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ABSTRACT Indigenous people’s perspectives present strong challenges to records keepers in many parts of the world. In New Zealand, as in Canada, indigenous people have used the information held in archives to reassert their rights and reclaim the past. This article provides a case study of the rights and interests of New Zealand’s indigenous people, the Maori, in archives. Maori perspectives on archives are explored through firsthand accounts and analysis of developments in New Zealand archives, museum, and library environments towards the implementation of “biculturalism.” It is argued that the Maori impact on record-keeping falls along a spectrum from reconnecting Maori with
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Information is most powerful, that’s what colonization did. It separated us from our heritage of information, not just our land and our language, but everything that flowed from that.¹

Like the glass cases of museums, the archives of colonial regimes and their independent successor states have often been described as prisons for the identities of the oppressed. Indigenous advocates in the United States and Australia have proclaimed that their people are “captives” of archives; their pasts are caught in records created by others, to which archivists hold the keys.² Pacific historian David Hanlon argues that archives, museums, and libraries, and the records, artefacts, and books they guard, cannot be disentangled from the imperial and colonial pasts that created them in the Pacific region.³ He writes that they brought the chill of a foreign cultural tradition with them to the Pacific, and they are still characterized by a Western frigidity. The cultural dimension of colonization is reflected in the alienation of knowledge and culture, along with land, forests, fisheries, and other physical property. The call from indigenous people to “decolonize” archival institutions, in order to reconnect indigenous peoples with their documentary heritage, is a response to this legacy. Evolving New Zealand organizational practice is a response to this call.

In New Zealand, indigenous use of archives as sources of evidence has risen dramatically over the past fifteen years. With this rise in access has come a reaffirmation and realization that vital fragments of indigenous identity, of the Maori self, are housed in written records. The impact of Maori engagement with archives, which record the knowledge of their forebears and key events in tribal history, can be traced through a series of stages, from research and “reconnection” with the information, to the integration of Maori culture into institutional practices, to calls for Maori control and ownership rights. Repatriation of key archives to Maori owners may be one ultimate result of this

progression, if institutions are unable to secure the trust of Maori through changes that have been described as equivalent to the impact of information technology.4

Reconciling with Indigenous Peoples

New Zealand Maori have played a significant role in the movements to improve the situation of indigenous peoples, which developed in many areas of the world in the second half of the twentieth century. The struggle of indigenous peoples to assert rights to traditional lands and to gain the resources necessary for self-determination and cultural survival is a feature of the social and political landscape in many countries with colonial pasts. Canadian historian and policy advisor Ken Coates writes that “struggles over land, the guardianship of the environment, land claims settlements, legal debates, and the survival of indigenous societies have emerged over the past forty years as among the most powerful movements on the world stage.”5 Indigenous peoples’ struggle for self-determination, partnership with non-indigenous peoples, and cultural survival will have an ongoing impact on our societies as governments seek to reconcile their countries’ pasts.

Despite varying histories, indigenous interests in recovering control of cultural and intellectual property have struck similar tones across the world. International initiatives to address these issues include the 1993 United Nations draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the Mataatua Declaration on Cultural and Intellectual Property Rights, which was the result of an international meeting of indigenous peoples’ representatives in New Zealand in 1993.6 The Mataatua Declaration requires state, national, and international agencies to recognize indigenous peoples as the guardians of their customary knowledge who have the right to protect and control dissemination of that knowledge. Furthermore, the declaration requires agencies to offer indigenous cultural objects held in institutions back to their traditional owners.

Article 12 of the United Nations declaration recognizes indigenous peoples’


right to “maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures,” including historical sites, artefacts, and literature, and the right to “the restitution of cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs.” Article 29 states that indigenous peoples should receive “recognition of the full ownership, control and protection of their cultural and intellectual property,” including the right to special measures to “control, develop and protect their cultural manifestations, including knowledge of the properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures and designs.” The inclusion of this article on cultural property in the United Nations declaration was a direct result of Maori participation.7

Where indigenous knowledge is held in archival sources, the United Nations and Mataatua Declarations imply a requirement for control, at the least, to be shared with indigenous cultural groups. Where archives contain indigenous knowledge gathered without free and informed consent, these declarations could require archival institutions to repatriate the relevant records, whether physically or through changes to organizational structures and controls.

Indigenous People in New Zealand

New Zealand’s history is a fairly classic example of settlement by Europeans, alienation of property, and economic, social, and cultural dominance of new arrivals over previous occupants.8 Maori have inhabited New Zealand since their arrival from tropical eastern Polynesia in ocean voyaging canoes some thousand years ago. Tribal groups, dispersed throughout the country, share a common language and a fairly homogenous culture. Visits by European explorers in the late eighteenth century were followed by waves of settlement through the nineteenth century. Colonization and settlement, disease and depopulation, alienation, international conflicts, and urbanization have made a great impact on Maori culture. However, while Maori were marginalized by colonization, they retained strength through a number of factors, including the


size and location of Maori communities,9 strong tribal affiliations, guaranteed political representation, and the Treaty of Waitangi signed in 1840. A revival of Maori culture in the late twentieth century was accompanied by efforts to redress past wrongs using this treaty as the foundation.10 Working with Maori issues is now a core responsibility for all organizations in New Zealand, particularly in the government sector, and Maori studies have developed an extensive literature both as an independent discipline and within other fields over the past few decades.11 Evolving theory and practice on Maori needs is particularly strong in the library and museum worlds (although less well developed in the archives field).12 This article draws on published studies from various fields, experiences at Archives New Zealand,13 and advice from colleagues in an analysis of the impact of Maori concerns on record-keeping in New Zealand. In particular, I am indebted to two recent library projects that consulted Maori on initiatives and practices, which I have mined for Maori comment on archival institutions.14

9 The 1996 census estimated that 14.5% of the New Zealand resident population identified as part of the Maori ethnic group. This is projected to rise to 21% by 2051. Four-fifths of Maori live in urban areas, and Maori make up a significant group in New Zealand’s middle class. Figures and projections are drawn from Statistics New Zealand, <http://www.statistics.govt.nz/> (accessed 15 January 2002).


13 In October 2000, National Archives became a stand-alone department of state, and was renamed Archives New Zealand.

14 “Consultation” is a dominant feature of the New Zealand legislative and administrative landscape. As is discussed later in this article, it is regarded as a necessity for any serious engagement with Maori. The two studies used are: Grant Pittams, Te Arotake i te Kaupapa Tiaki i te Mauri o te Matauranga - Wairarapa, An Evaluation of the Cultural Property Pilot Project – Wairarapa (Wellington, 1999); and Chris Szekely, Te Ara Tika Guiding Voices: Maori Opin-
Maori, like most other Pacific peoples, did not utilize a writing system before contact with Europeans. However, following the arrival of the first explorers, beachcombers, missionaries, and settlers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, written information recording was actively adopted by Maori. Literacy is reported to have spread around the country more rapidly than the missionaries who brought the Book, and in the early nineteenth century the Maori population achieved higher levels of literacy than those immigrating from the imperial metropolis, Great Britain.\textsuperscript{15} From this basis, as well as from outsiders’ recording of information about Maori, a great wealth of written Maori material is held in the archival and published collections of New Zealand institutions, and by Maori communities. As well as evidence of Maori traditions and practices recorded by anthropologists, travellers, and government officials, archival collections include significant bodies of letters, journals, diaries, and histories written by Maori leaders and scholars.\textsuperscript{16}

Written records constitute only part of Maori collective memory and evidence. Written documents, maps, images, and visual and sound recordings stand alongside oral traditions, stories, songs, dance, carvings, weavings, and other forms of memory-making. In particular, Maori carving has been described as “a symbolling system for the transmission of knowledge from the creation of the universe to the descent of human beings.”\textsuperscript{17} Traditionally, the conveyancing and communicating of Maori knowledge was understood and governed by a system of principles including tapu (forbidden or sacred, taboo) and noa (familiar), kai (nourishment), mauri (spiritual energy), wairua (spirit) and mana (authority, power, influence).\textsuperscript{18} The traditional centre of tribal life, the marae and the meeting house with its carvings and weavings, are often
identified as serving the role of a repository for cultural knowledge which maintains tribal culture and identity.19

In his guide on researching tribal histories and traditions, Maori historian Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal argues that Maori and other indigenous people often mistrust recorded information in comparison to oral traditions, which pass down knowledge within a continued cultural framework that “is never divorced from its cultural reality.” 20 The privileged position of written records as evidence in the European tradition may not align with indigenous world views. However, as traditional knowledge has been lost, the information that resides in the written records held in archives has amassed greater value. Bernard Makoare, Maori Services Manager at Auckland City Libraries, maintains that:

It would be difficult to overstress the depth of feeling that now surrounds [written cultural] information for Maori. Whereas its importance to past generations may have been determined by the spiritual connections the information facilitated, the importance today may be better understood in terms of the tenuous retention of Maori cultural identity in the face of the multitude of devastating influences.21

Maori consulted on the culture of New Zealand libraries have expressed similar feelings:

Many of my children, our mokopuna [grand-children] don’t know their own history, and we don’t have easy access to that knowledge because we haven’t got kaumatua [elders] left who know it all and can teach us. We are trying very hard to recapture what we have left. It’s really important, that information.22

There has been increasing emphasis in New Zealand on the need for Maori to access written information in order to settle historical grievances, and to revive and retain cultural identity. This trend constitutes part of an international drive for indigenous peoples to reclaim their cultural rights and identities.

Maori Rights and the Treaty of Waitangi

Maori rights in New Zealand are anchored in the Treaty of Waitangi, an agreement entered into between Maori and the Crown on 6 February 1840 and rati-
fied again by both parties in 1860. 23 Through the treaty, Maori granted the British Crown power to govern New Zealand and pre-emptive right of purchase of Maori land. In turn, the Crown undertook to respect Maori authority over their lands, resources and possessions, and extend to Maori the rights of British subjects. After a long period in which the treaty languished, it was again affirmed in 1975 with the passage of legislation establishing a process for considering Maori claims over offences against the treaty. 24 This statute established a separate tribunal in the Department of Courts, the Waitangi Tribunal, with responsibility to enquire into Maori claims of grievances which breach the treaty and to make recommendations to the Crown. 25 The treaty is now widely accepted both by lawmakers and the judiciary as the founding document of New Zealand, and by Maori as a fundamental covenant that must be honoured.

In applying the treaty, compliance is required with its “principles” rather than its literal terms, both because of the significant differences between the Maori and English treaty texts, and because of the need to fit the agreement to the current environment. Treaty principles, which New Zealand’s highest court has described as “the underlying mutual obligations and responsibilities which the Treaty places on the parties,” 26 are evolving over time, through interpretation by the Waitangi Tribunal and the courts. Principles consistently articulated by the tribunal include: 27

---

23 The definitive work on the evolution of the Treaty of Waitangi is Claudia Orange, The Treaty of Waitangi (Wellington, 1987).
25 The Waitangi Tribunal is a permanent commission of inquiry, comprising sixteen members appointed by the Governor-General on the advice of the Minister of Maori Affairs. The tribunal makes recommendations on claims brought by Maori relating to the practical application of the treaty and determines whether matters are inconsistent with the principles of the treaty. Claims can be made only against legislation or the Crown – not against private individuals. They can be historical (for instance, where people claim compensation for confiscated land) or contemporary (where claimants say a current government policy, action, or inaction is in breach of treaty principles). The tribunal has the right to refuse to inquire into a claim if it is considered too trivial, or if there is a more appropriate means by which it can be resolved. As at 3 October 2000, 870 claims had been registered with the Waitangi Tribunal. Further information on the tribunal’s role and functions is available from the Waitangi Tribunal Web site, <http://www.knowledge-basket.co.nz/waitangi/> (accessed 14 January 2002).
partnership – that the treaty signifies a partnership and requires both partners to act towards each other reasonably and with good faith;
• the government’s right to govern;
• Rangatiratanga (chieftainship)/self-regulation – that Maori tribes have the right to control and manage tribal resources;
• active protection – that the cession by Maori of kawanatanga (governance, called sovereignty in the English text) to the Crown was in exchange for the general protection of Maori interests and rangatiratanga;
• duty to consult – that before any decisions are made by the Crown or statutory authorities which may impinge on the rangatiratanga of a tribe over their property, full discussion must take place with Maori; and
• redress for past grievances – that the Crown will actively redress past grievances and avoid preventing redress.

Treaty principles are only legally binding on the Crown when they are directly referred to in legislation. However, under the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 Maori can challenge the Crown over matters relating to the treaty. Thus compliance with the principles of the treaty, and general responsiveness to Maori interests, is a responsibility of all parts of the New Zealand government.

Reconnecting Maori with the Documentary Record

The treaty, and the associated claims settlement process, have influenced New Zealand archives practice and government record-keeping in a number of ways over the past three decades. These can be presented on a spectrum from reconnecting Maori with cultural information held in written records, to Maori reclaiming control over management of these resources, to calls for records’ repatriation to their cultural owners. Perhaps this mirrors patterns indicated for decolonization and empowerment of indigenous peoples, from “survival, to recovery, development and self-determination.”

The process of settling New Zealand’s “unsettled history” through research into and resolution of treaty claims has had a great impact both on Maori identity in New Zealand and on the patterns of use of archives. When former Chief Archivist Ray Grover wrote about the development of New Zealand’s national archives in Archivaria in 1984, it was already apparent that Maori

30 Ward, An Unsettled History.
history was significant in the New Zealand archives environment.\textsuperscript{31} But it was not until 1985, when the Waitangi Tribunal’s jurisdiction was extended to cover historical grievances dating back to 1840, that Maori research became a dominant pressure in archival institutions.\textsuperscript{32} Historical claims submitted to date cover every area of New Zealand. These claims have had an intensive impact on Archives New Zealand and government records registries, as well as on manuscript libraries and other non-government archival institutions.

There is high awareness among Maori of the information held in New Zealand archival repositories due to the claims process. Many government records are fundamental sources for researching the background to historical claims. In particular, vital evidence of genealogies, tribal history and past land transactions is found in the records of the Maori Land Court\textsuperscript{33} and the various Departments of Maori Affairs.\textsuperscript{34} Records from other government agencies, including Lands and Survey, Public Works, and Conservation, are also fundamental to many claims as they document land transactions and the removal of Maori land for public works and conservation purposes. These records are now among the most heavily used and cited of New Zealand’s archives, as Treaty claims researchers sift their way through evidence of alienation.

Maori have become a significant section of the archives user community, alongside non-Maori professional researchers investigating treaty claims. In a 1998 survey of Archives New Zealand readers, 16% usually visited to research land claims. Maori made up 10% of the readers, and of these 79% were researching “family history,” while 26% specifically noted their interests


\textsuperscript{33} The Maori Land Court (Te Kooti Whenua Maori), established in 1865, is responsible for hearing matters relating to Maori land (which now makes up about 1.3 million hectares or under five percent of the total 26.4 million hectares in New Zealand). The records held by the Court form an invaluable part of the genealogy (\textit{whakapapa}) of all Maori, as it was necessary for the government to record oral evidence given in support of tribal land titles to document the complex Maori land tenure system. The historical role of the court is discussed in David V. Williams, “\textit{Te Kooti tango whenua}.” \textit{The Native Land Court 1864–1909} (Wellington, 1999). For information on the Court’s current role, see the Maori Land Court Web site, <http://www.courts.govt.nz/maorilandcourt/> (accessed 14 January 2002).

\textsuperscript{34} Various departments have carried central responsibility for administering government policy and operations for Maori affairs from 1840 to the current day, including the Protectorate Department from 1840 until 1846, Native Department 1865 to 1873 and 1878 to 1893, Defence Department 1873 to 1878, Justice Department 1893-1906, and Native Department / Maori Affairs Department from 1906 to 1989. Crucial archives of these departments were lost in a fire in 1907; however, those that remain provide fundamental evidence of government’s interaction with Maori.
as “private land claim research.” Relative to the Maori proportion of the New Zealand population, which stood at 14.5% in 1996, 10% is low. Although this figure is lower than the Maori proportion of the general population, however, usage can be considered high given the barriers to indigenous access to archival institutions. Literature from the archives and libraries professions has documented the difficulties indigenous peoples face in using institutions, which include language, education, location of repositories, under-promotion of relevant holdings, inappropriate index terms, and lack of indigenous staff. These factors can compound so that indigenous people do not identify archives and libraries as relevant to them. Library studies lecturer Philip Calvert writes that high use of archives by Maori is evidence that “indigenous people will access information when they have good reason to do so,” despite the barriers posed to use.

In researching historical claims, Maori have gained awareness of the ancestral knowledge that is held in the records of government. One Maori describing the experience of research states:

I’ve been involved with history research since 1991, and I’ve spent a lot of time in the Turnbull Library and the Archives. One of my key observations in both those places is that they are big buildings and can be foreboding, just because of their sheer size, and because you are so conscious of the fact that there is so much information, so much of your own records and your own tipuna’s [ancestors’] voices are just sitting in there. It’s quite awesome that feeling but it’s quite foreboding because you actually don’t know how to access it.

The strain of working with Maori information held in written documents, films, maps, and other records is a common thread in Maori statements on research. The importance of this knowledge to Maori identity is one of the factors driving organizations to reconstitute themselves to reflect Maori interests and present a more Maori environment.

35 Research Unit, Department of Internal Affairs, National Archives Readers Customer Satisfaction Survey (1998).
39 The Alexander Turnbull Library, which is associated with the National Library of New Zealand, holds the largest and most significant collection of private manuscripts and archives in New Zealand, including important holdings of Maori archives. Further information is available at <http://www.natlib.govt.nz/en/collections/turnbull/unpublished.html> (accessed 14 January 2002).
40 This reference is to Archives New Zealand.
Indigenous Voices in New Zealand Record-Keeping

Biculturalism in New Zealand Archival Institutions

The means adopted to achieve this aim are commonly referred to as “biculturalism” (between Maori and non-Maori New Zealanders or pakeha). This is taken to be promoted by the treaty principle of partnership. Dick Grace writes that biculturalism is “an acknowledgement of the culture of the tangata whenua, the indigenous people of the land... and aims to include Maori values and perspectives in the policies, practices and procedures of the organisation.” Over the past twenty years, the state sector has endeavoured to act on treaty responsibilities through organizational changes to implement biculturalism. Government agencies are evaluated and audited on their policies and practices for Maori, and on steps taken to achieve specific government aims for Maori. Maori academic Mason Durie describes a continuum of bicultural arrangements from the incorporation of Maori perspectives into a mainstream institution to the establishment of parallel or fully independent Maori institutions. Government agencies and archives, museums, and libraries are currently placed at varying points along this continuum.

New Zealand archives repositories have worked to be more responsive to Maori perspectives as Maori client groups have grown over the past two decades. A number of strategies have been identified and adopted to create environments which are more receptive to Maori. Organizations have adopted Maori names for institutions and positions, which are displayed prominently and sometimes used in preference to English titles, and bilingual signage has been put in place in public areas. Maori language information brochures, guides, newsletters, and other publications are increasingly common. To alter the physical environment, Maori art works have been commissioned or purchased, and specific spaces created for research which enable group work and discussion. Introductory training in Maori language and cultural awareness is often made available to staff.

42 A debate between use of the goals of “biculturalism” and “multiculturalism” is ongoing in New Zealand, with multiculturalism often seen as an argument in favour of universal recognition of needs and thus against recognition of Maori rights as indigenous people. For an outline of this debate in the context of Canadian and Australian policies of multiculturalism, see David Pearson, “Multi-Culturalism and Modernisms: Some Comparative Thoughts,” Sites 30 (Autumn 1995), pp. 9–30.
46 The literature on bicultural practices is voluminous. A useful overview of developments can be found in Garraway and Szekely, Ka Mahi Tonu.
Recruiting Maori staff, and establishing specialist Maori liaison or archivist positions, is fundamental if Maori perspectives are to be integrated into institutional policies and practices. However, this can prove difficult in practice in a small profession. Support structures for Maori archivists exist primarily in the library world, including the Maori Library and Information Workers Association / Te Ropu Whakahau, and the International Indigenous Librarians Forum. At Archives New Zealand, a Maori Staff Network / Te Ropu Maori was recently formed. The appointment of a Maori specialist to work with Maori collections at the Alexander Turnbull Library has been a successful strategy to document and promote holdings and build relationships with tribal groups. It is through the advocacy and advice of Maori staff that there is the most potential to identify and address Maori concerns within institutions.

Finding aids which promote Maori archives and provide assistance to Maori by discussing research from their perspective are increasingly common. A directory of Maori information resources, Te Hikoi Marama, was produced in 1993, to assist researchers in finding Maori archives and published information across diverse institutions. He Pukaki Maori, a guide to Maori sources at Archives New Zealand, was produced in 1995. A number of other guides to assist Maori researching their family history and historical relationship to land and resources for treaty claims were also published in the early 1990s. Within the library world, institutions have developed specific Maori collections to promote access and descriptive systems including subject headings have been developed to reflect Maori language and perspectives. These endeavours to describe holdings through terms which are meaningful to Maori users may serve as an example for archival repositories and government record-keepers.

Archival copying projects have been undertaken to improve access to key Maori sources. Most significantly, ongoing copying has been undertaken for the minute books of the Maori Land Court. Special project funding has enabled microfilming, photocopying, and digital scanning of these sources over many years. A detailed index to the information in the books has been

developed by the University of Auckland Library. On a project basis, this is New Zealand’s equivalent to the indexing and microfilming of Canada’s Indian Affairs records.

Forging Relationships for Partnership with Maori

Beyond biculturalism, many Maori have called on institutions to become the *kaitiaki* or guardians of the Maori information they hold, rather than its owners or creators:

The style that is required from archivists and curators needs to be that of a partnership, rather than a one-sided power play, which at present it is. Archivists and curators need to be able to understand that they are the guardians of the material and their role is to facilitate access in the most appropriate way.52

To work as guardians, archivists must build constructive relationships with the cultural owners of records. Consultation and partnership are means to enable Maori control of their property when it is held by institutions. Where constructive, ongoing relationships are formed, these will be of mutual benefit to institutions and Maori communities. Cultural heritage expert Aroha Meads states that an “inclusive” relationship with Maori groups would entail protocols for regulation of access to Maori archives, a Maori development framework, sustainable utilization of archival resources, and sharing of benefits.53 This is evidenced in the positive working relationships between Maori and institutions where collaborative approaches have been adopted.54

In contrast, Meads argues that an “exclusive” relationship in which Maori cultural owners are not able to assert their rights would lead to reliance on the treaty framework to address concerns.55 A duty to consult with Maori, in order for the government to act in good faith and make informed decisions, is one of the responsibilities of the Treaty of Waitangi.56 Because tribal sovereignty is guaranteed by article two of the treaty, failure to consult can be interpreted as a treaty grievance. Institutions which do not move to forge bridges to Maori communities face risk in the New Zealand political and legal environment.

At a deeper level, the partnership with Maori entered into in the Treaty of

---

52 Maori interviewee quoted in Pittams, *Te Arotake*, p. 35.
54 The experiences of the New Zealand Film Archives are a positive example of this. The archive has been involved for a decade in the process of “returning” images to their tribal owners through screenings and collaborative work. Jonathan Dennis, “Uncovering and Releasing the Images,” in *Documents that Move and Speak: Archives in the Information Age* (Munich, 1992), pp. 1–6.
Waitangi requires significant changes to the governance structures of institutions. Strategies to reflect a partnership in management and decision making vary among organizations. They include the establishment of Maori senior management positions, dual leadership positions, representation of Maori on governance boards, or the establishment of separate Maori advisory committees with varying degrees of power.57

**Control and Ownership of Maori Archives**

In defining the principle of *rangatiratanga* (chieftainship), the Waitangi Tribunal states that "Maori should control their own *tikanga* [custom and values] and *taonga* [treasures, possessions]."58 As in other countries, Maori have asserted a right to control their cultural information:

I think because we live at this time, that we haven’t got the same confidence that a lot of our *tupuna* [ancestors] had during the 1880’s and 1890’s when they were giving information to the Native Land Court. They were so confident in themselves that they could give out this information because it didn’t take anything away from them. When you have so little in the 1990’s that whatever you get you want to hold on tight to it ... we want to keep that for ourselves, because that’s all we’ve got.59

The right to ownership and control of Maori information has been asserted in a number of recent cases, although overarching principles of law or practice have not yet been developed.

Maori ownership rights over cultural heritage are protected under article two of the treaty, which guarantees Maori continued rights over their lands, resources, and *taonga*.60 Generally translated as treasures, *taonga* is an inclusive term, which refers to all dimensions of a tribal group’s material and non-material estate, including heirlooms and significant places, ancestral lore, and

58 *Te Whanaau o Waipareira Report*, p. xxv.
60 Chiefs, tribes, and all people of New Zealand are promised “*te tino rangatiratanga o ratou wenua o ratou kainga me o ratou taonga katou*” (Sir High Kawharu translation: “the unqualified exercise of their chieftainship over their lands, villages and all their treasures”), Article II, *Treaty of Waitangi* 1840, New Zealand Government Online site, <http://www.govt.nz/nz_info/treaty.shtml> (accessed 2 June 1999).
genealogy. It extends from oral traditions to the Maori language, and from historical artefacts to written documents, including the treaty itself. Under article two, Maori are able to claim exclusive ownership of taonga, unless this is passed to others with their consent. Treaty claims have tested this right to cultural property, resulting in the return of valuable cultural objects as well as restoration of Maori place names and rights over fish and bird species.

The call to control access to recorded information forms one component of an assertion of ownership rights over Maori cultural knowledge and intellectual property. In 1999, the right to control government information was expressed strongly in reaction to the Maori Land Court’s project to digitize records including Maori land titles and statements of ownership, to enable a move to electronic work processes. The court proposed that as part of digitizing the records it would be able to provide an on-line database of records, easing the process for Maori to access vital evidence. However, general accessibility through the Internet was reduced to controlled access at a limited number of locations following protests from some tribal groups. The court’s consultation with Maori demonstrated broad agreement that because whakapapa (genealogy) was intrinsically tapu (forbidden or sacred) there was a need to restrict access to this information to those who were “entitled” to see it. Similar arguments prevented the proposed placement of the Auckland University index to early Maori Land Court minute books on the Internet to enable researchers easier access.

As one respondent in consultation on Maori views of libraries has stated, information resources may be equated in settlement value to land:

The collections in Turnbull are now Crown owned... now Maori can actually put a block on Maori collections .... The idea of putting a claim on the National Library or any other

you know, it makes people certainly think differently. You can have all the collections in the National Library. We’ll have Turnbull as payment for the *whenua* [land].

The Maori Land Court digitization project also revealed clear views on ownership of the government record: “Iwi [tribes] may take the view that the Maori Land Court record belongs to them because it records Maori history.” The court’s report notes that because Maori information given to the government under statute cannot be regarded as freely obtained, the government may be a guardian of this knowledge and Maori its “owners.” When the court records are no longer of administrative use in the creating agency (due to digitization), Maori may assert their ownership interest if the government archives is not perceived as an accessible and trustworthy repository for their information.\textsuperscript{67} The reasoning of the court, followed to its logical conclusion, would be that all government records relating to Maori are “owned” by Maori but held by the government, because Maori have had no option but to provide their information to the government. Under the treaty, such information could constitute a *taonga* given away without consent.

Control over access to and use of Maori knowledge is an issue under consideration through the treaty claims process. The Waitangi Tribunal is in the process of hearing a conceptual claim, commonly known by its classification reference as Wai 262, which asserts treaty rights to all indigenous flora and fauna, and to Maori cultural and intellectual property. This claim will examine the extent of jurisdiction over *taonga* under article two. In preliminary hearings, a Maori representative from one tribal area has indicated that the claim should include return, guardianship, or control of all *matauranga* [knowledge] including oral recordings, histories, images, and other knowledge held in visual, audio, written, or other forms, regardless of current location.\textsuperscript{68} The Wai 262 claim mirrors developments in international declarations on indigenous cultural and intellectual property.

**Repatriation to Maori Keeping Places?**

One potential goal of the recognition of Maori ownership of cultural knowledge would be the repatriation of *taonga* to Maori custody. In consultation, some Maori have asserted their belief that the original documents of their ancestors are *taonga* with living spirits, and that their spiritual relationship to such documents would best be maintained by placing them in tribal hands:

It would be good for the originals to sit here at home, though they shouldn’t be

\textsuperscript{66} Maori respondent quoted in Szekely, *Te Ara Tika Guiding Voices*, p. 40.
\textsuperscript{67} Maori Land Court, *Access to and Archiving of Maori Land Court Records*, p. 11.
\textsuperscript{68} Apirana Mahuika, evidence at Ngati Porou hearing on Wai 262, Gisborne, April 1999.
accessed generally. Facsimiles are more important in terms of working documents, but I think the *mauri* [spiritual energy] that resides in those documents needs to be based at home. That *mauri* doesn’t need to be trampled by people every day. It just needs to reside here and be looked after ... but the stories, the *korero*, should be allowed to be traversed by everyone, and facsimiles are a good way to access the written word as opposed to the *wairua* [spirit].

Others acknowledge that physical repatriation is a goal for the future, and that institutions with established facilities and expertise are the best caretakers of information resources for the immediate future:

*Whakahokia nga taonga* [May the treasures return]. Which means that this stuff has to come home. It might be away at the moment, but that is just a temporary arrangement, and one day it will come home. What will come home are three things, one is the material itself, two is the expertise that we should have, and the resources that we should have, in order to look after those things well, and three, most important, is our identity, our own *taonga*, our own self coming back in those pages and in those artefacts. It’s only here at home can we breathe life into them.

Many Maori are in the process of developing the expertise and resources required to care for their *taonga*. Maori tribal groups establishing “keeping places” for archives and heritage objects are often doing so because their research into historical claims has generated an abundance of historical documentation, both by revealing the original documents held by tribal members and through copying of documents held in archives repositories, research libraries, and government registries. Financial resources are available from within some tribes, and from external funding agencies, to establish cultural resource centres. For example, the South Island tribe of Ngai Tahu, which negotiated a NZD $170 million settlement for historical grievances from the government in 1998, has identified tribal culture and identity among its leading priorities and set aside one million dollars to establish an archive for records and manuscripts in 2000. However, most Ngai Tahu papers will con-

70 Ibid. p. 11.
continue to be held by the Macmillan Brown Library at Canterbury University as guardian of the tribe’s manuscripts under a formal agreement.72

Expertise in historical research has been developed by many Maori in order to research historical claims. Expertise in record-keeping is now being promoted in order to build tribal organizational capacity and to protect Maori documentary heritage. A Diploma in Maori and Information Management was established in 2000, at Te Wananga-o-Raukawa, a Maori tertiary education institution, with the aim of producing graduates who can assist with the design, implementation, and management of information systems to suit Maori organizations.73 When strong tribal archive centres have been established, and trained Maori record-keepers are working in them, some barriers to the return of tribal heritage will have been removed. However, the question of ownership of government records containing Maori information will continue to be a significant issue.

Establishment of Maori “keeping places” is an outcome of increased awareness of information resources and a desire to develop tribal capability, but as Vicki-Anne Heikell contends, it also reflects the dissatisfaction Maori have felt with inappropriate handling of cultural objects (including archives) in institutions.74 Heikell, one of New Zealand’s five qualified Maori conservators, raises a number of cultural concerns relating to management of Maori information resources, and argues that:

[These issues] will challenge the direction of institutions – but only if Maori occupy positions that can influence that change from within. Institutions in New Zealand are incapable of dealing with culturally specific preservation concerns because there are too few Maori working in these institutions, and even fewer who are in positions of power to affect change.75

Changes to governance arrangements, the forging of inclusive partnerships between institutions and Maori cultural owners, integration of Maori rights into legal mandates and policies, alteration of professional practices to reflect Maori language, culture, and beliefs, and empowerment of Maori working in the record-keeping professions can all contribute to the “repatriation” of archi-

75 As with conservators, there are very few Maori professional archivists in New Zealand. Heikell, “A Maori Conservator’s View,” p. 93.
val *taonga* to Maori communities. Through such strategies, Maori trust in institutions as guardians of *taonga* may grow.

Although the treaty clearly impacts deeply on all who manage Maori documentary heritage, and on all operations of government, its specific implications for the management of government records are subject to uncertainty. *New Zealand’s Archives Act 1957, Official Information Act 1982,* and *Privacy Act 1993* do not make direct reference to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi or the rights of Maori in respect of information about them. Legislation for natural heritage resources, which reinforces Maori rights under the Treaty of Waitangi, has sometimes been referred to as a model for cultural heritage regulation. A project is currently underway at Archives New Zealand to develop policy for new public records legislation, which will replace the *Archives Act 1957*. Five key new matters are to be addressed by the legislation: electronic record-keeping; clarity of access regimes (including the relationship with the *Official Information Act* and *Privacy Act*); treatment of new organizational forms (for example, state-owned enterprises); a requirement to ensure adequate records are created; and growing inefficiency of operating outdated legislation. The legislative development is also attempting to address the concerns raised by Maori in relation to custody, ownership, and protection of cultural knowledge and intellectual property captured in public records. One proposed strategy is to provide mechanisms to build and maintain relationships between Maori and government agencies to enable flexible solutions for these concerns. Maori representatives from within and outside Archives New Zealand have had input into the development of policy positions on Maori issues, and it seems likely that clauses supporting the treaty and Maori interests will be included in the proposed Public Records Bill.

**Conclusion**

Maori rights regarding cultural property continue to undergo legal scrutiny and political review on a variety of fronts in New Zealand. The results of current treaty claims can be expected to strengthen or at least clarify Maori rights to cultural legacies held in written records. Treaty issues are complex, difficult, and often threatening. Maori recognize this:

> I hope that organisations... are courageous, because it takes a lot of courage to move closer toward *tangata whenua* [people of the land]. Our issues are very contentious.

76 In contrast, the draft Archives Bill 1996, s. 10 (c) states that “The Chief Archivist shall have regard to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi in carrying out his or her responsibilities to locate, preserve and make available public archives.”

Our issues are about governance. We are not easy to deal with because we are so fiercely focused especially here where the Treaty was our base.  

However, reconnecting Maori with their cultural heritage and repatriating the power of the knowledge held in archives are goals that New Zealand’s archivists must continue to have the courage to actively move towards.

Reconciling with indigenous people is a necessity for social and political stability in New Zealand, as well as for economic development. The New Zealand case study demonstrates that archival institutions have a part to play in this reconciliation process through the services they provide to indigenous researchers, but that the impact of indigenous peoples’ concerns can be much greater than a change in the make-up of the research community. To meet concerns about control of cultural and intellectual property, paradigm shifts are called for in the attitudes, systems, and structures of institutions. These changes may be equivalent to the impact of information technology, and they are an attempt to implement the postmodern age’s recognition of the co-existence of multiple world views, each of which has a right to be respected. Without this transformation, archivists risk being challenged over a denial of rights and facing removal of archives from their care, rather than being defended as trusted guardians of sources of indigenous knowledge.