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Appendix A - Mataatua Declaration
MihiMihi

Tihei Mauri Ora!

E nga mana, e nga poutoko o nga kaupapa, te taahu o te whakaaro nui e tui nei i a tatau, tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa.

Waiho ma te whakaaro hai tiki te anuatanga te manaere to pouri mo te hunga kua haere ki te po.

Ki a ratau ma, te puna wai ora, haere, haere, haere oti ahu.

Ko tatau ko nga wai whakaheke, enei e manako nei i roto i nga kaupapa, tera pea kei te korero a te tipuna o Tawhaki he maramatanga hei whainga, hei tauira:

"Kia mau ki te aka matua".

No reira, tena koutou, tena koutou, tena koutou katoa.

Denis Simpson
Kaumatua
Hui Whakapiripiri would not have been possible without the assistance, support and aroha of many people. We are grateful to the kaumatua and the whanau o Hongoeka Marae for their aroha and manaakitanga. To the keynote speakers, facilitators and participants, nga mihi ki a koutou.

Hui Whakapiripiri was funded by the Māori Health Committee of the Health Research Council.

"Nau te rourou,
naku te rourou,
ka ora ai te iwi."
1. **INTRODUCTION**

Te Rōpu Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare, the Eru Pōmare Māori Health Research Centre based at the Wellington School of Medicine, have a commitment to workforce development and training for both emerging and established Māori health researchers.

The differing needs of these two groups was highlighted at Hui Rangahau Hauora which was held in May 1993 at the Wellington School of Medicine. Hui Whakapiripiri was therefore organised as a forum for established researchers to get together and talk about research, learn from one another and share knowledge. We also wanted to foster discussion and debate on the position of Māori health researchers. More importantly, to encourage active planning and strategic priority setting to the year 2000.

Hui Whakapiripiri was launched two years later and was held at Hongoeka Marae in Plimmerton. This was the inaugural hui for kairangahau hauora Māori.

The aim of the hui was to:

- develop strategic directions for Māori health researchers.

This aim incorporated strategic directions for:

- Māori health research and its interface with Māori health;
- Māori health research ethics; and,
- workforce development issues for Māori health researchers.

Keynote speakers were invited to share their whaakaro and to prompt the hui into maintaining a proactive forum when discussing issues related to Māori health research.

The hui was introduced by kaumatua, Denis Simpson. Denis talked about the need for Māori to research Māori, and for those Māori researchers to learn tikanga from their own area(s) and to support their own people. He also stressed the need for research to have a positive impact on the status of Māori health.

Moana Jackson spoke on Māori health research and its relation to Te Tiriti o Waitangi. He challenged Māori health researchers to develop a set of research protocols including research ethics. These mechanisms would help ensure the protection of Māori and Māori knowledge in the research process.

Regina Peretini reaffirmed the need for Māori ethical guidelines that acknowledged Māori realities. Linda Smith then outlined kaupapa Māori research, a philosophical approach to research for those who are working with Māori on topics of importance for Māori.

We were also privileged to have Tamati Cairns present a session on tikanga and Māori health research. He reminded the hui that as researchers, the need to know ourselves first, before we attempt to know others, is of utmost importance. That is, for Māori to enter into research with a Māori model in mind, we must first know ourselves as belonging to a particular whanau, hapu and iwi.

In their reflections on the hui, Professor Colin Mantell talked about the role and expectations of the Māori Health Committee of the Health Research Council. Professor Mason Durie then outlined a Māori centred approach to Māori health research, incorporating guiding principles, purpose, practices, practitioners and politics.
The keynote speakers promoted much discussion both in the sessions and in the workshops that followed. This discussion culminated in a desire to make a collective statement about Māori health research. The result was the Hongoeka Declaration which will provide a focus for further discussion and debate about Māori health research for the future.

Included in this booklet are the transcribed and edited versions of the talks given by Moana Jackson and Regina Peretini. Linda Smith's and Mason Durie's papers are also included. The Māori Health Researchers Declaration heads the group of papers so that the reader begins where the hui ended. The appendix contains a directory of the Māori health researchers who attended the hui. The Mataatua Declaration is also included here, as this provided motivation for the Hongoeka Declaration.
2. **HONGOeka Declaration for Māori Health Researchers**

*He Puorino ka tangi*
*He kupa whakaor ka puta ki te ao.*
*Kerero atu rā mo toka mana motuhake*
*Tenei te whakapiti ko iana te whakakake*
*Tīhei maori ora.*

*Like the flute that sounds*
*Words suspended taking a message to the world.*
*Speak to them of my mana motuhake*
*Tī on the rise, tīs onward morning*
*Tīhei maori ora.*

As Māori researchers in the area of Māori health we are committed to working for research which contributes towards hapu, iwi, tangata whenua development. This process means regaining Tino Rangatiratanga and overcoming the negative impacts of colonisation. We acknowledge the Treaty of Waitangi as the basis for partnership between Māori and the Crown and will work to incorporate the values underpinning the Treaty in our work.

As a result of this hui, we declare that:

- we endorse the Māataua Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples’ over their cultural and intellectual property;
- we believe Māori health research should be determined and coordinated by Māori, working with Māori for Māori;
- we support Māori determination for our standards of health and wellbeing;
- we will work towards Māori control over policies, priorities and funding decisions relevant to Māori research;
- as partners to the Treaty, Māori reserve the right to use any approach to health research which will benefit our people;
- we will promote and develop kaupapa Māori methodology and methods;
- we are committed to promoting te reo Māori and tikanga Māori as appropriate for Māori health research;
- we believe that research encompasses the past, the present and the future;
- we recognise that there are diverse Māori realities;
- we are accountable to whānau, hapu and iwi;
- we will monitor, critique, and discuss, including in hui and public forums, all research impacting on Māori health; and;
- we are committed to strengthening the community of Māori health researchers and urge all relevant supporting organisations to urgently develop this workforce.
3. **Keynote Speeches**

3.1. **Māori Health Research and Te Tiriti o Waitangi - Moana Jackson**

I believe you are involved in an area of work which is crucial to our people and one that is fraught with difficulties and dangers. Part of the responsibility of Māori researchers is to be aware of what those difficulties and dangers are so that we can create protocols and ideas to safeguard the areas of knowledge in which you will work, to protect those of our people with whom you will work, and to protect the transmission of the knowledge which you gained from those people. All those areas of your work seem to me to have particular dangers and particular difficulties and they are best confronted by understanding:

- who we are as Māori;
- what our rights are in relation to that information; and,
- what our rights are as we stand on this land.

In terms of our history, as understood by our people, it was simply a marker in a continuation of events which reaffirmed who we were. So, it was a reaffirmation of our rights, and those rights are defined in various ways, such as tino rangatiratanga, or as mana, or as sovereignty, or as self determination.

What I think is more helpful is if we see it as a symbol of who we were and the actual power that we exercised in that time. In 1840, as in the centuries preceding 1840, there was no debate. There was no discussion about whether that power was mana or whether it was sovereignty. It was part of the essence of who we were. When the chance came to sign and negotiate an agreement, our people just did it. There was considerable debate among Pakeha as to whether we had the sovereign capacity to do it because in Pakeha eyes we were primitive savages who were uncivilised and unchristened. In their world view, primitive, uncivilised, non-Christian savages did not have the capacity to enter into proper treaties. If our people entered into this arrangement with no doubts about who they were, no doubts about their status, no doubts about their power and authority, then obviously, the treaty would simply be a reaffirmation for the benefit of these tauiwi of what was that status, that power, and that authority.

To me it is beyond comprehension that a people so fiercely proud and independent for hundreds of years, knowing they had the power to have a treaty with whomever they wished, would suddenly, on February 6th, 1840, decide to have a treaty with another iwi and give away all that their tipuna had bequeathed them. Yet through the process that we call colonisation, that is what we have been lead to believe; that we voluntarily submitted to the authority of somebody else, and in that voluntary submission, we gave away our ability and our right to do a whole lot of things. From determining whether our reo could be spoken, to controlling the land which is part of our mother, to deciding the ethics which would govern research that we would do as a people in 1996.

As Māori researchers, we have to accept that the Treaty did not submit us to the research methodologies and ethics of somebody else. The Treaty reaffirmed our right to develop the processes of research which are appropriate for our people, and to do that, the only people we have to seek permission from are our own. The only people that we need to seek guidance from to whom we are accountable are the mokopuna of those who also claimed that reaffirmation in 1840. Because of this process of colonisation we too often and too readily forget that reaffirmation right. We too easily submit to the ideas and processes of those who came to colonise and it is easy for us to do that if we lose sight of the fact that the Treaty reaffirmed what we were and what we should be. If we were a fiercely independent people never willingly subordinating ourselves to...
anyone else, then surely that is also what the Treaty reaffirmed we should be. As researchers:

- what does that mean in 1996;
- how do we respond to the question or the phrase, ‘Get Real’; and,
- what does all of this mean in terms of the reality of where you work, in terms of funding, in terms of the predominant paradigms of research?

Colonisation is the process of enrichment for those who come to colonise and a process of expelling and dismissing those who are to be colonised. One of the things that we need to try and work through as Maori people is to shape the way we live and the way we think. So as researchers:

- how does it shape the way we think as Maori;
- what does colonisation do; and,
- why are we in 1996 even having to have a discussion about the methodology and ethics about Maori research?

It is because of what colonisation does and continues to do to the way we think.

What this process of enrichment for the coloniser meant was the take-over of this land, of its resources and of all of the institutions of power by the coloniser, and that depended on a certain set of beliefs in the minds of the colonisers. The first thing they had to believe and to convince themselves of and then convince our people of, was that they had a right to take over this land. And they developed the belief in that right from a number of dichotomies or opposites.

Over time those ideas became unchallenged given of the way that Pakeha institutions work. And what that history of creating these legal rights from a set of assumptions meant was that the people who came to colonise came here believing in their superior civilised rights and, over time, our people began to believe in their heathen primitive inferiority. We began to believe what we were told, that indeed the ways developed by this part of the model were the only valid worthwhile ways of doing things, and that if we sought to challenge that and say we actually have our own ways, then we would be told in the 1990s to ‘Get Real’. Because in the ‘real’ world, these are the ways which predominate. But it seems that ‘getting real’ is a thing in our mind because in the reaffirmation in the Treaty, we were reaffirming a reality which had been shaped by our history, our culture, and our way of seeing the world.

The challenge for us in the 1990s - part of what they call decolonisation - is to reclaim that reality; to believe again that there is a Māori reality sourced in the tikanga, philosophies and the ideas of who we are, which should determine the way in which we operate and behave today. Colonisation convinces us that there is never such a reality, or that if it existed it is inferior, and part of our challenge is to proclaim again its existence and acknowledge again its value and its worth.

What I would like to focus on now is the layer of where you work as a researcher, because unless we develop some ethics for Māori research, develop protocols about how we do the research, step back from the day-to-day reality of having to investigate lung cancer, unemployment, and give ourselves the space and resources to set our own rules and guidelines for the work that we do, then inevitably, the reality of the majority colonising paradigm will force us to take our tikanga, take our views and twist and shape it into a set of protocols which is not our own, and the end result is research that is damaging to our people. If we are a people worthy of being who we are, why can’t we just study ourselves in comparison to nobody but ourselves, and not as an isolate social unit existing divorced from the world around us, but as a people worthy of a study in ourselves. But if we decide that that is the case, don’t we then need, as a reaffirmation of our worth, to develop a set of ethics, a set of protocols that are sourced in the values of tikanga, of who we are, so the end results are part of that layer building which is essential for our people to be free of colonisation.
Part of what we need to do is reclaim our own way of researching. That does not mean to research with the technology and tools that our tipuna had 150 years ago. The key is how we use the tools; the basis upon which we make them work for us. In 1996, research needs to take the modern technologies available and apply them within a view of the world that is consistent with who we are.

I believe it is possible to create mechanisms of protection for our taonga which will acknowledge the individual who may have created it. It ensures that the protection more accurately reflects the world view of who that taonga belonged to. In relation to research information, it is possible to create mechanisms of confidentiality. However, rather than base that protection on the very narrow individualist access of some people, we can base the mechanisms on guardianship and protection which will ensure that accountability rests where it should be, not necessarily in the professional, but in the people who in the end, share the information. But to find a practical mechanism to give effect to these ideas of confidentiality, we have to stand back and ask:

- what is it as Maori that we think is worthy of protection;
- what are the things that identify information that needs protection; and,
- what is it about the knowledge that you have that is sacred?

To establish a 1996 Māori paradigm of confidentiality in a practical sense, we need to be able to answer those sorts of questions. Once we begin to see the knowledge and information through those eyes with an understanding of how our tipuna shaped it, then I believe it's quite easy to develop the practical mechanisms that provide the confidentiality that you as researchers, and the people that you work with, require. It is, as in the area of intellectual property, moving away from the notion of ownership which is a very Pakeha capitalist view.

3.1.1. Conclusion

In relation to the health institutes that you are a part of, I believe that they should be working to develop things such as ethics and protocols that come from our people, not seek to adapt the ethics and protocols that come from 'them'. We have a kaupapa to serve Māori as best we can. Research should be a liberating exercise and we can only do that if it is within a process that we control, and that is based on what we think research is all about and so on. I would like to think that sometime soon, as people with certain skills and expertise in research, you will be able to collectively, or through nominated individuals, stand back and say:

"...Yes, we do need a set of ethics, we do need to develop a set of research protocols, a set of processes by which we can undertake our work and we will take the time to do that, the time to peel away the layers that colonisation has said constitutes the only way to do research".

As Māori we often get really depressed about what's going on. We get depressed when we look around and see corruption among our leaders. We get depressed when we see what's happening with processes and so on. However, over the last few years I've noticed and experienced that in all sorts of isolated places around the country, our people are doing some really neat things. And if as health research workers you were to build upon this process, you would not be acting alone because its an area where many of our people are stumbling around trying to find a better way of doing things for our people.

It might seem a long way from the ancient right of discovery to being a Māori researcher in 1996, but I don't think you can be a Māori researcher in 1996 without realising the process of history from which you operate. Because Māori health status in 1996 is a direct result of that history, you can't separate it out from the dispossession of colonisation. If the things you are having to research are a product of that history, then the way that you research it must also be aware of that history, and the best way that you can show that awareness is to reclaim from that history the ways of doing the research which will be most appropriate for our people.

de Ropu Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare (Eru Pōmare Māori Health Research Centre)
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3.2. **Ethical Issues for Māori Health Research - Regina Peretini**

### 3.2.1. The Current System

The current ethical review system consists of two national committees. The National Advisory Committee on Health and Disability Services Ethics and the Health Research Council's (HRC) Ethics Committee. At the local level, there are two types of institutions that both national committees have relationships with. They are educational institutions like universities, and RHA/CHE committees.

All these structures are governed by a National Standard which lays out a process about:

- how committees are to function;
- what their membership is to be, and;
- where the Treaty of Waitangi falls within their work.

The National Standard also covers issues like multi-centre trials, how they are going to be conducted, as well as issues such as consent, confidentiality, and participants withdrawing from research.

The National Standard is basically to protect and ensure harm is not done to consumers of disability and health services. National ethics committees, as well as local and regional committees, are also there to try and ensure this.

### 3.2.2. Where We Could Go

In a report that Te Puni Kokiri put together entitled, "Health sector ethics: Mechanisms for Māori into ethical review" (Te Puni Kokiri, 1994) we looked at what kind of structures could work so that as Māori, we could reaffirm our own reality. One of the examples looked at having a Māori National Committee and a group of regional and local ethics committees which are iwi-based. We need to have a Māori National Committee where they can pick up some of the stuff that a Māori committee within the HRC cannot, such as:

- what genetic engineering means to us; and,
- what the whole emphasis on DNA testing means to us.

We need to have Māori, iwi-based, regional and local ethics committees to ensure non-Māori doing research pertaining to Māori issues work within the kaupapa of any hapu or that a person from that hapu is appointed liaison person between the two.

If we are going to look at where we could go, there are some areas of commonality that we need to look at, such as the areas that make us unique as Māori and different from non-Māori. One is that Māori come from a totally different philosophical base. For Māori, it is for the whanau, hapu and iwi. Our obligations are to them. That includes urban Māori who still have a whanau of some type.

We already start with a philosophical difference in convincing non-Māori that Māori are actually different to them. Māori have different processes and operate from a different base.
3.2.3. Ethics and Confidentiality

When it comes to ethics, we are different. Any matters relevant to that iwi should be discussed and dealt with by that iwi. The final decision must be agreed by all. The word 'ethics' is a concept within our culture, but at some point, we are going to need to be able to describe that concept. The amount of work that has been done in the last five years is quite extensive, but we need to pull it together.

When it comes to confidentiality, we hold some information close to us, especially when it belongs to whanau and hapu. When it came to the whole area of ownership and guardianship of that information, it is the right of the iwi to do whatever they wanted with that information and to negotiate with the researcher.

3.2.4. Research Protocols and Accountability

One of the issues that came before the HRC Ethics Committee was the use of the 'placenta'. A pharmaceutical company wanted consent from the individual to take it back to France for experimental reasons. Pakeha members thought it was up to the individual, while Maori as a community, would not give approval to that research.

Accountability however, is a lot harder to achieve when you have Pakeha doing research on Maori. It involves a lot of trust, a good working relationship, lawyers to make sure it is all legal, and someone to do the monitoring.

3.2.5. Monitoring of Research Projects

Most ethics committees do not have the ability or the funding to monitor research protocols. We need a monitoring system that allows at least well qualified and trained Maori researchers, well qualified in things Maori, to go and monitor research projects that are being undertaken.

Why are we involved in a system that finds it difficult to accept that we are different and that we do things differently? Funding is one reason. Funding for things like:

- the completion of your thesis work;
- for research that is going to benefit Maori and go beyond just benefitting us as a people;
- funding for skills; and,
- for iwi and hapu collection of information.

It is imperative that we start doing a collection of information for hapu and iwi; a collection that we can use as a resource and is retained by us.

3.2.6. Conclusion

What I hope to happen is that all research that is Maori comes through us. I just want to say that your job is really important and that it does impact on us and on our communities. You have a right to make sure that ethics committees across the country work properly for Maori and that they are accountable to whanau, hapu and iwi.
3.3. KAUPAPA MĀORI HEALTH RESEARCH - LINDA TUIHWAI SMITH

"What happens to research when the insect looks back and the researched become the researchers?" - (Mita, 1989)

3.3.1. Introduction

As mentioned in previous writings, research on Māori is marked by a history which has shaped the attitudes and feelings Māori have held towards research. Research is implicated in the production of western knowledge, in the nature of academic work, in the production of theories which have dehumanised Māori and in practices which have continued to privilege western ways of knowing, while denying the validity for Māori of Māori knowledge, language and culture. Also previously mentioned is the general legacy of pakeha research on Māori attitudes towards theory and academic knowledge, attitudes which have led some Māori at least towards the direction of being anti-ALL theory and anti-ALL research. One of the challenges for Māori researchers working in this context has been to retrieve some space, firstly to convince Māori people of the value of research for Māori, secondly to convince the various, fragmented but powerful pakeha research communities of the need for greater Māori involvement in research, and thirdly to develop approaches and ways of carrying out research which take into account, without being limited by, the legacies of previous research, and the parameters of both previous and current approaches to research. What is now referred to as Kaupapa Māori Research is an attempt to retrieve that space and to achieve those general aims. This paper discusses Māori approaches to research and in particular, the ways in which Kaupapa Māori has become a way of structuring assumptions, values, concepts, orientations and priorities in research (Olssen, 1991).

In February 1985, the general frustrations of Māori towards research were reframed in a discussion paper by Evelyn Stokes for the National Research Advisory Council. This paper was written for inclusion in the more general discussion relating to the formation of new national science objectives. Stoke's paper argues for the acceptance of Māori knowledge and values, for the desirability and social significance of more Māori research, and for the need to train Māori researchers. The importance of Stoke's paper was its audience and its timing. It was directed at the top policy level, where decisions were being made which would dictate the national priorities of research. Since then, those priorities, and the ways in which they have been institutionalised, have been radically restructured. The timing of the paper was therefore strategically well placed because it put Māori research interests on the national science policy agenda. Several writers had already raised many of the same issues and had voiced these concerns at conferences and seminars. However these occasions tended to be disciplinary based associations, which did little to engage either the political realities of social science research or the attention of the few Māori who may have been in a position to carry out research.††

Later on in the same year, I set out as a postgraduate student to interview a group of Māori women whose children were in Te Kohanga Reo. My daughter attended the same Te Kohanga Reo and the women were well known to me and had willingly agreed to be interviewed. I had found little help in the standard methodological guide books for the issues I would confront when I was a Māori carrying out research with other Māori. Very little in the discussions of cross cultural issues was useful because I was not working

†† Annual disciplinary conferences are often dominated with academic presentations and the 'political' nature of research is kept well away. In some cases it is regarded as a contaminant and people who raise or address political issues are seen as being polemics. On the second point there were and still are very few Māori with post-graduate qualifications which tend to be the prerequisite for most research positions. Even fewer of these attend conferences or belong to disciplinary societies.

Te Rōpū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pomare (Eru Pomare Māori Health Research Centre)
cross-culturally. I was, at three levels at least, an ‘insider’, as a Māori, as a woman and as a mother, and at another set of levels, an ‘outsider’, as a postgraduate student, as someone from a different tribe, as an older mother and as someone who actually had a partner.†

Much of the cross-cultural literature assumed that the researcher belonged to the dominant cultural group and was ‘doing’ research to, for, and sometimes with, a minority group. There were some studies which addressed the issues for women researchers who were going to study in remote villages in Africa or South America. And of course, there were the romantic National Geographic accounts of women who spent years studying primates in various isolated spots, which frankly did not appeal. This literature reinforced the idea that one needed special skills related to being culturally sensitive, and to effective ways of gaining entrance into the community being studied, and to gaining the confidence of ‘informants’.†† There was a limited availability of literature which related to critiques of methodological approaches and these were primarily by African America scholars rather than other indigenous people (Mitchell, 1982). There was nothing which helped me think about and frame what I wanted to do within my own cultural context, or how I might go about doing some research in one of my own communities. Even previous research by other Māori academics appeared problematic to me, firstly because they wrote as if they were outsiders in their own world, and secondly because they were all men, fluent in Māori language and regarded as being deeply knowledgeable about Māori culture.††† I wrote a paper as a preamble to my research project, setting out the issues I faced and attempting to articulate what it was that made those issues so problematic (Smith, 1985). My concerns were also being voiced by other Māori in other contexts, however our isolation from each other meant that we struggled through these issues alone, and it took several years to bring what is still a small but active community of Māori researchers together.

3.3.2. Mapping Kaupapa Māori

At the outset it needs stating that not all those who write about or talk about Kaupapa Māori are involved in research. Kaupapa Māori has been applied across a wide range of projects and enterprises. Furthermore, not all Māori researchers would regard either themselves, or their research, as fitting within a Kaupapa Māori framework. So, not all research by Māori and not all Māori researchers claim to conduct Kaupapa Māori research. There are elements within the definitions of Kaupapa Māori which serve the purpose of selecting what counts and what does not count. One can ask, for example, “can a Māori researcher who is anti-Māori carry out Kaupapa Māori research?” The answer based on current definitions is ‘definitely not’. Another question is less easy to answer, “can a pakeha researcher carry out Kaupapa Māori research?” The answer on current definitions is more complex, perhaps it might read, “a pakeha can be involved in Kaupapa Māori research but not on their own, and if they were involved in such research, they would have ways of positioning themselves as pakeha”, or the more radical interpretation might say, “by definition, no, Kaupapa Māori research is Māori research exclusively”. From these two questions and answers, then, it is possible to say something more about what Kaupapa Māori research is, and what it is not. The following section of this chapter will map out the developing field of Kaupapa Māori research.

Irwin characterises Kaupapa Māori as research which is ‘culturally safe’, which involves the ‘mentorship’ of kaumatua, which is culturally relevant and appropriate while satisfying the rigour of research, and which is undertaken by a Māori researcher, not a researcher who happens to be Māori (Irwin, 1994a). This statement implies that other forms of research, that is culturally sensitive modes, have not been satisfactory

† Most of the parents in our Te Kohanga Reo were single mothers, very young and living in the state housing units down the street from the Kohanga Reo. I had a job as did my spouse, we had a car so there was also an issue of socio-economic circumstances.
†† I had always seen myself as belonging to the ‘informant’ community and thus felt well trained to inform on myself, but insufficiently trained to get others to do it for me! And of course, I ‘read’ what I was being told in the interviews, as if I were still a member of the ‘informant’ community and was very conscious of the way the words being given me were carefully selected and framed.
††† None of which is how I saw myself.
at the level of cultural safety. Irwin also grounds her work in 'a paradigm that stems from a Māori world view and in te reo Māori me ona tikanga' (Irwin, 1994b). Bishop writes that Kaupapa Māori “addresses the prevailing ideologies of cultural superiority which pervade our social, economic and political institutions” (Bishop, 1994). Bishop's model is framed by the discourses related to the Treaty of Waitangi and by the development within education of Māori initiatives which are 'controlled' by Māori. By framing Kaupapa Māori within the Treaty of Waitangi. Bishop leaves space for the involvement of pakeha in support of Māori research. He argues that pakeha, generally speaking, have an obligation to support Māori research (as Treaty partners). And secondly, some pakeha, who have a genuine desire to support the cause of Māori, ought to be included, because they can be useful allies and colleagues in research. The issue of 'control' is linked, in Bishop's argument, with the goal of empowerment.

"In the context of research, empowerment means that Māori people should regain control of investigations into Māori people's lives". - (ibid:176).

Bishop also argues that Kaupapa Māori research is located within an alternative conception of the world from which solutions and cultural aspirations can be generated. This alternative conception draws from an alternative code. Both Irwin and Bishop argue for the importance of the concept of whanau as a supervisory and organisational structure for handling research. Bishop refers to this as a 'research whanau of interest'. Irwin refers to a 'whanau of supervisors'. For both Bishop and Irwin, the whanau provides the intersection where research meets Māori, or Māori meets research, on equalising terms.

From these comments it is clear that under the rubric of Kaupapa Māori research, there are different sets of ideas and issues being claimed as important. Some of these intersect at different points with research as an activity. Some of these features are framed as assumptions, some as practices and methods, and some are related to Māori conceptions of knowledge. Smith (1990) summarises these by saying that Kaupapa Māori research is:

- related to 'being Māori';
- connected to Māori philosophy and principles;
- takes for granted the validity and legitimacy of Māori;
- takes for granted the importance of Māori language and culture; and,
- is concerned with the 'struggle for autonomy over our own cultural wellbeing'.

Smith locates Kaupapa Māori research within the wider project of Kaupapa Māori, and draws from the broader concept of Kaupapa Māori a set of elements which, he argues, can be found in all the different projects associated with Kaupapa Māori. Some of these principles will be discussed more fully later in this paper. However, the general significance of these principles is that they have evolved from within many of the taken for granted practices of Māori as well as being tied to a clear and coherent kaupapa (project or plan). In terms of research, particularly of attempting to develop actual empirical methods, and in a sense, operationalise the principles outlined by Smith, there is another set of steps to take beyond the working principles, as identified by Smith.

3.3.3. Kaupapa Māori as Localised Critical Theory

Most discussion about Kaupapa Māori is also located in relation to critical theory, in particular to the notions of critique, resistance, struggle and emancipation. Previous sources, for example, situate Māori research within the anti-positivist debate raised by critical theory. Pihama suggests that;

"...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 within 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 the continued oppression of Māori people". - (Pihama, 1993).

Bishop goes further to suggest that critical approaches to research have in fact 'failed' to address the issues of communities such as Māori, and the development of alternative approaches by Māori reflects a form of resistance to critical theory (Bishop, 1994). Bishop makes this point in the context of the debate between Ellsworth and Giroux, about the failure of critical pedagogy in relation to its emancipatory goals.

Smith, however, argues that Kaupapa Māori is a 'local' theoretical positioning which is the modality through which the emancipatory goal of critical theory, in a specific historical, political and social context, is practiced. This 'localising' of the aims of critical theory is partly an enactment of what critical theory actually 'offered' to oppressed, marginalised and silenced groups. The project of critical theory held out the possibility, that through emancipation, groups such as Māori would take greater control over their own lives and humanity. This necessarily implied that groups would take hold of the project of emancipation and attempt to make it a reality in their own terms. Whilst western academics may quibble about the success or failure of the emancipatory project, and question the realism which lies behind it, there is a tendency to be overly 'precious' about their project as a universal recipe that has to be followed 'to the letter' if it is to be effective. Furthermore, this stance assumes that oppression has universal characteristics which were independent of history, context and agency. At the level of abstraction, this is what has to be argued in a sense, but it can never be so on the ground. There is also a naivety about what Stuart Hall has called the 'dirtiness' of political projects, or what Fanon and other anti-colonial writers would regard as the violence entailed in struggles for freedom. The end result can be predetermined. The means to the end involves human agency in ways which are complex and contradictory. The notion of strategic positioning as a deliberate practice is partially an attempt to contain the unevenness and unpredictability, under stress, of people engaged in emancipatory struggles. The broader kaupapa of Kaupapa Māori embraces that sense of strategic positioning, of being able to plan, predict and contain, across a number of sites, the engagement in struggle.

Another dimension of Kaupapa Māori research is to be found clustered around issues of identity. Bishop, Irwin, Pihama, and G.H.Smith have all argued that being Māori, identifying as Māori, and as a Māori researcher, is a critical element of Kaupapa Māori research. Whilst this position is anti-positivist, it is also saying that we look at the world through our grounding in Māori world-views, most Māori researchers would also argue that being Māori does not preclude us from being systematic, being ethical, being 'scientific', in the way we may approach a research problem (Smith, 1995).

This positioning of the researcher and the views they bring to research has been well argued in terms of feminist research. Feminist research maintains its focus on issues of gender (not just of women), but has moved away from the idea that only women can carry out feminist research to one which is less essentialist.

Kaupapa Māori research, as currently framed, would argue that being Māori is an essential criteria for carrying out Kaupapa Māori research. At the same time, however, some writers suggest that we exercise restraint in becoming too involved in identity politics because of the potential these politics have for


‡ This is not without contention in that some feminist groups would still argue that men, because they are men, can not possibly articulate a feminist position or carry out feminist research. What I want to signal however is that feminist scholarship has moved from its early foundations and as a parallel the same possibility exists for Kaupapa Māori research.
paralysing development. For example, Irwin writes:

"There is still a destructive debate taking place in some quarters over who are 'real' and, heaven forbid, 'acceptable' to Māori women. Precious time is wasted debating amongst ourselves who is and who isn't an 'acceptable' Māori". (Irwin, 1992).

This position is based on the specificities of our history and our politics. However, this does not preclude those who are not Māori from participating in research which has a Kaupapa Māori orientation.

The latter point connects with the concept of whanau, as raised earlier, as a way of organising research. The whanau principle is one identified by Smith as an important aspect of Kaupapa Māori approaches. Both Te Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori have attempted to organise the basic decision making and parent participation within each of these initiatives around the concept of whanau. It is argued that the whanau, in precolonial times, was the core social unit, rather than the individual. It is also argued that the whanau remains as a persistent way of living and organising the social world. In terms of research, the whanau is one of several Māori concepts, or tikanga, which have become part of a methodology, a way of organising a research group, a way of incorporating ethical procedures which report back to the community, a way of 'giving voice' to the different sections of Māori communities, and a way of debating ideas and issues which impact on the research project. It also has a very pragmatic function, in that the whanau is a way of distributing tasks, of incorporating people with particular expertise, and of keeping Māori values central to the project. In Bishop’s model it would be at this level, for example, that pakeha can be involved. The whanau then can be a very specific modality through which research is shaped and carried out, analysed and disseminated.

Whanau is one of several aspects of Māori philosophy, values and practices which are brought to the centre in Kaupapa Māori research. Nepe argues that Kaupapa Māori is derived from very different epistemological and metaphysical foundations and it is these which give Kaupapa Māori its distinctiveness from Kaupapa pakeha or Kaupapa Science or any other kaupapa (Nepe, 1991). In other words, there is more to Kaupapa Māori than our history under colonialism or our desires to restore rangatiratanga. We have a different epistemological tradition which frames the way we see the world, the way we organise ourselves in it, the question we ask and the solution which we seek. It is larger than the individuals in it and the specific 'moment' in which we are currently living. The significance of Kaupapa Māori to Māori language is tied to the connection between language, knowledge and culture.

According to Sir James Henare, one of the architects of Te Kohanga Reo:

"Ko te reo te kakahui o te whakaaro te huarahi i te ao turoa o te hinengaro"

"The language is like a cloak which clothes, envelopes and adorns the myriad of one's thoughts". - (Nepe, 1991).

The revitalisation of Māori language has brought with it the revitalisation of Māori forms of knowledge and the debates which accompany those knowledge forms (Salmond, 1985). Kaupapa Māori, however, does not mean the same as matauranga Māori or Māori knowledge and epistemology. The concept of 'kaupapa' implies a way of framing and structuring how we think about those ideas and practices. Nepe argues that Kaupapa Māori is a 'conceptualisation of Māori knowledge' (Nepe, 1991). It is a way of abstracting that knowledge, reflecting on it, engaging with it, taking it for granted sometimes, make assumptions based upon it, and at times critically engaging in the way it has been and is being constructed.

† Nor does it preclude those who identify as Māori but can not speak Māori language, those who are Māori but do not know their whakapapa, nor those who are Māori but have lived away from their ūri or whanau territories.

‡‡ For example those involved in Kaupapa Māori projects question attempts to mystify Māori knowledge or use either their identity and knowledge of whakapapa or Māori language as a way of excluding other Māori from participation in decision making or other forms of involvement.
There is the possibility within Kaupapa Māori research to address the different constructions of Māori knowledge. A good example of this is in the development of Māori women's theories about Māori society which question the accounts of Māori society provided by men, including Māori men, but which still hold to a position that argues that the issues of gender for Māori do not make us the same as white women (Awekotuku, 1992). The critical theory of Kaupapa Māori also applies, therefore, to Māori ways of thinking, but does not deny either the existence or fundamental legitimacy to a position that argues that the issues of gender for knowledge. A good example of this is in the development of frameworks of knowledge.

There is another feature of Kaupapa Māori research which is becoming increasingly important as research funding is restructured around government priorities and policies. The state is the largest funding institution for research in New Zealand. The restructuring which occurred after 1994 separated the policy making functions of government from the allocation of resources for research. The largest amount of money is institutionalised through the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology. Other ministries and government departments still fund research but this research is in the form of 'purchases' of specific reports which fulfill the 'outputs' of the ministry concerned, and which, in many cases, are written over (rewritten) and subjected to crown copyright. In this sense the research is not research it is a purchased product which becomes owned by the state. It becomes debatable then as to whether the purchased product is worth taking seriously outside government. The restructuring of research connects with the wider restructuring of the state in line with new right economic policies. These have emphasised the importance of government objectives, of competition and contestability, of the separation of policy from funding, of outputs which are purchased, and of outcomes (Clark, 1995). This shift towards the new right has very profound implications for Māori cultural values and practices. It also has major implications for Māori in terms of its re-inscription of positivist approaches to scientific research.

3.3.4. Kaupapa Māori Research: In Which Fields?

In terms of Kaupapa Māori, the more important question is related to issues of social justice. The debate about this aspect occurs at several levels. Reconciling market driven, competitive and entrepreneurial research, which positions New Zealand internationally, with the need for Māori to carry out research which recovers histories, reclaims lands and resources and restores justice, hardly seems possible. This is precisely why the debates around rangatiratanga and the Treaty of Waitangi have been insignificant. The attempt by Māori to engage in the activities of the state through the mechanism of the Treaty of Waitangi has won some space in which Māori can argue for different sorts of research priorities. This space, however, is severely limited as it has not only had to be wrestled from the state, but from the community of positivistic scientists whose regard for Māori is not sympathetic. Furthermore the competitive environment created by the restructuring makes Kaupapa Māori research a competitor for resources with positivistic research. The problem is not just that positivist science is well established institutionally and theoretically, but that it has a connectedness at a common sense level with the rest of society who, generally speaking, take for granted the hegemony of its methods and leadership in the search for knowledge. As far as many people are concerned, research is positivist, otherwise it can not be anything else. Kaupapa Māori is a fledgling approach which is occurring within the limited community of Māori researchers, which in turn exists within a minority culture which continues to be represented within antagonistic colonial discourses. It is a counter-hegemonic approach to western forms of research and as such, currently exists on the margins of western research.


* For examples see the guidelines and policies for the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology and their application forms.
Kaupapa Māori research is imbued with a strong anti-positivistic stance. However, its wider kaupapa is to include within it all those researchers who are attempting to work with Māori and on topics of importance to Māori. The outer edges of Kaupapa Māori are not necessarily sharply delineated although, as argued in the introduction to the thesis, there is, at the political level, something ‘at stake’. One of the strands of a burgeoning Māori research community is the development of Māori health research. This development provides one interface between the more positivistic medical science approaches, to research, particularly epidemiology, and social science approaches such as sociology and policy analysis. The ‘failure’ of medical research to address the needs of Māori in health parallels the failure of educational research. Recognition of this has shifted some areas of health research towards firstly, developing more culturally sensitive research, and secondly, employing Kaupapa Māori approaches. These include the involvement of Māori researchers in large studies, and the establishment of Māori health research units which focus on issues of Māori health, are managed and organised by Māori, and which employ multi-disciplinary approaches within a Kaupapa Māori framework. Hence, large scale epidemiological survey work and ethnographic, qualitative studies sit alongside each other in the same centre. The connections between the two highlights yet another feature of Kaupapa Māori research. Getting the kaupapa ‘right’ is the first and major issue, the second issue is employing the most appropriate methods and people. So, sometimes a positivistic piece of research can be carried out by Māori researchers, but the questions it sought to answer, the problems it sought to probe and the data it sought to gather, have generally been priorities and debated by Māori working in a Kaupapa Māori framework. There are three different points to be drawn here. Firstly, there are politics attached to research which most researchers understand; quite simply positivistic research attracts funding. Secondly, there are accountabilities and pre-research discussions which have already framed, and to an extent, transformed the approach to research. Thirdly, most of the Māori health research units have developed strong ties with specific Māori communities. These are reflected in the way the centre is constituted and the geographical areas in which they work.

There may be a question as to whether Kaupapa Māori research is its own paradigm. Irwin suggests that it is. Others involved in Kaupapa Māori would quite deliberately be reluctant to engage in such a debate because it sets up comparisons with western science, which is exactly what Kaupapa Māori is resisting.

Kaupapa Māori research is both less than and more than a paradigm (Kuhn, 1970). It does set out a field of study which enables a process of selection to occur, which defines what needs to be studied and what questions ought to be asked. It also has a set of assumptions and taken for granted values and knowledge, upon which it builds. In this sense it can be fitted into some of the ways a paradigm is defined. However, it is also more than the sum of those parts. Kaupapa Māori research is a social project, it weaves in and out of Māori cultural beliefs and values, western ways of knowing, Māori histories and experiences under colonialism, western forms of education, Māori aspirations and socio-economic needs, and western economics and global politics. Kaupapa Māori is concerned with sites and terrains. Each of these are sites of struggle. Each of these sites have also been claimed by others as ‘their’ turf. They are selected or select themselves precisely because they are sites of struggle and because they have some strategic importance for Māori. We are not at present interested in nuclear physics but we are becoming interested in genetic science. There are sound reasons we are interested in education, employment, health and history. Each of these domains situates us in crisis. They are more real and more pressing.

† Two such units, Te Pumanawa Hauora ki Manawatu based at Massey University and the Eru Pomare Māori Health Research Centre based at the Wellington School of Medicine, are funded by the Health Research Council, another unit exists at the University of Auckland Medical School and other units operate inside existing centres, for example, the Alcohol and Public Health Research Unit at the University of Auckland.

†† These include rural and urban communities and several hei groups.

††† See quote on page four of this chapter.

†††† See for a further discussion, Smith, G.H., 1995. 'Falling Through the Cracks of the Constructivism Debate: The Neglect of the 'Māori Crisis' within Science Education', in Access. It is soon to be published in ACCESS, Education Department, University of Auckland.

††††† It is not that nuclear physics is not thought to have an impact on our lives but it is not yet as real as the advances currently being made in genetic engineering and the possibility which now exits under GATT for ‘our’ genetic material to be copied and patented.
3.3.5. **The Working Principles of Kaupapa Māori Research**

Having mapped out some of the key points relating to Kaupapa Māori research, this section of the chapter will shift its focus to issues which are more methodological (Harding, 1987). The discussion draws together a range of experiences in research and work by other Māori in this area. It begins by defining some working principles based around the importance of Māori ways of knowing, Māori values, Māori processes and practices. Secondly, it addresses the sorts of critical questions which also frame Kaupapa Māori research, and thirdly, discusses issues arising from practices held to be important specifically for Māori researchers.

Graham Smith, in a series of papers on Kura Kaupapa Māori as an educational intervention, has argued that within the intervention are key elements which make it successful for Māori. These elements encapsulate Māori values and knowledge but also provide bridges through which other educational strategies can be put into practice (Smith, 1988). Briefly, Smith outlines six principles. These are as follows:

- (tina) rangatiratanga - (relative autonomy principle);
- taonga tuku iho - (cultural aspirations principle);
- ako Māori - (culturally preferred pedagogy);
- kia piki kē i nga raruraru o te kainga - (mediation of socioeconomic and home difficulties principle);
- whanau - (extended family structure principle); and,
- kaupapa - (collective vision, philosophical principle).

This list is not claimed to be definitive, but it does capture the salient features of Kura Kaupapa Māori and these same principles can be said to operate in any Kaupapa Māori context. However, some of these principles get reframed in the context of research, or rather, the details are different but the basic principle remains the same. The following working principles for research have been taken, not just from Smith’s framework, but from the context of research projects in which I have been involved in a number of roles, and from discussions with Māori researchers at hui and conferences. Unlike Smith’s principles, the following ‘working’ principles are centred around issues which are being discussed at hui and other gatherings of the Māori research community. They incorporate the views, to some extent, of those who work in health, education, Māori Studies, policy analysis, history and iwi based research. In each case there is a set of recent politics around these ideas and, rather than ignore them and insert other concepts, I have taken each one and mapped it out in terms of its implications for Kaupapa Māori research.

3.3.6. **The Principle of Whakapapa**

A number of Māori have identified whakapapa as the most fundamental aspect of the way we think about and come to know the world (Rangihau, 1981). Whakapapa is a way of thinking, a way of learning, a way of storing knowledge and a way of debating knowledge (Smith, 1987). It is inscribed in virtually every aspect of our world view. In terms of Kaupapa Māori Research, whakapapa is embedded in our own knowledge and is integral to what becomes taken for ‘granted’. Whakapapa intersects with research in a number of different ways. Furthermore, the shape it takes varies according to the context, the time, the people and the actual project.

It is through whakapapa that Māori people trace ourselves, our access to land, to a marae and to a turangawaewae. Whakapapa also positions us in historical relationships with other iwi, with our landscape, and within the universe.

---

$t$ Rather, say than in the context of Kura Kaupapa Māori or other types of hui. The ‘community’ of Māori researchers is a specialist community which includes health, policy, postgraduate students and educational researchers.

Te Rōpū Rangahau Hauora e Eru Pomare (Eru Pomare Māori Health Research Centre)
The ancient whakatauki (a proverb or saying) following, tells us that we are the seeds or direct descendants of the 'heavens', and can trace our whakapapa back through time to the very beginning of time and of the creation of the universe:

"E kore koe e ngaro, he kakano i ruia mai i Rangiatea".
"You will never be lost, you were a seed planted at Rangiatea".

Whakapapa also relate us to all other things which exist in the world. We are linked through our whakapapa to insects, fishes, trees, stones and other life forms. The concept of whakapapa embraces much of how we see ourselves in relation to everything else. It is the principle of a different code and as such is realised and elaborated through a wide range of practices.

John Rangihau, for example, wrote about the difficulty that the term ‘Māori’ presents for him as a person with specific whakapapa which locate him in whanau, hapu and iwi (Rangihau, 1981). The 'pan-Māori' approach to all things Māori was an identity imposed externally upon all Māori people. Other definitions of identity, such as race classifications, have been equally problematic. These definitions resulted in the working out of mathematic equations which determined 'how much Māori blood' you had, and did not take into account any notion of culture. The assumption was that the less you had, the more modern Māori were becoming.

The classification of identity means something different, however, for researchers who need some conceptual and empirical control over the classification systems which underpin their work. Statistical attempts to define just who is Māori are also fraught with problems. The last census attempt to record iwi statistics has ended up with a large pool of Māori who have not identified an iwi. People were asked to nominate a primary iwi, to choose an iwi. Māori can claim bilineal descent, and having to nominate just one counters the principle of whakapapa. However, these external measurements of identity and attempts to regulate identity are significant at an ideological level because they become normative, they set the norm for what it means to be Māori.

The importance to Kaupapa Māori research of the principle of whakapapa is based on a number of interrelated issues. Firstly, it needs to be regarded as an important way of thinking about Māori people generally. It is not the only way, gender, age and being able to speak Māori are just as important, but it is a culturally important way. It is about having a deep and thorough understanding of Māori society. Secondly, it is important if Māori people are the subjects of research, even in urban settings when one may not expect to be working with kinship based groups. Many of the contemporary institutions to which Māori people in urban areas belong, such as sports clubs, house schools, networks and Kohanga Reo, still operate in some situations on the basis of whakapapa. This applies, for example, if they visit or receive visits from other Māori, it sometimes determines social support networks, access to a church Minister or a marae. It may even shape friendships. The point is that you can not assume that whakapapa is not 'working' when Māori people are involved.

A third issue is related to the role of Māori researchers. The recent trend to have more Māori researchers involved in projects often assumes that simply employing any Māori will be enough to satisfy the need to be culturally sensitive. However a Māori researcher also has a whakapapa, also belongs somewhere, also has an identity which goes deeper than simply being Māori. Māori researchers need to think critically about what that means for the way they may think about themselves as researchers, and about the Māori issues or Māori people they are researching. Being a Māori researcher does not mean an absence of bias, it simply means that the potential for different kinds of biases needs to be considered reflexively. It cannot be assumed either that a Māori will be more sympathetic to Māori issues or other Māori. Sometimes, in

positioning themselves or being positioned as ‘experts’, they construct and apply a normative view of Māori culture based on their own experiences. Some Māori are perceived by other Māori as being more hostile to Māori than a pakeha researcher might be. Some Māori are viewed as applying their own iwi belief systems over other iwi. One of the ways these issues are dealt with culturally is through the practice of ‘kanohi ki te kanohi’ (face-to-face) in which the researchers ‘front up’ to the people and in the usual welcoming rituals of Māori, position themselves publicly on the marae in terms of their whakapapa.

3.3.7. The Principles of Te Reo

Māori language has been a site of struggle since the beginnings of state education. Practices to ‘get rid’ of Māori language in the home have been well documented. The struggle to revitalise the language was central to the politics of Māori in the 1960s and 1970s. A petition to have Māori language taught in primary schools was organised in the 1970s by Nga Tamatoa. The development of Te Kohanga Reo in 1982 has been the most innovative approach to saving the language. Māori language was the subject of a claim to the Waitangi Tribunal in 1985. Kura Kaupapa Māori the primary schooling alternative based on Māori philosophies and taught through Māori language first started in 1986. The Māori Language Act was passed in 1987. This Act declared Māori an official language, established a Māori Language Commission and gave limited rights to speak Māori in judicial proceedings. Protection of Māori language has also formed part of subsequent claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and cases taken to the High Court. The most recent case was taken to the Privy Council in 1995. 1995 has also been named by the Government as Te Tau o Te Reo Māori (Year of the Māori Language) as part of the United Nations’ Decade of Indigenous Peoples.

As already mentioned, Te Reo Māori is significant as a principle in Kaupapa Māori research. The survival of Te Reo Māori is viewed as being absolutely crucial to the survival of Māori people. It is an issue which brings together a wide spectrum of Māori people in support. There are several ways in which Māori language is regarded by Māori. The following whakatauki gives an indication of its value:

"Ko te reo te mauri o te mana Māori
Toku reo, toku ohooho,
Toku reo, toku maapihi maurea,
Toku reo, toku whakakai maorihi”.

"The language is the life principle of Māori
My language, my inspiration,
My language, my special ‘ornament’,
My language, my precious ‘treasures’”.

In terms of research, Māori language is important in a number of different ways. Māori world views are embedded in the language. There are some social practices which are only ever conducted in Māori. There are rich forms of expression which made sense in Māori because they connect with histories, and values and other images. Many of the early researchers, such as Elsdon Best, did much of their interviewing in Māori, and gained access to whole bodies of knowledge which have still not been translated. The language, in this sense, is a window to ways of knowing the world.

However the language is also a way of interacting in the world. In this sense Māori researchers need to have a range of skills with Māori language. There are age, gender and iwi prescriptions on the ways in which they may use the language formally, but in most situations there are basic requirements which are expected when the researcher is Māori and is in conversation with a Māori speaking research subject. Not all Māori speakers choose to speak only Māori language, but sometimes, even when they use English, they are making connections and using expressions which in Māori make a lot more sense.

There is an issue of dissemination of research results and the extent to which they are available for Māori speakers and readers. This has not as yet been a priority. However, there are three areas in which research could be carried out and made available in Māori language and these are:

- the claims and findings of the Waitangi Tribunal;
- the recovered histories specific to whanau, hapu and iwi; and,
- the dissemination of information related to health, education and other social policy areas.

This latter aspect is about sharing knowledge and the results of research so that people can become better informed and make better decisions. It has another consequence further down the track of promoting different forms of literature in Māori.

3.3.8. The Principle of Tikanga Māori

Tikanga is regarded as customary practices, obligations and behaviours, or the principles which govern social practices. It is about being able to operate inside the cultural system and make decisions and judgements about how to interpret what occurs. The concept of tikanga can be used as a rigid set of rules by which actions are judged as 'tika', or correct although there are other values which mediate against that rigidity. One example is the concept of 'mana' which was sometimes gained by those who dared to take risks and exploit or change tikanga. Tikanga applies to a wide range of social practices, for example, in relation to land, to carving and the construction of carved meeting houses, to health practices, to use of marae, to the carrying out of tangi and unveilings, to whaikorero and waiata, to the hosting of manuhiri.

The concept of tikanga may also be used to convey the sense that something feels and looks 'right', for example, the incline of the roof of a wharenui is of the 'right' angle, the aesthetics of a carved house has the right balance, the way a manuhiri enters on to the marae, the way people present themselves on formal occasions. The sense of correctness, of having things set right, is important, because the alternative of getting it wrong is considered to have consequences. This has direct implications for research. How researchers enter the research community, how they negotiate their project aims and methods, how they conduct themselves as a research project and as individuals, and how they engage with the people, requires a wide range of cultural skills and sensitivities. Māori researchers tend to take many of these skills for granted, but in doing so, tend to under-rate the importance of such skills. Others may be so much in awe of 'getting it right', that they end up getting it wrong. And, 'getting it wrong' in a traditional sense is viewed as having real, or sometimes dire consequences, for example, someone may fall ill. Obviously 'rational' science would not consider this as a rational belief, but it is not important what the researchers think, it is important for what the researched think and their perception of the researchers. This is one of the primary reasons that even Māori researchers need a mentor or kaumatua when they are entering the more formal domains of Māori communities. One of the roles of the kaumatua is to look after or attend to the formal, ritual and spiritual dimensions of tikanga.

Intersecting this principle, and indeed all others, is the concept of tapu. Some forms of knowledge are regarded as tapu and therefore access to these forms of knowledge is restricted, and even when access is given, it needs to be treated with respect and care. Tapu knowledge generally relates to knowledge which is specific to hapu and iwi and is of a more esoteric nature.

† Manuhiri are guests or visitors, tangi are our mourning rituals which include the funeral, waiata are chants and songs often used to give 'relish' to a speech.

†† This is sometimes referred to as Te Kauwae Runga, or the 'upper jaw' form of knowledge, while more accessible forms of knowledge are referred to as Te Kauwae Rare, or the 'lower jaw'. This can be found in the account by Te Matorohanga who was Percy Smith's key informant. Se Smith, P., 1913. The Lore of the Whare Wananga. New Plymouth, Polynesian Society. Thomas Avery.
It impacts particularly on those researchers who work in the tribal history area. Some of these histories are actually written down and often it is the book they are written in which becomes less knowledgeable about their own specific histories, others have become more knowledgeable. This can lead to mystification of knowledge which is not about tapu but about power of an individual to claim resources and land and assert 'traditional' claims which can not be challenged. In general however, tapu is an important cultural way of regarding knowledge and in this sense needs to be incorporated as a principle of respect for the people who choose to share their knowledge with you. In the words of a whakatauki:

"Ahakoa he iti, he iti pounamu".
"Although small it is (like) a precious greenstone".

3.3.9. The Principle of Rangatiratanga

The concept of rangatiratanga has been used throughout this thesis. In Smith’s framework, rangatiratanga is connected to the ‘goal of control over one’s own life and cultural wellbeing’. This involves control over decision making processes. The usage of rangatiratanga is framed within the discourses related to the Treaty of Waitangi.

In the Māori version of Te Tiriti o Waitangi, Article Two says in part:

"...ki nga tangata katoa o Nu Tirani te tino rangatiratanga o o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me a ratou taonga katoa".
"(...)the Queen agrees to give) to chiefs and hapu and all the people of New Zealand the full chieftainship of their lands, their villages and all their possessions". - (Project Waitangi).

Although there is considerable linguistic and legal debate about the concept of rangatiratanga is in relation to the text of the Treaty and the obligations of the Crown, its wider use by Māori encapsulates a wide range of beliefs and aspirations (Kawharu, 1989). These discourses alongside the increasingly 'expert' definitions of the Waitangi Tribunal and the Crown itself, have a major influence on the way research is 'governed'. At one level it is about control over the agenda for research, but also control over the resources and how they are distributed.

There are several sets of principles in use in relation to the way the Treaty of Waitangi is being interpreted by the Crown. These principles should not be confused with the general principle of rangatiratanga being proposed here. In this context, rangatiratanga owes as much to the discourses around the Treaty of Waitangi as it does to the shifts in social science research towards more sympathetic and emancipatory research aims and practices. Community control, ethical practices and research reflexivity have marked some aspects of this kind of research.

At a more pragmatic level the principles of rangatiratanga would govern the ways in which the following critical questions are answered:

- what research do we want to carry out?;
- who is that research for?;
- what difference will it make?;
- who will carry out this research?;
- how do we want the research to be done?;
- how will we know it is a worthwhile piece of research?;
- who will own the research?; and,
- who will benefit?
The principle of rangatiratanga would consistently affirm the importance of addressing these questions to Māori people and not, as has previously happened, to pakeha experts, with Māori being consulted on the side. Where discussions by Māori on these issues have occurred it has not meant that pakeha researchers have been excluded or restricted. Many pakeha researchers have found the process far more collaborative and exciting than if they had attempted to carry out their research without attempting to work through Māori groups.

3.3.10. The Principle of Whanau

A whanau is an extended family. Smith suggests that the principle of whanau is important because it provides a support structure which has inbuilt responsibilities and obligations. The significance of whanau, especially as a way of organising and supervising research, has been raised earlier in this chapter. However, there are other dimensions to whanau which also need mentioning here.

One of these dimensions relates to mana wahine and mana tane, issues of gender and these issues are important on a number of grounds. At one level Māori women have been absent from the way research about Māori has been conducted, for example, tribal histories. In other ways Māori women have been present, but as a subtext to the major story. Thirdly, Māori women have been the target of research and of subsequent interventions. This has been particularly the case in the health and education areas. At the same time however, it needs to be recognised that research into Māori boys’ education and personal development has not been sympathetic either. In terms of recovering histories, there is a need to look again at the ways in which gender issues are discussed, privileged and/or silenced in the way we, as Māori researchers, think about research. Gender issues have become important for Māori women because of the exclusionary practices within Māori society, based primarily on gender, which seem to disadvantage women more than men. Many women would argue that these practices are recent ones, and are becoming more entrenched as new, younger and less secure groups of men take over positions of leadership with their iwi. These issues are frequently buried under iwi politics (Mead, 1994). In the following section of the thesis this issue is discussed in more detail.

In gender issues in the context of whanau are important, so are age issues. In attempts to operate within Māori contexts, the role of kaumatua has taken on a new significance. Irwin for example, sees their role as a mentoring and supportive role. Others have 'adopted' kaumatua as part of their research team, an official member who brings special expertise. Part of this exercise has been about gaining entry into a community. Kaumatua are also held to be those people who are knowledgeable about Māori things. This is based not simply on the fact that they are old and therefore wise, but that they have systematically gathered wisdom as they have aged. Not all older Māori are kaumatua in this sense of the term. Some kaumatua, for example, have kept written records and histories, they are experts in whaikorero and waiata, they can operate beyond their own immediate marae; they have earned respect, they have mana and can defend it if necessary through their skills in whaikorero, their knowledge of whakapapa and their matauranga. Their status as kaumatua is linked directly to their knowledge and ability to use that knowledge for the collective good. Māori views about knowledge have been discussed in the wider literature, however, there are some aspects of knowledge which are important to Māori research. There exists the notion of levels or phases of knowledge which are helpful concepts for thinking about Kaupapa Māori research. The notions of mohiotanga, wananga, maramatanga and mataurangatt, for example, indicate levels and processes by which we gain insight and deep clarification of what we are seeking. Matauranga is said to be attained when it is held or comes to rest within us.

A good example of this is the Maui story which, in oral accounts, is a story in which Maui engaged in different ways with his grandmothers, for example, to acquire fire and wisdom and to attempt to gain immortality. However even in some recent written children's stories the grandmothers have been all transformed into men. It has become a story about men. For a discussion see, Jenkins, K., 1992. "Reflections on the Status of Māori Women", in Te Pua 1, Puawaitanga, University of Auckland, pp.37-45.

Salmond, 1985, discusses these concepts in more detail. They are all terms for different sorts of knowing.
Eruera Stirling defines matauranga as:

"...a blessing on your mind, it makes everything clear and guides you to do things the right way". - (Salmond, 1980).

One of the roles of kaumatua, then, is to make the pathways to knowledge clearer. This is achieved through their use of karakia, their involvement in the welcoming rituals and mihimihi, as well as their intellectual involvement in analysing data.

Within the dynamic of whanau there exist other sorts of social relations. Some of these will be discussed in the next section of the thesis. However, in terms of research, the whanau principle is generally regarded as an organisational principle, a way of structuring supervision, of working collaboratively, of ensuring that a wide range of Maori concepts are discussed rigorously, and a way of connecting with specific communities and maintaining relationships with communities over many years. The whanau can sometimes replace advisory committees, project teams and supervisory roles. It includes all those roles which are technical and roles which are about mentoring and support.

3.3.11. Maori Cultural Ethics

Ethical issues have become increasingly significant as research communities across all disciplines have been held up for public scrutiny and found wanting. The idea of the self-monitoring community of professional scientists, who adhere to codes of good conduct and exert standards on their members fell apart with the National Women’s Hospital Cervical Cancer Inquiry. This Inquiry shocked women and ‘ordinary people’ as an exercise in academic, scientific arrogance. However, for Maori, the Inquiry simply reinforced the sense that we have been objectified by research since our first encounters with the west. The ethical issues for Maori, then, have come out of a long history of being researched by outsiders and then having that research flung back at us.

Research ethics for Maori communities extend far beyond issues of individual consent and confidentiality. In a discussion of what may constitute sound ethical principles for research in Maori communities, Te Awekotuku has identified a set of responsibilities which researchers have to Maori people (Te Awekotuku, 1991). Her framework is based on the code of conduct for the New Zealand Association of Social Anthropologists, which in turn is based on the American Anthropological Association’s guidelines. Te Awekotuku sets out fairly basic guidelines aimed at the respect for and protection of the ‘rights, interests and sensitivities’ of the people being studied. There are, however, some culturally specific ideas which are part of Kaupapa Maori practices. These are not prescribed in codes of conduct for researchers, but tend to be prescribed for Maori researchers in cultural terms, as follows:

- aroha ki te tangata - (a respect for people);
- kanohi kitea - (the seen face, that is present yourself to people face-to-face);
- titiro, whakarongo... korero - (look, listen... speak);
- manaaki ki te tangata - (share and host people, be generous);
- kia tupato - (be cautious);
- kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata - (do not trample over the mana of people); and,
- kaua e mahaki - (don’t flaunt your knowledge).*\(t\) \(t\)

\(t\) I have selected these sayings, having heard them used on several occasions as evaluative comments on people. The saying ‘titiro, whakarongo, korero’ comes from Te Atarangi, the Maori language programme for adults. It seems to be a basic code of conduct in a number of situations for researchers. Actually these sorts of sayings are often made by the kuia, or older women, on a marae as they watch, very keenly, what people are doing.
These ‘sayings’ reflect just some of the values that are placed on the way we behave. They are very different from the ‘public’ image of Māori society as a forum for ritual, oratory and chiefly leaders, but they are the kinds of comments which are used to determine if someone has ‘good’ qualities as a person. There are several other whakatauki which contain the ideals and aspirations which are worth seeking, as well as the moral messages for those who decide not to conform to the rules of practice.

There have been some suggestions that the way to carry out research in Māori communities can be reduced to a set of simple steps or procedures. These need not address the issues discussed here because they assume that the single most important issue is access to Māori communities. These ‘procedures’ for example, include; finding a kaumatua who is willing to help, going to the local marae with the kaumatua and being introduced to and employing local people as research assistants.† There is a danger that such ‘procedures’ become fixed criteria for determining ethical practices and good conduct. But the reduction of Māori attitudes, values and experiences with research to simple procedures, while helpful to outsiders, masks the underlying issues, and is a deeply cynical approach to a complex history of involvement as research objects. For Māori researchers, the above steps are far too simplistic in that our choices, culturally, are much more flexible, the community networks are more established, there are more opportunities to discuss issues and to be seen. At the same time the accountabilities and feedback from the community are more immediate and last longer.

3.3.12. Questions of Method

The main focus of this paper has been the underlying aspects of Kaupapa Māori research and how it is situated as a theory about research. These final comments, then, are brief ones which address the actual practices of selecting how to gather ‘data’.

People engaged in Kaupapa Māori research have been trained in different disciplines, each with its own methods for carrying out research. To date, many of these researchers have had to develop a critique of their own disciplinary approach to research and to Māori issues, and then struggle to make space for their projects within the constraints of the methods imposed. How easy or difficult this is depends on the discipline, (and the particular orientation within the discipline), and the nature of the issues being researched.

Increasingly, Māori research projects have employed multidisciplinary approaches to a research ‘problem’. Māori researchers have themselves developed methods and approaches which have enabled them to do what they want to do. They have gone into the field (that is, their own territory or rohe) to interview subjects (sometimes their own relations or whānau), which they have identified through various means (including their own networks), filled out their questionnaires or interview schedules, and gone back to the office to analyse and make sense of their data. During the course of their encounter they are often fed and hosted as a special guest, they are asked questions about their family backgrounds, they are introduced to other members of the family who sometimes sit in on the interview and participate. Sometimes, if the subject is fluent in Māori, they switch back and forth between the two languages, or if they think that the researcher can not understand Māori, they try even harder to speak ‘good’ English, if the researcher is in their homes they may see photos of family members in the lounge. Sometimes it is hard to tell that the ‘subject’ is Māori, sometimes they say things a researcher may feel uneasy about, sometimes they come right out and ask the researcher to do something for them, sometimes they are cynical and hostile to the questions being asked. When the researcher leaves, it is with the silent understanding that they will meet again. The researcher may return to work and feel good about the interview they conducted. Or was it an ‘interview’, a conversation or dialogue perhaps? Or was it something more than that?

† For example the New Zealand Doctor 9 June 1995 has a 15 step guide for visiting a marae. The Race Relations Office also used to publish ways to gain easy access to Māori communities.
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So much of the 'method' used in this kind of empirical research gets written out, the voices of the researched become increasingly silenced as the act of organising, analysing and interpreting the data starts to take over. Time passes by, because these processes take a very long time to work through. In Kaupapa Māori research, as a final point, there is the commitment to report back to the people concerned. It is part of the commitment to reciprocity and partly a process of accountability. Students who have written these for example, have taken a copy back to the families they have interviewed, other researchers have invited people in to their centre for a presentation, others have made use of an occasion to publicly thank the participants concerned. The significance of these acts is that sometimes a written piece of work is passed around the whanau, other people phone and ask for their own copies, and others put it alongside the photos of family members which fill their sitting rooms. This final reporting closes off one part of an activity, it does not close off the relationships established.

3.3.13. In Summary

This chapter has mapped out some of parameters of what is referred to as Kaupapa Māori Research. This has included a discussion on the concept and context of Kaupapa Māori and then a discussion on its application to research. I also discussed the connection between Māori cultural values, principles, priorities and the emancipatory aims which are seen by those who write in this area as a significant component of Kaupapa Māori Research. It is this intersection of context and theory which makes Kaupapa Māori Research very different from other forms of research, for example models of cultural sensitivity. The connection between cultural systems and emancipatory goals gives what has been called a 'local' context for what critical theoretical approaches mean for Māori. This makes it unique.

Also significant about these developments is the involvement of Māori conceptually, as well as in the field. This is a difference between other models of culturally sensitive research, where the space to be involved at the beginning is often not up for negotiation. Some critical tensions exist, one of which is the involvement of non Māori researchers. Although there are some examples where non Māori researchers have become involved through whanau organisation, this does not by any means open involvement. It is one issue which will continue to be contested and debated. 'Researching back', like 'writing back', is partly about talking back to the west, or in this case to pakeha, and partly about talking to ourselves. Kaupapa Māori Research is a way of organising such processes.
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3.4. MāORI HEALTH RESEARCH AND MODELS THAT WOULD ENHANCE MĀORI RESEARCH AND MĀORI RESEARCHERS - TAMATI CAIRNS

We discussed 'tikanga' as a fundamental part of Māori research. For Māori to enter into research with a Māori model in mind, one must know themselves as belonging to a particular whanau, hapu and iwi first.

These are the founding structures of Māori society wherein ‘tikanga’ are constructed, reconstructed, defined, redefined and changed to meet the right ‘rite’ of the time. We can be sure that the processes used by our tipuna were that of wananga, hui and consultation as a means to arrive at a consensus.

As a Māori researcher entering into Māori research with a Māori model in mind, many things come to focus around one’s own comfort level in the knowledge of one’s own tikanga. This is indeed, a tall order. Where do you start, given the enormity of the task? At one level, there is ‘te reo’ and all that it means inside of our own particular whanau, hapu and iwi. There are the customary concepts and the subtleties of interpretation that allows us to be different and special in our own right.

For the purposes of Māori research, one need look no further than themselves as beginning to build a Māori model. Know yourself, your whanau, hapu, iwi, your tikanga, your reo, the customary concepts and other aspects that make you special. In knowing how special we are, our vision in the service we provide as researchers will be enhanced in the knowledge of all Māori belonging to a special creed of people.
3.5. CHARACTERISTICS OF MAORI HEALTH RESEARCH - MASON DURIE

Maori health research acquired fresh impetus and recognition in the Health Research Council (HRC) Act 1990. The purpose of the Act was to 'improve human health by promoting and funding health research', and the new Health Research Council (HRC) was required, among other things, to appoint members to a Maori Health Committee. Subsequently, with the establishment by the HRC of two Maori health research units, Nga Pumanawa Hauora, in 1993, an infrastructure was created as a focus for the development of a stronger Maori health research ethos and the provision of training opportunities for young Maori researchers. By then, many other Maori individuals and groups were also embarking on health research and formal and informal networks emerged. In that process, the HRC played a catalytic role, not only funding Maori research activities (Health Research Council, 1995), but also encouraging researchers to interact and share experiences.

Previously, research which impacted on Maori health was sporadic, generally illness-oriented and more often than not focused on comparisons with non-Maori health. Unlike Maori health services which had progressively (at least since 1984) been shaped by Maori perspective's of health, taking on distinctive styles and specific functions that not only targeted Maori clients but also delivered services within a cultural context, Maori are able to present a Maori view. There were notable exceptions found for example in the work of Te Rangi Hiroa among Maori soldiers returning home from World War I or much later, Eru Pomare's compilation of a comprehensive profile of Maori standards of health in 1980 and again in 1988 and 1995. But while the focus on Maori was evident, the approaches taken did not necessarily depart from standard research protocols. Perhaps that was their strength. In contrast, the Rapoora study of the Maori Women’s Welfare League (Murchie, 1984), showed that there were other approaches to Maori health research which went beyond the conventions of the day taking greater cognisance of the expectations and preferences of the subjects, acknowledging the impact of the cultural bias of researchers and utilising the research process itself as an opportunity for the advancement of health.

Maori health research as a distinctive entity was further emphasised in the first Government policy guidelines to the HRC (Shipley, 1995a). The guidelines provided a basis for developing a formal agreement between the Crown and the HRC for the funding of health research and reflect the Government’s priorities for health research. The ‘special needs of Maori’ are highlighted and the HRC is encouraged to promote greater Maori participation, resource allocations which take account of Maori health needs and perspectives, and the development of culturally appropriate practices and procedures as integral requirement in the purchase and provision of health research. In particular, attention should be paid to the further development and maintenance of a Maori health research community that provides quality Maori health research for Maori.

Hui Whakapiripiri convened by Te Rōpū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare (formerly known as Te Pumanawa Hauora ki te Whanganui-a-Tara), has provided an opportunity to identify some of the key concerns facing Maori health research. This paper proposes a framework for the consideration of the characteristics of Maori health research according to guiding principles, purpose, practices, practitioners and politics. It is not intended that the characteristics of Maori health research should be limited to a five point mould or that other ways of characterising Maori health research should not be encouraged. But, and without wishing to promote undue introspection or to suggest a crisis of identity, it is timely to at least consider the activities and underlying philosophies which make Maori health research distinctive.
3.5.1. A Māori Centred Approach To Māori Health Research

Central to the debate about Māori health research as a specialty area in its own right is the contention that there is only one science and that research methods are similarly universal. Attempting to separate Māori health research from other types of health research is therefore sometimes seen as subverting science and research for politically correct purposes. This paper does not accept that view and argues that because Māori health research focuses primarily on the health of Māori people, as Māori, then research methods and practices must take full cognisance of Māori culture, Māori knowledge and contemporary Māori realities. The 'universal' approach - at least as it has been practiced in New Zealand - falls well short of being able to locate Māori at the centre of the exercise, or even to seriously incorporate Māori needs; nor has it significantly contributed to growing Māori researchers or promoting methodologies appropriate to Māori. Moreover, in practice, and despite the claim of universality, medical and health research is heavily biased towards eurocentric views and philosophies and favours approaches which are similarly attuned to western modes of thinking and investigating. Where other cultural views are admitted they tend to be grafted on as perspectives but within conventional disciplinary frameworks that themselves may obscure key linkages and causal relationships. In addition, contemporary health research has progressively become focused on disciplines, all too often at the expense of increasing a holistic understanding of health and wellbeing, important to Māori concepts of health.

The Māori centred approach proposed in this paper does not ignore the range of research methods, nor the contributions which have derived from medical and health sciences but it deliberately places Māori people and Māori experience at the centre of the research activity. Three developments have accelerated the move towards a Māori centred approach to Māori health research. First, the world-wide move by indigenous people towards self determination and greater autonomy has implications for health research and health services. In North America for example, tribal sovereignty, because it raises issues of intellectual ownership, community control, participation, research methods, and recruitment of subjects, will lead to substantially different research styles and projects that reflect a higher level of partnership than in the past (Freeman, 1993). Similarly, a more relevant and coherent approach to health research has paralleled the quest for self determination by Australian Aborigines. Special funds for Aboriginal health research have been allocated by the National Health and Medical Research Council and the Australian Institute of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Studies is taking a more active role (Saggers & Gray, 1994). In Aotearoa/New Zealand, Māori are increasingly intolerant of any suggestion of assimilation. A reinterpretation of Māori ideas, concepts and philosophies to fit in with eurocentric views has been largely rejected and countered by a restatement of Māori philosophies and methods. In the process, Māori research methods and processes have appeared to be fundamentally different from the disciplines generally regarded as making up the health sciences. Placing Māori health research within the confines of established disciplinary boundaries has been seen as both ideologically and politically unsound, and scientifically short sighted.

The second development which favoured Māori health research as a separate area of inquiry, was New Zealand's reaffirmed commitment to the Treaty of Waitangi in the 1980's and the subsequent inclusion of the Treaty in the objectives (if not legislation) of Government. The expectation that health institutions and programmes would reflect the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi and appropriately acknowledge Māori as the indigenous people of New Zealand, created an environment which favoured fresh approaches to all Māori issues including Māori health (Department of Health, 1992) and Māori studies (Bishop, 1992). Conversely, a failure to make explicit provisions for Māori could be seen as inconsistent with Government Treaty objectives.

Thirdly, by 1984 it was clearer than it had been, that Māori world views and Māori understanding of knowledge were themselves distinctive. The holistic approach, while not exclusive to Māori, was certainly favoured by Māori and a Māori perspective of health, characterised by four interacting dimensions, epitomised the approach. The whare tapa wha model enabled health to be compared to a four sided house, its walls representing spirituality (taha wairua), emotional and intellectual health (taha hinengaro), physical
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health (taha tinana) and family health (taha whanau) (Durie, 1994). All four were necessary for good health. Underlying the whare tapa wha model is the consistent theme of integration with reduced importance being attached to traditional western intellectual divisions (mind, body, individual, family). Thus, while many New Zealanders were beginning to argue that Māori aspirations for greater independence would lead to isolation and insular thinking, Māori researchers were equally concerned that disciplines such as history, political science, sociology, geography and anthropology were building limited fences to protect (and isolate) their own endeavours (Mead, 1993). The strong disciplinary bias to study and research was seen as counterproductive, even detrimental to the organisation and extension of Māori knowledge. A feature of Māori development generally, including Māori health and research, and Māori studies is its intersectoral and interdisciplinary basis and its emphasis on a holistic approach to human development (Durie, 1995a). In this climate Māori health research has emerged with its own distinctive features.

3.5.2. A Māori Health Research Framework

A Māori centred framework for considering the key features of Māori health research is suggested in this paper. It builds on the frameworks for reviewing Māori health contained in Hauora Māori Standards of Health III (Pōmare, et al, 1995) but derives more directly from the experience gained and the methodologies developed in Te Pūmanawa Hauora ki Manawatu since 1993. Though intended primarily as a vehicle for further debate about Māori health research, it may also have some value as a conceptual platform for addressing Māori health research issues, including funding, training and future development.

The framework is built upon five interacting components: principles to guide research, the purposes of research, the practice of research, practitioners of Māori health research and the politics which surround Māori health research.

3.5.3. Principles to Guide Māori Health Research

A number of principles for Māori Health services and health policy have been described. At Hui Ara Ahu Whakamua for example, the principles of tino rangatiratanga (self development and self determination), he tangata, he tangata (the people first principle) and tatau tatau (the principle of collective responsibility) were recommended to guide the formulation of Māori health policy (Te Puni Kokiri, 1994). Five principles for purchasing culturally effective mental health services have also been suggested: choice (a range of service options), relevance (of a service to culture and actual needs), integration (with other services and sectors), quality (high standards, reflected in good outcomes), cost-effectiveness (value for money) (Durie, et al, 1995).

In a framework for the delivery of disability support services to Māori, six identified principles are whakapiki (enablement), whai wahi (participation), whakaruruahu (safety), totika (effectiveness), putanga (accessibility), and whakawhanaungatanga (integration) (Ratima, et al, 1995). And the principles felt to be important for a Māori disability information framework included the Treaty of Waitangi, confidentiality, guardianship, purposefulness and consistency (Potaka, et al, 1994).

While many of these principles could equally be applied to Māori health research, there are three principles which are particularly applicable to a Māori centred approach to health research. Each reflects the strong position adopted by Māori, and voiced in numerous situations, that neither research nor health can be reduced to an independent variable or isolated from human experience, culture, the economy and society. Further, the three principles have been selected because of their recurring emphasis in health research projects undertaken by Te Pūmanawa Hauora ki Manawatu, as well as their relevance to all aspects of the research process including research design and research ethics. They are important not only because of their value in guiding research activities but also because they are indicative of the philosophies which underlie Māori health research.

Te Ropū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare (Eru Pōmare Māori Health Research Centre)
The first principle is whakapiki tangata - enablement, or enhancement, or empowerment. By implication, research activity should aim to enhance people so that either their health status improves as a result of the research or they are better positioned to take control of their own health, or both. Importantly also, the measures should be those adopted by Māori rather than the researcher’s interpretation of what constitutes enhancement. Much research into Māori health in the past has failed to demonstrate any benefits to Māori and scepticism about the efficacy of research is not unexpected (Pōmare, et al, 1995). On the other hand, research which enhances the standing of Māori so that they are empowered or at least enabled, not only justifies the activity in Māori eyes, but discourages research which is primarily for personal aggrandisement.

Whakawunga, integration, is the second principle. It recognises the holistic Māori view of health and the links which exist between health, culture, economics and social standing as well as historical events. While there are substantial differences between indigenous peoples, there are also sufficient similarities to underline the importance of a total environment to understandings of health. Māori, Native Americans, and Australian Aboriginals all place great importance on an integrated approach to development generally and to health in particular (Kunitz, 1994). In this integrated approach, Māori health research must take account of the complex interactions between past and present, the individual and the collective, the body, mind and soul, people and their environment, political power and social and economic spheres. Few conventional methodologies allow for such an expansive view of health and as a consequence health research often appears to Māori to construct unrealistic, hypothetical paradigms. However, in identifying research on Māori issues as a particular priority, the Foundation for Research Science and Technology has at least recognised that the past influences the future and that development opportunities are partly shaped by historical contingencies (Foundation for Research, Science and Technology, 1995).

The third principle, Mana Māori (Māori control), draws on the concept of tino rangatiratanga, Māori self-determination and places importance on control over research which involves Māori as subjects or which investigates aspects of Māori society, culture or knowledge. Inherent in this principle are the issues surrounding intellectual property rights, guardianship (of things Māori by Māori), and exploitation (of Māori by unscrupulous researchers). Mana Māori not only refers to particular research projects or programmes but also to the evaluation and management of research and research ethics. Essentially, it is a principle which enforces Māori initiative and drive in health research and rejects attitudes of superiority that in the past have resulted in Māori being regarded simply as passive subjects.

3.5.4. The Purpose of Māori Health Research

Although the specific purpose or aim of Māori health research depends on each project, there are some global aims which apply generally to Māori centred health research. First, either directly or indirectly, Māori health research should aim to increase health gains for Māori. This is a central focus without which health research is difficult to justify. At the same time it needs to be acknowledged that there is uncertainty about the meaning of “health gains for Māori”. Measurements of health gain frequently employ indices of so-called good health that do not necessarily accord with cultural views of health. An elderly Māori who is overweight, breathless on exertion and prone to gout, may be seen by himself and his community as healthy because his whanau (family) relationships are mutually rewarding and he maintains a sense of harmony with the wider environment (Durie, 1995b). Furthermore, defining Māori for the purpose of research is problematic because although there has been a general move towards a definition based on descent (from a Māori) and self-identification rather than biological inheritance, the link between identity and health has not been as well researched as the links between lifestyle and health or genetics and health (Kilgour & Keefe, 1992). Because Māori live in diverse realities, assumptions about either lifestyle or genetic loading can no longer be made in respect of persons who opt for a Māori identity.

But leaving aside for now the fact that more work is needed to define health gains as well as ‘Māori’, and accepting that improved health gains for Māori is a reasonable overriding goal for Māori health research, there are nonetheless other goals which are equally distinctive. Māori health research is not simply about
Māori people being more healthy, but Māori being able to achieve maximum health as Māori. The Government objective that Māori should have the same opportunity to enjoy good health and wellbeing that other population groups in New Zealand have (Shipley, 1995b) should not be seen to imply that the same measuring rod can be used for all people or that similar outcomes are desirable. There would be an assimilative device, totally unacceptable to Māori and, more to the point, inconsistent with the finding that health and culture are inseparable (Kunitz, 1994). In addition, over the past decade Māori health activities have not occurred entirely within the health sector but have also been aligned to Māori cultural, social, political and economic development (Durie, 1994). In other words, there is a wider context which shapes Māori health research giving added purpose and bridging the gap with a range of other research programmes - in education, economic restructuring, Treaty settlements, te reo Māori, iwi development and the environment. During the decade of Māori development emphasis was placed on three themes:

- integrated development (intersectoral cooperation and multidisciplinary activity);
- positive outcomes (wellbeing in terms of economic, social and cultural wellbeing); and,
- quality of life (cultural affirmation and the opportunity to be Māori).

The relevance of those themes to health gains has been noted and they are no less significant for Māori health research (Durie, 1995b).

Māori health research can therefore be conceptualised as those research activities which will contribute to gains in health for Māori, as Māori, and which will advance the aims, goals and processes of positive Māori development.

3.5.5. The Practice of Māori Health Research

Hauora III discusses many of the practices which characterise Māori health research (Pōmare, et al, 1995). Broadly they relate to the ways in which Māori participate in research and include issues of participation, ownership, accountability, definition and methodology, intellectual property rights and the incorporation of Māori world views.

With greater emphasis on Māori self-determination, the ways in which Māori participate in research has assumed increasing importance. This issue is not confined to Māori. Health and research agencies in the USA have been urged to adopt collaborative approaches in cancer research with American Indian and Alaska Native populations based on rationale that “community-based cancer research will only be successful with the cooperation and involvement of the target population” (Network for Cancer Control Research Among American Indian and Alaska Native Populations, 1994). Joint ownership of research programmes has been recommended so that full participation of native groups can occur (ibid). By the same token, is it any longer acceptable for Māori communities to be treated as passive respondents; or a research process which disguises cultural incompetence as researcher objectivity to be tolerated. Instead, and consistent with taking control over a range of economic and social services, Māori are seeking to control research processes which directly affect them.

This gatekeeping role ensures that ethical and methodological matters can be adequately scrutinised to determine their relevance to Māori and their safety to Māori subjects. Research consent forms for example should be genuinely informative and understandable, and written in Māori if that is indicated. The Indian Health Service also emphasises for Alaska Natives and American Indians that the process used to obtain informed consent must minimise any institutional pressure to participate (Freeman, 1994). Often these requirements are misconstrued as opposition to research; more correctly they represent opposition to bad research, the effects of which are still felt by many Māori groups. Māori are not opposed to research - indeed, there are signs that it has high priority - but they are not willing to embrace eurocentric approaches if it means an abandonment of protocols which make cultural and moral sense; neither are they any longer prepared to give over intellectual knowledge so that it can be used at random by researchers, unacknowledged and often out of context.

Te Rōpū Rangahau Hauora a Eru Pōmare (Eru Pōmare Māori Health Research Centre)
Sound research also requires the employment of methodologies which are designed for the particular task. There is no single research methodology which can be used for all Māori health research nor is it always clear what is meant by a “Māori methodology”. Given the range of inquiries and the diversity of Māori subjects, it is more sensible to aim for methodologies which are appropriate to Māori and to a particular situation. At different times, both qualitative and quantitative approaches are indicated; and analysis of results might simply employ a variety of techniques. What is important, as already noted, is the terms under which Māori will participate in the project, but also the incorporation of Māori world views into the research design and the utilisation of measures which are capable of reflecting Māori positions. Health outcome measures are a good example of the latter. The prevention of hospital admissions measured by a reduction in Māori admission rates may be used to determine the effectiveness of Māori primary health care programmes. However, such a measure would entirely overlook the possibility that a good outcome of the programme is the more effective use of secondary services, that is, an increase in hospital admissions.

Confronted with the same issue, the Indian Health Service in the USA has embarked on a systematic search for capacity, process and outcome measures which are more relevant to American Indian and Native Alaskans and a Baseline Measures Workgroup has made a number of recommendations and observations. In considering evaluative studies, the Workgroup stressed the importance of active participation by the tribes in the methodology and design of the evaluation and tribal specific baseline measures were fully supported (Baseline Measures Workgroup, 1995). Similarly, because the Māori situation is different from New Zealand generally, both in cultural and health terms, Māori health research requires the development of new methodologies that will better measure and reflect Māori health as defined by Māori. A method of research which integrates sectors, disciplines and varying cultural views is solely needed if the holistic development favoured by Māori is to gain momentum. Meanwhile, multiple methodologies rightly characterise Māori health research.

3.5.6. The Practitioners

There is wide agreement that Māori health research should be conducted by Māori; for Māori by Māori is the challenge. It is not simply a matter of exercising political muscle but rather of ensuring that researchers are qualified equally in terms of solid research experience and a capacity to understand Māori, society and culture so that they can mediate in a helpful way. At the same time, Māori exposure to formal health research is relatively recent and there are a dearth of researchers with dual qualifications. Two implications arise from this situation.

Firstly, in order to meet the aim of improving health gains for Māori it may sometimes be necessary to include other researchers within the research group. In this event although the objectives of the research will take precedence over the origin of the researcher, and provided the initiative remains with Māori, a Māori centred approach need not be compromised. Health research is not the only area where there are insufficient qualified Māori. In several aspects of Māori development non-Māori experts are engaged to undertake particular tasks; many Runanga iwi (tribal councils) for example use non-Māori consultants in law, economics and management. There is no disagreement that the long term goal is to be self sufficient but short term demands require a developmental approach to workforce planning and an interim policy of getting the job done by the best available means.

Secondly, because a health researcher is Māori there is no guarantee of expertise in Māori language, culture of tikanga. While it may be quite justified to assume that a Māori researcher will be more empathic towards Māori and strongly committed to the aims of Māori centred research, it does not always follow. Quality research will require evidence that the researcher, no matter what the ethnic origin, is qualified in both cultural and research dimensions. Where that is not possible then the absent qualities may need to be sought from more than one source, so that the research team as a whole is suitably equipped for the task.
While there is overlap between health research and other research relating to Māori development, there are particular skills and knowledge bases which are important to Māori health and essential in a competent Māori health researcher. As already mentioned, being Māori is not by itself a guarantee of competence; nor is a background in other types of Māori centred research (e.g., Māori education, Treaty claims, history) an adequate compensation for a lack of health research skills and experience. Three groupings of competencies are sought; competence in health research, competence in understanding and managing is a background in other types of workforce is currently small.

3.5.7. The Politics of Māori Health Research

Whai te Ora mo te Iwi, the Government's statement of objectives for Māori health (Department of Health, 1992) accepts that the Treaty of Waitangi is a founding document of modern New Zealand and implicitly, rather than explicitly, recognises the Treaty as relevant to Māori health development. A similar point had been made in submissions preceding the establishment of the HRC. However, legislation does not enforce the Treaty as a basis for health services or health research and it is not clear that the Government accepts Treaty obligations in any of the social policy areas, despite the strong recommendation from the Royal Commission on Social Policy that the Treaty was equally relevant to policies in the resource and non-resource areas (Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988). Disparities in standards of health between Māori and non-Māori are probably used more often as the major rationale for focusing on Māori health as one of the four Government health gain priority areas. It could be argued (though usually is not) that so long as there are disparities, then Article Three of the Treaty (an article which deals with equal citizenship rights for Māori individuals) remains unratified.

In any event, and although its precise implications have not been fully determined or accepted, the Treaty remains essential to Government and Māori relationships and is the most frequently used justification for tino rangatiratanga, Māori self determination, including Māori control over health services and health research for Māori. In keeping with that theme, the health reforms have enabled greater Māori involvement in the health sector at a purchaser and provider levels and to a significant extent in the determination of health policy. Likewise, the establishment of a Māori Health Committee by the HRC can be seen as a Treaty driven response.

Iwi (tribes) and other Māori groups do not dismiss the significance of these changes nor the attention given to the Treaty by public agencies as a result of Government policy. Often however, they see them as steps towards higher levels of self sufficiency within which Māori will have greater decision making roles at policy and service levels. There is also some debate within Māori society about the most appropriate vehicle for Māori social advancement. Iwi development has been a feature of Māori development over the past decade. While that is more clearly relevant to physical resources such as forests, land and perhaps fisheries, urban Māori argue that an exclusive reliance on iwi will bypass many Māori who live in urban areas and who are not aligned to tribal structures. Health research is of particular interest and urban Māori authorities see a major role for themselves on behalf of local Māori household and whanau.

At the heart of the politics of Māori health research are the arrangements for funding. There are two issues of concern. The first is the position of the Māori health component of the HRC. A seeming reluctance to give the Māori Committee similar status as the Biomedical Research Committee or the Public Health Research Committee and pressure to reduce funding in favour of biomedical research, combines to create uneasiness and some uncertainty about commitment to Māori health research, despite Government objectives. The second concern relates to Māori autonomy in decision making and a suggestion that Māori research funds should be moved out of mainstream institutions (e.g., HRC and the Public Good Science Fund) and developed to a Māori agency (possibly a Māori Research Foundation) under Māori control and based on Māori tikanga (procedures). Then a more favourable climate could be created for the development
of appropriate methodologies, measures which will be more useful to Māori and an integrated approach to Māori research generally (Te Runanga o Raukawa, 1995).

3.5.8. Conclusion

Māori health research can be described in several ways. This paper has emphasised a Māori centred approach and a number of characteristics, summarised in Table 1, have been discussed. A Māori centred approach places Māori people, culture, knowledge and processes at the centre and in this respect is different from other types of research into Māori. In contrast, biomedical research into Māori people has, for the most part, placed a disease or health problem at the centre and has then investigated its significance for Māori. Though often taking into account Māori ethical and procedural concerns, the methodology and analysis has not been significantly different from research in other populations; nor have the researchers.

Another focus for research into Māori health has been the comparative approach. Hauora III for example is primarily about comparisons in health standards between Māori and non-Māori (Pomare, et al, 1995). The focus is ill health while the central concerns are the disparities in health.

There is no suggestion that biomedical research or comparative research is unhelpful or seriously flawed. On the contrary, because Māori are over-represented in most disease categories, research into disease patterns, treatments and epidemiology are likely to bring benefits for Māori. Similarly, comparative research provides a useful series of indicators regarding hospitalisation, mortality, trends in ill health and are an invaluable source of data for planning, prioritising and health promotion. Moreover, they enable progress between groups to be measured over time and offer an empirical base for allocating resources. However, it is misleading to use either biomedical or comparative research in order to build a wider picture of Māori health or indeed to understand Māori health. The danger is that Māori health status is likely to be defined against measures which may not be relevant or, in the case of disease oriented research, on the basis of pathological processes.

The essential point of this paper is that a Māori centred approach to health research has its own validity and is consistent both with Māori aspirations and the experience of other indigenous peoples. Though likely to be of limited value if it is constructed on values, knowledge and philosophies which no longer have meaning for most Māori, the framework summarised in Table 1 provides an opportunity for examining health research which purports to be Māori driven and comparing it with other (non-health) Māori research. Moreover, the approach encourages the development of new methodologies which are not sector or discipline bound and which can contribute to a wider appreciation of health, wellness and positive Māori development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: A Māori Centred Health Research Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principles</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Whakapūkīpiki tangata (enable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Whakaurunga (integrate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Mana Māori (Māori control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Health gains for Māori,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) as Māori,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) to advance positive Māori development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice of Research</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Active Māori participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) multiple methodologies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) measures relevant to Māori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Practitioners</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Māori researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) interim solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) competencies - Māori knowledge; health research; Māori society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Politics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Treaty of Waitangi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Māori and iwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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SEP96 - HUI WHAKAPIRIPRIRI: A HUI TO DISCUSS STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS FOR MĀORI HEALTH RESEARCH -
APPENDIX A:

- Mataatua Declaration -

Over 150 delegates from fourteen countries attended, including indigenous representatives from Ainu (Japan), Australia, Cook Island, Fiji, India, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Surinam, USA and Aotearoa.

The Conference met over six days to consider a range of significant issues, including: the value of indigenous knowledge, biodiversity and biotechnology, customary environmental management, arts, music, language and other physical and spiritual cultural forms. On the final day, the following Declaration was passed by the Plenary.

**PREAMBLE**

Recognising that 1993 is the United Nations International Year for the World's Indigenous Peoples;

Reaffirming the undertaking of United Nations Member States to: "Adopt or strengthen appropriate policies and/or legal instruments that will protect indigenous intellectual and cultural property and the right to preserve customary and administrative systems and practices." - United Nations Conference on Environmental Development: UNCED Agenda 21 (26.4b);


**WE DECLARE THAT**

Indigenous Peoples' of the world have the right to self-determination, and in exercising that right must be recognised as the exclusive owners of their culture and intellectual property;

Acknowledge that Indigenous Peoples have a commonality of experiences relating to the exploitation of their cultural and intellectual property;

Affirm that the knowledge of the Indigenous Peoples of the world is of benefit to all humanity;

Recognise that Indigenous Peoples are capable of managing their traditional knowledge themselves, but are willing to offer it to all humanity provided their fundamental rights to define and control this knowledge are protected by the international community;
Insist that the first beneficiaries of indigenous knowledge (culture and intellectual property rights) must be the direct indigenous descendants of such knowledge;

Declare that all forms of discrimination and exploitation of Indigenous Peoples, indigenous knowledge and indigenous cultural and intellectual property rights must cease.

1) **RECOMMENDATIONS TO INDIGENOUS PEOPLES**

*In the development of policies and practices, indigenous Peoples should:*

1.1 Define for themselves their own intellectual and cultural property.

1.2 Note that existing protection mechanisms are insufficient for the protection of Indigenous People’s Intellectual and Cultural Property Rights.

1.3 Develop a code of ethics which external users must observe when recording (visual, audio, written) their traditional and customary knowledge.

1.4 Prioritise the establishment of indigenous education, research and training centres to promote their knowledge of customary environmental and cultural practices.

1.5 Re-acquire traditional indigenous lands for the purpose of promoting customary agricultural production.

1.6 Develop and maintain their traditional practices and sanctions for the protection, preservation and revitalisation of their traditional intellectual and cultural properties.

1.7 Assess existing legislation with respect to the protection of antiquities.

1.8 Establish an appropriate body with appropriate mechanisms to:

- preserve and monitor the commercialism or otherwise of indigenous cultural properties in the public domain;
- generally advise and encourage indigenous peoples to take steps to protect their cultural heritage; and,
- allow a mandatory consultative process with respect to any new legislation affecting Indigenous Peoples Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights.

1.9 Establish international indigenous information centres and networks.

1.10 Convene a Second International Conference (Hui) on the Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights of Indigenous Peoples to be hosted by the Coordinating Body for the Indigenous Peoples Organisations of the Amazon Basin (COICA).

2) **RECOMMENDATIONS TO STATES, NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL AGENCIES**

*In the development of policies and practices, States, National and International Agencies must:*

2.1 Recognise that indigenous peoples are the guardians of their customary knowledge and have the right to protect and control dissemination of that knowledge.

2.2 Recognise that indigenous peoples also have the right to create new knowledge based on cultural traditions.
2.3 Note that existing protection mechanisms are insufficient for the protection of Indigenous Peoples Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights.

2.4 Accept that the cultural and intellectual property rights of Indigenous Peoples are vested with those who created them.

2.5 Develop in full cooperation with Indigenous Peoples an additional cultural and intellectual property rights regime incorporating the following:

- collective (as well as individual) ownership and origin;
- retroactive coverage of historical as well as contemporary works;
- protection against debasement of culturally significant items;
- co-operative rather than competitive framework;
- first beneficiaries to be the direct descendants of the traditional guardians of that knowledge; and,
- multi-generational coverage span.

Biodiversity and Customary Environmental Management

2.6 Indigenous flora and fauna is inextricably bound to the territories of indigenous communities and any property right claims must recognise their traditional guardianship.

2.7 Commercialisation of any traditional plants and medicines of Indigenous Peoples, must be managed by the Indigenous Peoples who have inherited such knowledge.

2.8 A moratorium on any further commercialisation of indigenous medicinal plants and human genetic materials must be declared until indigenous communities have developed appropriate protection mechanisms.

2.9 Companies, institutions both governmental and private must not undertake experiments or commercialisation of any biogenetic resources without the consent of the appropriate indigenous peoples.

2.10 Prioritise settlement of any outstanding land and natural resources claims of indigenous peoples for the purpose of promoting customary, agricultural and marine production.

2.11 Ensure current scientific environmental research is strengthened by increasing the involvement of indigenous communities and of customary environmental knowledge.

Cultural Objects

2.12 All human remains and burial objects of Indigenous Peoples held by museums and other institutions must be returned to their traditional areas in a culturally appropriate manner.

2.13 Museums and other institutions must provide, to the country and Indigenous Peoples concerned, an inventory of any indigenous cultural objects still held in their possession.

2.14 Indigenous cultural objects held in museums and other institutions must be offered back to their traditional owners.
3) RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE UNITED NATIONS

In respect for the rights of Indigenous Peoples, the United Nations should:

3.1 Ensure the process of participation of Indigenous Peoples in United Nations fora is strengthened so their views are fairly represented.


3.3 Monitor and take action against any States whose persistent policies and activities damage the cultural and intellectual property rights of Indigenous Peoples.

3.4 Ensure that indigenous peoples actively contribute to the way in which indigenous culture are incorporated into the 1995 United Nations International Year of Culture.

3.5 Call for an immediate halt to the on-going 'Human Geonome Diversity Project' (HUGO) until its moral, ethical, socio-economic, physical and political implications have been thoroughly discussed, understood and approved by Indigenous Peoples.

4) CONCLUSION

4.1 The United Nations, International and National Agencies and States must provide additional funding to indigenous communities in order to implement these recommendations.