

Rebooting the **Regions**

Why low or zero growth needn't
mean the end of prosperity

Paul Spoonley
Editor



First published in 2016 by Massey University Press
Private Bag 102904, North Shore Mail Centre,
Auckland 0745, New Zealand
www.masseypress.ac.nz

Text copyright © authors as credited, 2016

Design by Jo Baffey. Layout by Sarah Elworthy
Diagrams redrawn by Janet Hunt

The moral right of the authors has been asserted

All rights reserved. Except as provided by the Copyright Act 1994, no part of this book may be reproduced, stored in or introduced into a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise) without the prior written permission of both the copyright owner(s) and the publisher.

A catalogue record for this book is available from the National Library of New Zealand

Printed and bound in New Zealand by Printlink

ISBN: 978-0-9941300-3-7
eISBN: 978-0-9941325-6-7

Contents

Foreword 9

Lawrence Yule

Introduction 13

Paul Spoonley

1. **Regional futures:** Diverging demographics and economies **17**

Paul Spoonley

2. **Irresistible forces:** Facing up to demographic change **47**

Natalie Jackson

3. **Here to stay:** Reshaping the regions through mana Māori **79**

Naomi Simmonds, Tahu Kukutai and John Ryks

4. **Down on main street:** The depopulation of the central North Island **107**

Alice Kranenburg

5. **No region left behind:** Local success stories in regional innovation **123**

Christine Cheyne

6. **The future is young:** How the regions can address youth underachievement **143**

Dan Henderson

7. **The peculiar case of Canterbury 159**

Lana Hart and Carl Davidson

8. **Income inequality in New Zealand regions 177**

Omoniyi Allmi, David C. Maré and Jacques Poot

9. **The shrinkage pathway:** Managing regional depopulation **213**

Rachael McMillan

Afterword: Where to now? 239

Paul Spoonley

About the contributors 249

3. **Here to stay:** Reshaping the regions through mana Māori

**Naomi Simmonds (Raukawa,
Ngāti Huri), Tahu Kukutai
(Waikato, Ngāti Maniapoto and
Te Aupōuri) and John Ryks**
Te Whare Wananga o Waikato /
The University of Waikato

Here to stay: Reshaping the regions through mana Māori

Situated 65 kilometres south-east of Hamilton, Putāruru (population 3747 in the 2013 Census) is typical of the many farming service towns scattered across rural Aotearoa New Zealand. Bakeries, op shops, a sports bar and a farm equipment supplier occupy the main street. Unlike nearby Tirau, which transformed from a one-stop shop into a vibrant boutique village in the late 1990s, Putāruru township remains largely indistinguishable from other rural centres. There are few clues to the substantial farming-based and water-generated wealth that lies beyond the town.

Many locals have it that Putāruru is the 'home of the owl', on account of its original Māori name Puta-a-ruru. Puta means 'to come forth' and the ruru or morepork is a native owl. In fact, the town's name has nothing to do with owls; it originates from a story that establishes the territorial rights of Raukawa iwi over the South Waikato region. After the murder of Raukawa's granddaughter Korekore (sometimes referred to as Koroukore) by Ngāti Kahupungapunga, her attendant Ruru fled to inform the Raukawa people of her murder. 'Te Puta-a-Ruru' was the place where Ruru came out of hiding. There are variations to this story, but each establishes the relationship of Raukawa, through Ruru and Korekore, to Putāruru and its surrounds. For local authorities, businesses and many of the wider community who actively maintain the morepork version of the town's name, 'home of the owl' provides a more accessible narrative than that of Ruru the ancestor. Conveniently, it also provides a narrative that does not threaten the political autonomy of the local authority, or the powerful

economic interests of those who benefit from control and use of the land and resources of the area.

The example of Putāruru is instructive because it illustrates the ease with which Māori narratives and histories connecting people and place have been erased from towns and regions across the country, both physically and figuratively. In this, Putāruru is the norm rather than the exception. As regional New Zealand struggles to carve out a sustainable future in the context of depopulation, structural ageing and shrinking labour forces, towns and centres have much to gain through promoting and leveraging their distinctive identities. Engaging Māori in meaningful partnership through collaboration, co-management and co-production is an essential precursor to reshaping the regions. However, in order for this to happen local authorities need to recognise and provide for mana Māori (Māori autonomy) and mana whenua (territorial rights).

In building this argument we examine the demographic, cultural, political and economic presence of Māori in the regions. We begin with a discussion of the cultural and historical dimensions of Māori place-based attachment with a focus on mana whenua. Mana whenua have responsibilities as kaitiaki (guardians) to the land and resources, to local knowledges and narratives, to iwi and hapū members and to the wider community. The deeply embedded relationships to place and the subsequent responsibilities held by mana whenua make them well placed to champion, and in fact lead, regional revitalisation in Aotearoa.

We next consider the spatial patterning of iwi. Much attention has been given to the high Māori population share in economically deprived areas such as Gisborne and the Far North, but patterns of iwi distribution are poorly understood. This is unfortunate given the growing potential of iwi to contribute to regional sustainability through the process of Treaty-based settlements and development. Our Census-based analysis focuses on the share of iwi members living within their tribal boundaries and finds a great

deal of inter-iwi variation. This presents both opportunities and challenges for internal iwi planning and development, but should not be seen in isolation from broader regional trends that include deepening inequality.

A key mechanism for enabling greater Māori engagement in regional development is through local and regional planning and decision-making. While transformative potential is best realised through increased rather than diminished Māori autonomy, there is still a tendency for Māori engagement to be based on token forms of consultation. Despite existing mechanisms and provisions for increased Māori representation and engagement, there have been few best-practice examples where local authorities have actively worked with Māori to transfer decision-making responsibilities. Finally, we provide two case studies, focused on the South Waikato and on Hamilton, to illustrate two very different approaches to recognising mana Māori and mana whenua in the regions.

The enduring and evolving nature of mana whenua

Mana whenua have always derived meaning from place. Mana whenua refers to the mana held by local people who, through whakapapa, have 'demonstrated authority' over land or territory in a particular area. Mana whenua is the localised articulation of what it means to be tangata whenua, and provides for the heterogeneity of experience and expression that tends to be obscured under such umbrella terms as tangata whenua or Māori.

Mana whenua is not the only way of understanding Māori spatiality. There are many place-based concepts that exemplify the enduring nature of place for Māori. Hau kāinga (winds of home/home) and ahi kā (those who maintain occupation/keep the fires burning) are well-known concepts among Māori. Tūrangawaewae, the place where one can stand and belong, is a relatively well-known concept that links people, identity and the land. In the 2013 Māori social survey, Te Kupenga, nearly 70 per cent of Māori reported feeling a 'strong' or 'very strong' connection to

tūrangawaewae vis-à-vis their ancestral marae.

Whenua — meaning at once ‘land’ and ‘placenta’ — is exemplary in demonstrating the relational and reciprocal arrangements between people and place. This illustrative description is provided by Eva Rickard, who successfully campaigned for the return of ancestral lands at Whaingaroa Harbour to the peoples of Tainui Awhiro:

First whenua is land. Secondly, whenua is the placenta within the mother that feeds the child before birth. And when it is born this whenua is treated with respect, dignity, and taken to a place in the earth and dedicated to Papatūānuku . . . and there it will nurture the child. You know our food and living come from the earth, and there also this whenua of the child stays and says ‘this is your little bit of land. No matter where you wander in the world I will be here and at the end of your days you can come back and this is your Papakāinga and this — I will receive you in death’ (1977, p. 5).

A perhaps lesser-known concept is that of te ūkaipō — ‘the night-feeding breast’. Like tūrangawaewae, this concept establishes a specific place of belonging and nourishment for those who are connected to that place. Ūkaipō is a term that can have dual meaning: referring to one’s mother, but also to a specific place where someone can go to gain physical or spiritual sustenance. This is reflected in the instructions, to those who may be living away from their tribal lands or are metaphorically distant, ‘e hoki ki tō ūkaipō’ — ‘return to the night-feeding breast’, or to that place where you can go to sustain yourself, recharge and/or regenerate.

For mana whenua, and indeed for those Māori living away from their tribal lands (which, as the next section shows, is the majority of Māori), identity and distinctiveness are inextricably embedded in place. The collective cultural memory of mana whenua is etched into the landscapes

and storyscapes of Aotearoa’s regions. These storyscapes reference cosmological and social origins, events and encounters, and are enduring. They endure historical and more contemporary colonial impositions; the ebbs and flows of regional population growth or decline; local and central government election cycles, policy development and changes; and economic highs and lows.

As is discussed in the case studies below, these enduring place-based relationships have the potential to provide culturally grounded and transformative approaches to addressing some of the key issues currently facing New Zealand’s regions, including environmental protection and economic development that is ethical and sustainable. The challenge lies in local authorities, and the Crown, recognising this and proactively facilitating greater mana whenua participation and autonomy in local and regional planning, management and development. This is not just another opportunity for regions to selectively appropriate those bits of iwi/hapū knowledges that they see as accessible, convenient and useful to their own agenda. While many local authorities have expressed an interest in learning local knowledges, for the most part they have sought to do so on their terms. In so doing, they have failed almost unequivocally in *partnering* with iwi and hapū to lead the revitalisation of their towns and communities in culturally grounded and responsive ways.

Iwi spatiality

Māori have unique forms of place-based attachment that link whānau and whenua, but the extent to which Māori are able to live ‘at home’ is mediated by structural, historical and political factors. The rural–urban Māori migration that occurred after World War II was one of the most rapid spatial transformations observed for any population anywhere. At the start of the twentieth century, 85 per cent of the Māori population lived in rural locations and 15 per cent in urban locations. By the turn of the

century this had reversed, with 85 per cent living in urban settings. These transformations had major implications for rural Māori communities. Some parts of the Hokianga literally emptied out as entire whānau moved to towns and cities. Although aware of their genealogical connections to place, many whānau have lived as mataawaka (outside their own customary rohe, or tribal boundaries) for two or three generations. Contemporary Māori migration has not been confined to Aotearoa New Zealand, with an estimated one in six Māori living overseas, primarily in Australia. At the time of Australia's 2011 Census there were more Māori living in Queensland than in 10 of New Zealand's 16 regional council areas.

Geographical dispersion is an enduring feature of contemporary Māori society and one that is important for iwi and hapū to understand and respond to. However, there are ongoing challenges with accessing information that reflects Māori spatiality and well-being and development priorities. Most administrative boundaries bear little resemblance to customary Māori understandings of rohe. 'Cadastral space' enables planners to demarcate and allocate land-use zones according to development principles and resource management rules. Tribal boundaries are often delineated in relation to landmarks, pou whenua and sometimes key events and ancestors. These boundaries have traditionally been fluid and permeable. For example, the tribal rohe of Raukawa that takes in Putāruru is represented by four pou whenua: Te Pae o Raukawa, Wharepuhunga, Maungatautari and Te Kaokaoroa o Patetere. Tribal kaumātua Haki Thompson described the tribal boundaries of Raukawa as follows:

It [begins] at Te Wairere, from Te Wairere to Tarukenga along Mount Ngongotaha, Tarukenga to Horohoro, from Horohoro to Nukuhau, Nukuhau to Karangahape, from here to Titiraupenga, Titiraupenga to Wharepuhunga, Wharepuhunga to Maungatautari and from Maungatautari back to Te Wairere.

One of the key reasons for undertaking a census is to obtain an accurate count of individuals within a clearly delineated boundary. Subnational population estimates are indispensable for planning and policy-making, and administrative boundaries such as regional councils and territorial authorities (TAs) continue to provide a basis for local-level decision-making. For iwi authorities, knowing how many members live within their rohe is critical. However, obtaining such information is difficult because the spatial classification systems used by Statistics New Zealand do not recognise Māori spatiality in the form of iwi boundaries. For the purpose of this chapter we thus construct our own.

Table 1 shows the proportion of iwi affiliates that resided within their customary rohe at the time of the 2013 Census. In the absence of an official iwi rohe classification, we use Te Kahui Mangai, which identifies the TAs of Mandated and Recognised Iwi Organisations included under the Māori Fisheries Act 2004. In the case of Waikato iwi, for example, this includes the six TAs of Auckland, Waikato, Hamilton City, Matamata Piako, Waipā and Ōtorohanga. This ad hoc approach, which includes entire TAs rather than partial areas, is less than ideal.

Our aggregations are likely to overstate the size of most rohe and, consequently, the proportion of those living inside them. As such, our figures should be taken as generous estimates of within-rohe residence. Table 1 includes 88 of the 110 or so iwi included in the official classification (the rest were not included in Te Kahui Mangai). Here we note that iwi affiliation in the Census is based on self-report, which is quite different from the process of iwi registration. The latter typically requires at least two or three generations of whakapapa to a hapū and/or marae, and some form of external recognition or endorsement by a kaumātua. Iwi register data are the property of iwi and are generally unavailable to researchers.

Table 1: Proportion of iwi affiliates living within iwi rohe (defined by territorial authority)

Percentage living within rohe	Percentage of iwi (n = 88)
Less than 20%	21.6
20–29.9%	30.7
30–39.9%	21.6
40–49.9%	11.4
Half or more	14.8
Total	100.1

Note: Percentages sum to more than 100 per cent due to rounding

The key point to note from Table 1 is that iwi vary greatly in terms of their within-rohe share. In 2013, only about 15 per cent of iwi had at least half of their members living within reach. Just over half had less than 30 per cent of members living within rohe. And about one in five, including Ngāti Porou (Gisborne), Whakatohea (Ōpōtiki) and Ngāti Maniapoto (Waipā, Ōtorohanga, Waitomo, New Plymouth, Ruapehu), had less than 20 per cent of their peoples living within rohe. The 2013 data closely reflect the distributions in the 2001 Census.

This heterogeneity is not random but reflects, in part, broader structural differences in economic opportunities between and within regions. It is not surprising that the iwi with the highest proportions of within-rohe members are those that incorporate major cities and labour market areas within their boundaries. For example, Ngāti Whātua, Te Kawerau, Ngāti Whanaunga, Waikato, Ngāti Wai, Ngāti Paoa and Ngāti Tamaterā are the iwi with the highest share of within-rohe members. They also include, or are encapsulated within, the Auckland Region.

Iwi have little influence over the structural characteristics of their rohe in terms of population growth, proximity to labour markets, migration flows,

structural ageing and (to some extent) economic cycles. Research strongly suggests that income inequality is growing within and between regions. There is also increasing regional divergence in terms of demographic and economic growth, ageing and diversity. As the regions continue to develop unevenly, and inequality perhaps grows, this will almost certainly exact a heavier toll on some iwi than on others.

Enabling effective regional partnerships

Understanding the spatial distribution of iwi and the rohe within which they live can inform and enrich a discussion about the rights and interests of iwi in the planning and development of regions, and subsequent policy responses from central and local government. Historically, the depth and integrity of the latter has been lacking. In 1988, the Waitangi Tribunal reached the conclusion that tino rangatiratanga in the Treaty of Waitangi referred not to separate sovereignty but to tribal self-management in a manner similar to the operation of local government (Muriwhenua Fishing Report). In reality Māori, and tangata whenua in their role as kaitiaki, have struggled to be allowed to make decisions regarding their own affairs and resources at a local level. Local self-government has never eventuated despite a number of provisions and mechanisms for Māori representation in the Local Electoral Act 2001, the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA) and the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Overall, iwi have not been able to obtain an effective level of representation in, and engagement with, local government, or had opportunities for authentic sole governance.

This is partly due to the lack of willingness of local authorities to actively promote forms of Māori representation internally on boards and other decision-making forums. For example, Māori representation in local government has for the past 10–15 years remained static at around 5 per cent, despite Māori accounting for approximately 15 per cent of the population. As we write, the debate about Māori representation on local

councils is continuing to be played out in New Plymouth, where the New Plymouth District Council mayor recently resigned after being subjected to blatantly racist attacks because of his support for increased Māori representation on the council.

The absence of Māori authority also reflects inconsistencies in how local authorities engage with iwi on major environmental projects across regions, in spite of their legislative requirement to do so. The RMA intended to provide a high level of public participation, particularly for Māori given their status as tangata whenua and their traditional relationship with natural resources. In reality, Māori are largely excluded from the majority of RMA decision-making processes, with less than 7 per cent of resource consent applications being notified and involving iwi. There are also a number of options and tools available to local authorities to foster iwi decision-making. This includes the ability to transfer RMA powers and functions to iwi authorities under Section 33 of the RMA. However, over the last 25 years, local authorities have been unwilling to transfer these functions or powers.

Since 2005, provision has also existed for Joint Management Agreements (JMAs) as a way of encouraging more collaborative management between councils and Māori. These agreements recognise the status of Māori as tangata whenua and provide potential for Māori to exercise rangatiratanga in relation to natural resources. Despite good intentions, there has been limited use of JMAs outside of Treaty settlements. This is disappointing. The settlement-based co-management agreement and underlying JMAs that were developed for the management of the Waikato River show great potential and demonstrate the benefits of increased representation to iwi and the wider community. The Waikato River Authority, which comprises five iwi and five Crown representatives, has been proactive in attempting to deliver the shared goal of a clean and healthy Waikato River.

It is clear that while a number of mechanisms and provisions exist for Māori representation in and engagement with local government, there are major barriers to implementation. Ultimately, the effectiveness of these provisions and mechanisms will be determined by the willingness of local authorities to fulfil their obligations to Māori and for Māori to be fully supported and empowered in this process.

Building on Arnstein's original ladder of citizen participation, Figure 1 provides a framework for thinking about current and future levels of iwi decision-making and governance, and serves to illustrate that despite there being opportunities for sole governance and representation and engagement with local government, institutional barriers prevent advancement up the ladder and continue to affect economic, cultural, environmental




Figure 1: A ladder of Māori and iwi decision-making

and social development in the regions. It also presents questions for both iwi and local authorities to consider.

Existing mechanisms for Māori participation, such as those provided for in the RMA and the LGA, fall short of necessitating a Treaty-based relationship between local authorities and iwi and hapū, insofar as the nature and extent of that relationship is a discretionary matter for councils. That being said, we would argue that this necessitates an opportunity for local authorities to show leadership in their engagement with mana whenua to provide bold leadership in regional revitalisation and to demonstrate meaningful and effective Treaty partnerships at the local government level.

While Māori 'development' tends to be framed and responded to at a national level (and, increasingly, iwi level), rangatiratanga is enacted locally. A 'one size fits all' approach cannot address the specific issues, challenges and opportunities that exist within rohe. Formal recognition at a national level does not always lead to improved outcomes at the local level — the inconsistent and weak implementation of the RMA provisions pertaining to Māori is evidence of this.

Mana whenua concepts can help build resilient, sustainable regional development pathways that are also inclusive. To illustrate the potential of these pathways, the next section presents two case studies that address different aspects of mana Māori. The first, located in the South Waikato, presents two important places, Te Wāotū and Te Waihou, that exemplify the challenges and opportunities for mana whenua in terms of building inclusive communities, active protection of significant places and collaborative engagement.

Empowering mana whenua

Case study 1: South Waikato

The Raukawa rohe of Te Kaokaoroa o Patetere, which encompasses much of

the South Waikato, contains a number of significant ecological and cultural places that provide the rohe with a distinctive and rich identity. One such example can be found only a short 20 kilometres from Putāruru, in the area known as Te Wāotū. This falls within the traditional lands of the Ngāti Huri hapū, which is now one of the only actively maintained hapū in the area and acts as kaitiaki for a number of other hapū that have traditionally been known to occupy the area. Te Wāotū is the site of one of the first Native Schools in the Waikato, which opened in 1886, and is the standing place of a number of ancestral and ecological sites of significance to hapū and the wider iwi of Raukawa.

This place not only refers to the 'home place' — the tūrangawaewae or ūkaipō — for whānau of Ngāti Huri, but also refers to the physical characteristics of the landscape, the historic standing place of a significant tōtara plantation and the symbolic standing place of a number of ancestral sites. Te Wāotū represents one of many geographically bound concepts that not only serve to define a physical place but also have the potential to provide a hapū-specific conceptual framework for understanding and transforming social, cultural, ecological and political landscapes of the South Waikato. For example, it provides a focal point to collaboratively protect ecologically significant remnants of the native bush at the Jim Barnett Reserve. Further, Te Wāotū has, on numerous occasions, provided a conceptual framework for discussion and engagement between hapū and the community about what it means to stand tall and strong like the historic stand of tōtara.

In addition to the example of Te Wāotū, we can look to the case study of Te Waihou spring to necessitate mana whenua engagement for sustainable regional transformations. Just a short drive out of Putāruru is the Blue Spring, known by mana whenua as Te Waihou. Te Waihou River and its origin as a puna (spring) within the Mamaku range has been a critical part of life for mana whenua for centuries, providing a rich source of both resources and connection. Te Waihou puna is one of a number of significant

springs along the Waihou, the water source is a very old groundwater aquifer that sits within the Mamaku/Kaimai area and the quality of the water is exceptional. The spring was, and is, an important resource for the Raukawa hapū of Ngāti Ahuru, Ngāti Tukorehe, Ngāti te Rangi and others as it was located centrally between the marae, and access to the spring and river was shared.

The South Waikato District Council (SWDC), and others, have been quick to capitalise on this distinctiveness. The 2015/16 summer season saw record numbers of visitors to Te Puna Waihou (the Blue Spring), with visible impacts on the puna and its environs. The massive increase in visitor flow was a direct result of the promotion of the spring by the council and others to domestic and international visitors. Along with such promotion and marketing, however, comes the responsibility to ensure that the spring and the surroundings are not negatively affected. The local authority has the opportunity within its Operative District Plan to develop a co-management plan with Raukawa and the Waikato Regional Council for the use and management of Te Puna Waihou. Furthermore, the JMA between SWDC and the Raukawa Settlement Trust, signed in 2013, suggests an emerging era where co-management is a reality rather than just an aspiration. While this may be the case for the Waikato River catchment area, where co-management is a requirement of the Waikato River Settlements, it has yet to be realised in the Waihou catchment and in relation specifically to the Blue Spring.

As well as being a place of extraordinary natural beauty and spiritual significance, Te Waihou has also become a lucrative source of water-generated wealth. Approximately 70 per cent of New Zealand's bottled water is taken from the spring. Water is taken from the municipal supply by the bottling companies without the need for separate resource consents (that would have their own conditions of consent, monitoring and enforcement), for a seemingly nominal fee paid to the local authority. Engagement with

mana whenua on this issue has been almost non-existent. The impacts of these commercial water takes stretch far and wide. They include:

- excessive use of water in the production and manufacturing of bottled water, and the other drinks produced by the commercial companies that have 'purchased' rights;
- potential hydrological impacts of water takes on the puna;
- marketing of indigenous places often using information that is questionable;
- the partial privatisation of water (a resource for which access is guaranteed as a fundamental human right); and
- increased pressure on the environment through transportation and packaging of water.

SWDC, in its 2016 annual planning cycle, is now promoting the idea that Putāruru brand itself as the water town. If iwi and hapū are not engaged in the development of a co-management plan for the spring or in the branding of the town, there is a very real chance that history will repeat itself; although rather than perpetuating the myth that Putāruru is the 'home of the owl', the new myth will instead perpetuate symbolic and ecological exploitation of wai Māori (fresh water) — something that is considered by mana whenua to be a taonga (treasure), not a brand.

By the SWDC's own admission in the South Waikato District Plan, engaging with mana whenua and the wider community around the co-management of the Blue Spring is an opportunity for the council to fulfil its obligations to meeting tangata whenua values in the region (Section 3 of the SWDP) and the outstanding natural values of the district (Section 6). The Raukawa Settlement Trust has also articulated its commitment to the spring (and indeed all the waterways in the district) and to engaging with the council through JMAs, numerous submissions to the district and

annual planning processes, and in the Raukawa Freshwater Fisheries Plan and the Raukawa Environmental Management Plan (REMP).

We would argue that the opportunity is more than this and is, in fact, one where the council and iwi can lead by example and demonstrate to the community and to others around the country their commitment to proactive management of the spring, and their leadership and innovation in the sustainable management of this place so that it continues to be a distinctive and defining feature of the region. Furthermore, this is an opportunity for the council to step up in a positive way to implement and activate its obligations under the RMA, LGA, SWDP, REMF and, importantly, Te Tiriti o Waitangi. The ability to engage mana whenua in a co-management plan for Te Puna Waihou is entirely possible within the current legislative and policy framework. The willingness on the part of the council to take the lead and partner with iwi and the wider community is yet to be realised, although we are hopeful.

The opportunity for more meaningful partnership between local authorities and iwi is timely, and other examples within the region such as the Waikato River co-management framework demonstrate what is possible if councils and iwi partner to proactively manage this puna. Effective use of the opportunity lies in the willingness of local authorities and the wider community to recognise and actively provide for the distinctiveness of mana whenua relationships to Te Waihou spring. More meaningful engagement and partnerships between council and iwi in relation to the spring can, we believe, see the realisation of new possibilities for resource management, sustainable economic growth, and the creation of a sustainable, distinctive and 'rich' community identity.

Furthermore, in their environmental management plan, Raukawa recognise the opportunities for sustainable economic growth in the district, with Te Waihou spring providing an obvious focal point for attracting people to the area. What is important, they say, is that this can

only be done in a context where the natural environment is protected and the values and knowledge of Raukawa upheld. Within this context, with increased mana Māori and partnership in relation to the spring and the wider district, there are many options for meeting the needs of the tribe and the wider community.

In fact, the Raukawa Settlement Trust, which signed its Treaty settlement in 2012, sets out a vision in its 2030 strategic plan — Raukawa Kia Mau Kia Ora — that could equally drive district-wide growth and revitalisation in a way that upholds mana Māori and mana whenua rights and responsibilities as kaitiaki. Raukawa Kia Mau means 'to hold firmly', and speaks of the need to recognise, maintain and actively celebrate the unique identity, traditions and values of Raukawa people and Raukawa whenua (land). Kia Ora means 'to prosper', and represents the idea of growth, sustainable development, and fostering the best opportunities as we move into the future. The iwi is still in the very early stages of post-settlement, and therefore the implementation of this vision is a work in progress; what is clear, though, is that with partnership and increased mana Māori the possibilities could be endless and could apply well beyond the bounds of the resource management sphere.

The point is that mana whenua, in partnership with local authorities and the wider community, should define and determine the specific opportunities and benefits that could come from significant places such as Te Waihou spring. Some examples of what this could look like include sustainable iwi-led or joint ventures that can provide pathways (economic, educational and cultural) for iwi members to 'return home' to the district; the creation of roles for mana whenua that provide employment to protect and maintain the spring (kaitiaki roles); educational programmes about the significance of the spring to the iwi and to the district (beyond simple signage at the spring); and research on and revitalisation of mātauranga Māori and tikanga, or practices and customs, in relation to the spring.

Te Wāotū and Te Waihou are two significant places in the South Waikato that serve to illustrate the opportunities for regions with increased participation by, representation of and partnership with mana whenua at all levels of district and regional decision-making. The challenges and opportunities surrounding Te Waihou are highly relevant, and are still being played out as this chapter is written. Increased recognition, engagement and representation of mana whenua and mana Māori in the South Waikato are opportunities not only to reshape the region but also to exemplify a Treaty partnership in action and, importantly, *with* actions.

Case study 2: Hamilton

While there is a growing awareness of the potential of the ‘Māori economy’ to contribute to national development, its contribution to regional economies has been largely overlooked, even though in some regions the impact has been substantial. Likewise, the heterogeneity of Māori in regional Aotearoa New Zealand is seldom considered in planning or development.

Hamilton City and its surrounding area provide a useful illustration of both the complexity of contemporary Māori spatiality and the growing economic influence of Māori entities. In Figure 2, the map on the left shows the proportion of the Māori population within the Hamilton main urban area (MUA) that affiliates with the mana whenua iwi of Waikato, Ngāti Maniapoto, Raukawa and Ngāti Hauā. Statistics New Zealand uses the MUA classification to identify concentrated urban or semi-urban settlements without the distortions of administrative boundaries. There are 16 MUAs (12 in the North Island and 4 in the South). The Hamilton MUA encompasses Hamilton City and a number of surrounding towns that form part of a larger commuter zone. The map on the right in Figure 2 shows the spatial distribution of the Māori population (based on descent) as a percentage of the total population in each census area unit (CAU). CAUs are the second-




Figure 2: The spatial distribution of mana whenua and the total Māori population in Hamilton

smallest unit of dissemination of Census data and are aggregations of meshblocks that often define urban neighbourhoods and suburbs.

In comparison with other cities in Aotearoa New Zealand, Hamilton has a high percentage of mana whenua (38% compared with 16% in Auckland, 6% in Wellington and 29% in Christchurch). However, within the Hamilton MUA the demographic visibility of mana whenua varies substantially, from less than 10 per cent to nearly 70 per cent. High mana whenua concentrations can be found north of Hamilton City in Ngāruawāhia, Horotiu and Gordonton (the urban area excludes Huntly), and to the south of Hamilton City around Te Awamutu and Kihikihi.

This spatial patterning likely reflects the historical clustering of

papakāinga communities within proximity of marae, such as Tūranga-waewae in Ngāruawāhia, Hukanui in Gordonton and Mangatoatoa near Kihikihi, as well as connection to ancestral lands where ownership has either been retained or returned to mana whenua. These areas, while in some cases materially disadvantaged, are culturally vibrant focal areas for marae, hapū and iwi development. In more densely populated areas such as Hamilton City, the overall Māori population is concentrated more generally in areas of high socio-economic deprivation (for example, the suburbs of Enderley, Frankton and Glenview).

These maps highlight the ongoing significance of mana whenua connections to place, the demographic importance of mataawaka in urban centres, and the contemporary inequalities that each face. Iwi and urban Māori organisations are well aware of the challenges and opportunities. Māori migration is hardly new, so iwi have had generations to adjust to diasporic flows of whānau outside of the rohe as well as being host to Māori from other parts of the country. How iwi and mataawaka navigate these relationships is informative because it illustrates the potential for constructive engagement and cooperation where competition might otherwise prevail.

Te Rūnanga o Kirikiriroa is the Urban Māori Authority that represents the needs of mataawaka in Hamilton City, along with Pacific peoples. The rūnanga was established in the mid 1980s under the direction of the late Māori queen, Te Arikinui Te Atairangikaahu, and provides a wide range of services from youth mental health services and budgeting advice to social housing and whānau ora services. The rūnanga explicitly recognises the distinctive rights and interests of mana whenua in Hamilton and seeks to work in ways that complement, rather than compete with, their social, cultural and commercial activities.

Waikato-Tainui, the iwi organisation that covers Hamilton, has about 65,000 registered members from 33 hapū and 68 marae spanning from Te Kuiti in the heart of the King Country to Maraetai in Auckland.

Whakatupuranga 2050, the tribe's long-term strategic blueprint, identifies three key avenues for advancing individual and collective well-being: tribal pride and identity, success in education, and socio-economic independence. Key to the latter is growing the tribe's asset base from the \$170 million received in land and cash as part of the Waikato Raupatu Claims Settlement Act 1995.

After difficult beginnings, Waikato-Tainui has become a major economic stakeholder in the region, with the 2015 annual report showing total assets worth \$1.2 billion. The portfolio includes four-star hotels; bus operator Go Bus, purchased in a joint venture with Ngāi Tahu Holdings Corporation; and the country's largest shopping complex, The Base. The land on which The Base stands was taken by the Crown under the Public Works Act for defence purposes prior to World War II, and the run-down air force base was returned to the tribe as part of the 1995 settlement. The success of The Base has cemented the tribe's position as a key economic player in Hamilton and contrasts sharply with the struggling retail zone in the city's central business district.

The ubiquity of bilingual signage, which extends to the restrooms and car park, along with the Māori design features and the liberal use of Māori names (the flagship mall is called Te Awa), distinguishes The Base from the other retail centres and malls across the country. It also affirms, in a very direct way, the cultural and symbolic value of te reo and normalises the use of te reo in commercial settings. This contrasts with the (neo)colonial process of predominantly using English place names in the planning and development of commercial and residential sites. The distinctive features of The Base, along with the location of three carved pou, are retained under the terms of the recent 50/50 partnership formed with retailing giant Kiwi Property Group.

Plans by Tainui Group Holdings, the tribe's commercial arm, to build a \$3 billion inland port and commercial hub on tribal land near the University

of Waikato represent a massive scaling-up from its retail and hotel interests. In so doing, it faces stiff competition from Ports of Auckland, which has entered into a power-play with designs to develop its own freight hub north of Hamilton. If successful, the Waikato-Tainui inland port development will not only diversify the tribe's property-heavy investment portfolio, but will also act as a substantial driver for regional development and greater connectedness in the growth triangle of Auckland, Waikato and the Bay of Plenty.

The relationship between Waikato-Tainui and Hamilton City Council (HCC) over both The Base and the inland port development has at times been stretched. In 2009, HCC developed a variation to its District Plan to restrict further development of The Base. In 2010, Waikato-Tainui disputed the plan change in the High Court, citing that HCC had breached a duty to consult with it as the relevant iwi authority. The presiding judge agreed with Waikato-Tainui. Similarly, in 2013, HCC declined an application for fast-tracking the inland port development. In 2014, at the request of Waikato-Tainui, the Ruakura plan change was heard by the Environmental Protection Authority Board of Inquiry and the plan change was approved. These examples point to some of the issues identified earlier around Māori representation and engagement in the regions. They also highlight the need for local authorities to recognise Waikato-Tainui as both mana whenua and significant resource managers and developers.

In attempting to meet its goals identified in *Whakatupuranga 2050*, Waikato-Tainui will need to create effective and inclusive ways to translate economic success at the collective level to improved well-being for those Waikato-Tainui individuals and whānau in greatest need. This underscores the challenge of balancing responsibilities of manaaki ki te tangata (collective relationships of reciprocity) and tribal capitalism so that existing inequalities are not sharpened in the push to grow collectively owned wealth.

Conclusion

If Aotearoa New Zealand is to capitalise on regional distinctiveness, then this needs to be done in partnership with iwi and hapū, and in ways that recognise and provide for the diversity of mana whenua relationships with place. However, a word of caution is needed. It is not enough to simply 'recognise' iwi and hapū relationships with place — these relationships need to be protected and opportunities for partnerships with mana whenua actively facilitated. Partnership and greater Māori autonomy, we argue, has the potential to create positive, collaborative and innovative strategies for regional revitalisation; much more so than if it is left to a single, territorial political and administrative organisation.

The key spatial transformations that have occurred for iwi mean that a 'one size fits all' approach will not work. In building robust and sustainable regions, one of the most critical and immediate tasks is to ensure that the unique and diverse experiences, knowledges, roles and responsibilities of Māori are respected and acknowledged. The role of local authorities is crucial here in enacting meaningful partnerships with mana whenua and recognising the key role iwi and hapū play in driving change within the regions.

To end we return to Putāruru — a place that, as mentioned already, reflects little of the farming-based and water-generated wealth of the local area. What the town lacks in material wealth, however, is made up for in its richness in community, history and culture, demonstrated through places like Te Wāotū and Te Waihou. This is not always apparent for those passing through on the main highway through town. The challenge lies in generating sustainable growth that attracts to the town those people who want to contribute to the richness of the community and not extract or exploit it for their own individual purposes. Mana whenua understand the importance of the collective to the well-being of the town and wider region. This means that the role and responsibility of iwi and hapū, in this area, are

multiple, and involve advocating and caring for iwi members; proactively seeking opportunities to facilitate the return of iwi members to their ahi kaa/tūrangawewae/ūkaipō; fostering relationships with the wider community; and establishing connections and relationships with new and diverse members of the community within an ethics of manaakitanga (hospitality) and whanaungatanga (relationship-building).

It is time to recognise in a meaningful way the distinctive, rich and innovative histories and solutions that mana whenua and mana Māori provide our communities, beyond the simplistic and convenient narratives such as 'home of the owl'. Mana whenua have a compelling reason to champion the revitalisation of the South Waikato, and indeed of New Zealand's regions: our collective identity is embedded in the land. While individuals move, tangata whenua are here to stay and have intergenerational responsibilities as mana whenua and as kaitiaki. The role of mana whenua in reshaping the regions has never been more important.

The authors acknowledge the support provided by the MBIE research grant, Capturing the Diversity Dividend in Aotearoa New Zealand (CaDDANZ), and the University of Waikato Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences Contestable Research Fund.

References

- Arnstein, Sherry R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35 (4): 216–224.
- Rickard, E. (1977). Whenua. In B. Gadd (ed.), *Pacific Voices: An anthology of writing by and about Pacific people*. Albany: Stockton House.