultural tourism experience from a kin group perspective over-
ride any essentialising characteristics because cultural integrity is an inherent feature of
the production. In this, Māori control and Māori perspective act as self-determining
autonomous entities that challenge the previous implications of the essentialised colonial
Other. For Māori, the kaupapa around the term “authenticity” will be important in
defining any collective consensus of what it means for Māori tourism. The aspect of
change is important to cultural tourism development. Not only do cultures change, but
also the appreciation of cultures changes over time. As Schouten notes: ‘heritage is re-
evaluated by each generation anew; some aspects are added to it and others may be
fading away’ (2007: 34). It is the existence of ‘boundaries’ per se that makes hybridity a
relevant notion. Boundaries are an inherent part of biculturalism. By re-negotiating
these boundaries Māori effectively re-negotiate biculturalism.

7.3.2 Identity and Cultural Difference

The modernity of indigenous people has often been denied, and this is especially true in
the field of tourism where indigeneity works as a part of tourism marketing (Tuulentie
2006: 25). From a critical angle tourism has often portrayed indigenous peoples as
“exotic”, “timeless”, “primitive” and “authentic” in ways that have served to homogenize
and fix indigenous culture in a static mode of representation. But much has changed over
the past couple of decades that have altered ways of seeing culture as a dynamic construct that is constantly evolving. In the context of globalisation and the rise of identity politics, indigenous matters have assumed enormous significance not least within the tourism arena whereby indigenous peoples have taken active and assertive roles in constructing their own identities as well as the identities of the tourists visiting their home regions. In this respect the “subject-object” dichotomy of cultural tourism is altered through subjective meanings and realities constructed in the host guest encounter.

Research in this thesis has focused on the significance of tribal identity within Māori tourism by examining the extent to which construction of a national identity has neglected the diversity of regional differences amongst Māori culture. This research has found that Māori tourism is not a homogenous entity and that Māori tourism operators offer a range of product and experiences that represent diversity in tribal identity. By constructing their own identities and communities as tourism products Māori tourism operators act as entrepreneurs and give meaning to their involvement in tourism. Thus, they negotiate the margins of their cultural autonomy and local self-management (van Meijl 2004) and project the multiplicity of Māori culture that in itself challenges the structure of a bicultural society.

The importance of Māori identity within tourism representation is manifest in how Māori culture is represented. Cultural experiences are consumed and negotiated in terms of tourist’s prior knowledge, and their interests and expectations before visitation occurs. The way tourists interact with travel literature and marketed representations of a culture affect the outcome of this experience. Cultural offerings promoting Māori culture that centres on only cultural product such as performance or static images creates a limited stereotyping of Māori imagery that masks the contemporary and diverse tribal nature of Māori culture. A form of localised tribal identity occurs within tribal rohe and these boundaries mark regional differentiation of Māori tourism product although represent porous structures in terms of inclusivity of Māori culture.
However, cultural difference and cultural hybridity shows the fluidity of boundaries and cross-cultural mixing that occurs in the global/local nexus of tourism mobility. The question of defining Māori identity within Māori tourism is problematic as the concept of identity is complex with many meanings. Description draws on signifiers to represent meaning, and stories have become one means of demonstrating ‘points of difference’ within Māoridom and between Māori and Pākehā. Immediately there is the possibility of diversity in respect of identifying regional Māori identities. In this respect stories can be viewed as a form of postcolonial resistance, operating within power structures to reassert cultural ways. The production of cultural identity in a self-determined sense, which confronts or instigates change from colonial agents, can be seen as successful postcolonial resistance. Thus Māori operators, through the reiteration of identity and difference in the form of storytelling disrupt colonial practice and the binary opposites imposed by colonial identities.

As stated in Chapter Two my interpretation of culture for this research focused on the decision-making of tourism stakeholders that shape the representation of New Zealand tourism; and as a consequence the “narrative” of (tourism) culture as a determining feature of identity. Narratives from Māori tourism personnel at regional and national level has demonstrated that multiple Māori voices exist and each symbolic dialogue that individuals construct make up an inclusivity of Māori tourism within the wider construct of New Zealand tourism. In terms of “discourse” and “power” Māori act as powerful “cultural brokers” in the representation of their cultural image. There are several categories of brokers including tourism entrepreneurs, guides and personnel working within both governmental and non-governmental organisations. The ‘flow of power relationships’ is thus dynamic and dialectical between identities (Tuulentie 2006). Māori mediate between a number of groups within the tourism sector; thus exploitation of their cultural image is diminishing as Māori increasingly become active players in the commercial marketplace and of their own cultural production.

This thesis has focused on “identity” as a process rather than as a given content. That is, identities are continuously renegotiated and the boundaries between different identities
have been blurred as participation in global migration, mobility and transculturalism continually shape societies within the global/local nexus. However, the effects of globalisation have reinvigorated locality whilst at the same time diminished the nation state (Wevers 2006). We might ask does globalisation allow indigeneity a discourse which keeps it in place but frees it from the locking binaries of postcolonial nations. Indeed, theories of globalisation have moved, over the last half century, from expressions of the process as ‘cultural imperialism’ or neo-imperialism to analyses of the ‘hybridization’, ‘diffusion’, and interrelationship of global societies (Ashcroft et al. 2002).

Strategies by which the ‘local’ colonised engage large hegemonic forces reveal that supposed passive subjects (e.g. Māori) demonstrate energies for interchange, circulation and transformation (via processes such as Hall’s Circuit of Culture). These energies may become the ‘weapons’ of resistance so to speak in progressing self determination. Such narratives of succession resonate in the contemporary politics of settler countries such as New Zealand and whereby the Māori Crown binary is constantly under review and renewal. In relation to tourism the re-appropriation of images and cultural property and the assertion of autonomous control unsettle narratives of settler nationhood and (re)define new futures for Māori through shifting discourses and (re)imaginings.

Identities are part of the system of differences and the process of identification is relational and situational. In a mobile culture the meanings of identity are negotiated in interaction processes, and these meanings emerge and shift as persons establish and negotiate the task at hand (Tuulentie 2006: 28). Identities then can be viewed as sources of meaning for the actors themselves. As such Māori tourism operators both internalise and construct meaning around their individual, kin group and global associations as part of the practice of tourism which itself is central to the construction of self. The Māori-identity ascription paradox between Self/Group is constantly being re-negotiated as new generations of Māori who are less encumbered by Treaty processes ascribe different identities within their day to day lifestyles. As noted by Tuleentie members of a minority can be regarded as being more aware of the elements of their identity than the majority.
people, and I would agree this is true of how Māori inscribe their local and regional identities within the wider national identity of being a “New Zealander”. Negotiations are done not only in relation to kin group identity but also in relation to “outsider” opinions. As such, Māori tourism operators successfully re-negotiate the homogenous identity ascribed to them by outsider forces such as the national tourism organisation, other media and visiting tourists.

7.3.3 Cultural Hybridity

New hybrid forms are significant indicators of profound changes that are taking place as a consequence of mobility, migration and multiculturalism (Pieterse 2001). Hybridity thinking encompasses the old with the new and involves different ways of looking at historical and existing cultural and institutional arrangements. For tourism, hybridity offers a new way of thinking about the cultural production of Otherness. For my research hybridity has provided a means to explore the layers of history that make up Māori culture and which still influence the practice of Māori culture today albeit in a hybridised sense. As Pieterse states ‘hybridity is deeply rooted in history and quite ordinary. Indeed, what is problematic is not hybridity but the fetishism of boundaries that has marked so much of history’ (2001: 221). In a postcolonial context this notion of hybridity refers to Māori as intercultural brokers, producing counter-narratives from the nation’s margins to the ‘totalising boundaries of the nation’ (Bhabha 1990). In the socio-political context of New Zealand, this can be transferred to how the impacts of colonisation, Treaty negotiations, race relations, identity politics and the ensuing multicultural make up of New Zealand have been produced. Contemporary accelerated globalisation is an intrinsic part of this process and inextricably linked to the processes of tourism and the new modernities of the emerging markets. New Zealand has a well established touristic image in the global marketplace and continues to seek and promote “difference” as a strategy for tourism position. Māori have adapted, adopted and evolved within the tourism environment from one of homogeneity to one of diversity. Thus, hybridity is an argument against homogeneity.
Māori operators are increasingly engaging with a third space – a hybridity which re-inscribes the dualisms of colonised and coloniser. My research has placed emphasis on the positive mode of articulation this third space offers as a way of describing a space that engenders new possibility for Māori tourism development. This third space provides a spatial politics of inclusion rather than exclusion and accommodates both differences and affinities between and within cultures. Thus affinity and difference intertwine to mediate previously held notions of ‘them/us’. In the urban context Māori tourism operations such as operator number three go beyond narratives of ‘traditional’ and ‘originary’ with their focus on the processes of change and adaptation of ‘modern’ Māori living in a city environment. Essentialist notions of Māori identity are countered by such operators who promote contemporary and modern Māori experiences. Those who have been subject to classification now have the opportunity to present “reality” grounded in difference. Such a process re-interprets the “signs” that have previously signified other meanings (MacCannell 1976). By presenting Māori culture in a modern urban environment as fluid and changing, such operators contest and negotiate the historical conjuncture of discourses in which they are produced (Meredith 1998). “Māoriness” is not monolithic or a historical.

The articulation of cultural differences and cultural hybridity provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of selfhood – singular or communal – that initiate new signs of identity. Their act of defining society and their place in society is one of both collaboration and contestation that re-works meanings in a local context. It is unlikely such Māori operators self identify as hybrid, although hybrid self identification is in fact common (Pieterse 2001). Hybridity as a social phenomenon exists when it is identified as such by those involved in social interaction, or in the ‘practice’ of the beholder (Friedman 1999 in Pieterse). Thus, my interpretation of such Māori businesses suggests that indeed, Māori tourism operators are engaging with hybridity and third spaces through the very representation of past and present manifest through concepts such as whakapapa. As mentioned earlier in the thesis I do not inscribe this notion on all Māori
but see it as a way to examine the innovative, creative and entrepreneurial role of Māori tourism operators in translating/negotiating their tribal identities.

Cultural hybridity is apparent in ways Māori integrate Western business practices with traditional values regarding goals and operations (Panoho and Stablein nd.) and the way Māori tourism operators blend spiritual and cultural values and beliefs in ways that show the *lived experience* of modern Māori today; and where new expressive cultural identities continually open out performatively to realign boundaries. As such, focus on the emotive, performative and interactive experience with Māori is an important part of product development and provides opportunity for raising cultural awareness among travellers (McIntosh and Ryan 2007). Indeed future research on the changing nature of business frameworks within Māori tourism operations could be examined for their ‘hybrid’ characteristics and how Māori perceive cultural values ‘fit’ within such frameworks.

Urban operations such as operator number one and three are examples whereby presenting Māori culture as modern and contemporary incorporates both western and Māori philosophies in the business operation. Re-working notions of Māori culture as ‘modern’ through contemporary interpretations of how Māori live today is a form of transculturation. This may range from concepts of kawa and tikanga to more contemporary issues such as working with Māori urban youth and the cultural influence of traits like American hip hop and rap on youth that become integrated within the cultural milieu. Or in the example of operator number one tikanga is ‘adjusted’ to suit cultural contexts as in the host guest encounter. As such these enterprises can be seen to represent a contemporary face of Māori tourism whereby identity is largely contextual and motivated by how Māori live in a city environment whilst still incorporating traditional values. Indeed many Māori enterprises follow similar processes within their business operations and whereby the need to exploit their enlarged resource bases (often as a result of Treaty settlements) means operating within a Westernised (or hybrid?) paradigm as a necessity to survive and compete in the global marketplace. Further research could be undertaken to ascertain the concept of ‘fusion culture’ (including
Pasifika/Asian cultures) within Māori urban-based tourism product such as wine and
cuisine, music/hip-hop, arts, home-stay experiences, and even the burgeoning cruise
market and how this is being incorporated in the visitor experience. Do visitors expect
such ‘fusion’ as part of a Māori experience? What issues does this raise in terms of
“authenticity” and visitor perceptions?

However there appears to be intrinsic conflict between the goals of preserving cultural
routines and the acquisition of new routines that are compatible with economic growth in
the modern context (Clydesdale 2007: 66). An evolutionary perspective reminds us that
Māori culture is multi-layered and has adapted to the resource base existing at a particular
time for particular needs. Preservation and change are not incompatible and cultural
hybridity is but one form of cultural production that emerges from these processes. The
issue of ‘boundaries’ discussed in this thesis can be re-thought as third spaces whereby
the space across and between boundaries is a liminal space and current changes involve
liminality of a kind becoming a collective awareness (Pieterse 2001: 239). Pieterse
describes this awareness as a kind of ‘Trickster knowledge’, a sort of ‘shape-shifter’ who
does not take seriously what all society around regards as sacred rules. This may be
pushing the boundaries in some Māori academic circles or indeed, the wider society of
Māoridom, but I see connections with Māori epistemology and the mythical demigod and
‘Trickster’ Maui who ‘fished up’ Aotearoa New Zealand. In this sense, hybridity
consciousness represents a return of the Trickster, now at a collective scale. Why this is
notable as a conclusion to my thesis is that the figure of Maui has recently been used as a
collective theme by which to represent Māori regional tourism by the NZMTC under the
heading ‘Living Landscapes’.

This concept creates a national story that originates with the landscape and connects
visitors with a Māori perspective of this landscape. Within this framework MRTOs will
develop their ‘stories’ in their regional landscapes that ‘look through Māori eyes’
(NZMTC 2008). The concept aims to not only strengthen relationships with other
industry stakeholders such as RTOs, TNZ, TIANZ, iSites and government, but also adds
value to visitors by drawing on the wairua (spirit) of Māori culture to impart that for
Māori, New Zealand is a ‘living landscape storyline’. This will differentiate regions through stories that are particular to Tangata Whenua of the region and who describe themselves as part of the Maui story. The multi-layered narratives that are intrinsic to Māori identity will be evident in such experiences that connect Māori with the landscape. The following comment reiterates this point:

Those visitors would have made a connection with the truth, the culture, and the people of the land they visited. For our international visitors, this is a simple, authentic, indigenous story sequence that explains the origin and spirituality of New Zealand in one breath. It establishes an alternative view of our beautiful landscape, different but complementary from the current promotional strategies. It offers mystique and the promise of a spiritual connection with a tribal society still in touch with culture and tradition. There are two equally marketable New Zealand’s … one is modern, innovative and 100% pure in adventure, landscape, lifestyle, it’s urbane, multicultural … the other New Zealand is unique: it’s Māori, spiritually connected to the landscape.

(NZMTC 2008: 6-7).

I have highlighted words in this statement that reveal Māori tourism is indeed hybrid, non homogenous and postcolonial. These issues have all been discussed within this thesis as contributing to how Māori negotiate their image, tribal identities and cultural difference within a postcolonial framework that resists homogeneity and asserts equity through self determining practice. I feel Māori tourism has arrived at a pivotal point of negotiating their cultural identity from the grass-roots to the global.

7.4 Summary
This thesis has looked at various ways in which tourism practices in postcolonial settings are, and could potentially be, sites of postcolonial resistance and contestation by examining the representation of Māori tourism. It has proposed that the delivery of Māori tourism product through storytelling as attached to tribal (thus, regional) identity represents a form of critical postcolonialism by offering Māori a discursive space in
which they re-articulate and re-present their culture. The effects of colonialism show how discourse has both informed and shaped native/settler identities and constructed the notion of the Māori Other. As postcolonial agents, Māori seek to redress the situation of social, cultural and political domination that has arisen through colonialism.

In concluding my research, I want to reiterate the point that I do not view my research as an end in itself, but as a contribution to the future planning and development of Māori tourism. My study has examined the potential for regional Māori tourism to expand beyond the description assigned and prescribed by the national tourism organisation. Māori tourism is rich in opportunity because of tribal points of difference that exist within and between kin groups. To further extend this proposition and promote further initiatives we might ask how this richness of opportunity for Māori tourism operators can be translated into action. My research therefore contributes to the current korero on Māori tourism development by extending conceptualisation of Māori tourism within a postcolonial framework; one that interrogates and re-negotiates the boundaries of biculturalism.

In the course of this research my identity as a Māori person has developed as the narrative takes shape; strengthened by the knowledge shared and people I have met in the course of fieldwork. It has made me much more aware of the issues Māori and indigenous people face and the complexities inherent in cultural politics. I have gained a sense that Māori are re-articulating their position through collaborative participation in tourism in a way that goes beyond categorical binary structures of ‘us/them’, ‘colonised/coloniser’. The metaphor of Bhabha’s (1994) third space signifies a new frame of reference wherein resides the potential for better understanding one’s experiences and the complexities of identity construction. Thus, I view contemporary Māori tourism is acting within third spaces that recognise the diverse realities that operate within postcolonial societies.


