

Panel Session and Discussion on the Opening Keynote

Ken Tremaine said Ian Shirley's address was a wake-up call to the profession and planners to improve tools and techniques, and to move away from narrow definitions of impact assessment. It was particularly important to consider impacts in the wider setting of beliefs and values. This had to be done in the context of Auckland expanding its physical and economic dimensions by at least another million people.

Maurice Gray

Maurice acknowledged his co-panellist - Bill Kapea. He said his mind was cast back to listening to the elders on the marae - where no English was used. The people there referred to a holistic approach instead of the reductionist thinking of the scientific tradition. The people referred back to a pivot or launching place in order to see their place in the world. They related as social beings to each other and the environment. The key concept for him was Mauri (*life force*) which strongly permeates Maori thinking and acts as a pivot - things can be referred back to that concept.

In the public policy sectors of government, there is only reference to physical things instead of the spiritual dimension. For him, knowledge is diminished when the knowledge base of church and state are kept apart. In *Tikanga Maori*, there is an integration of the institutional life of the spirit. Today the church is a repository of that institutional life. The challenge was to condense all these issues to a short presentation and to try to integrate the fragments. Maurice ended with the metaphor of the bicycle and the frog. One could disassemble and catalogue the parts of a bicycle and put it back together and it would function as before. But if one dissected a frog, it could not be put back together and function.

Wiremu Kapea

Wiremu introduced himself as a fire fighter – trying to put out fires started by others. He referred to the Auckland Regional Growth strategy and asked how it could have been released without tangata whenua having spoken to the Auckland Mayors Forum¹ [which is behind the strategy]. He said he believed that dialogue needed to be *kanoi to kanoi* (face to face) not just mediated through a Council officer. He compared this situation with the relationships he and others from Ngati Whatua had had with the Takapuna Community Board. The Board recommended a policy that prohibited the taking of all molluscs from the Takapuna Reef. While he did not dispute the need to preserve shellfish for environmental reasons, their decision

¹ Noel Reardon comments "Bill was not given the opportunity to present his submission, which was an error. At the beginning of the process I went to each Iwi and asked them how they wanted to be involved. They all said that they wanted to be kept informed and wanted the opportunity to provide written submissions at the appropriate time. Bill suggested getting the iwi to respond collectively which I encouraged. Unfortunately this didn't happen. The ARC then asked each to respond individually to the draft and paid for their time to prepare a formal submission. Only Bill Kapea asked to present his submission. I then went to each iwi and conveyed to them how the strategy had been changed to take into account their concerns. All but Bill were happy. Once again they reiterated two points, they wanted to be kept informed and there was the issue of tangata whenua relationships with Councils in a wider sense. "

betrayed a lack of understanding of the concept of *kai moana* and its relationship to the expression of *mana* – the taking away of *mana* was the taking away of pride. Wiremu contrasted this with the situation of Ngati Porou where the loading of tables with seafood at tribal gatherings, including numerous crayfish caught in the area, demonstrated their *mana* and control of the resources of the sea. Now they had to buy the crayfish.

He also related the nature of greetings exchanged on the marae. It was a transmission of knowledge made when meeting others, relating it to important events of the iwi and who they were. In the case of Ngati Whatua at Orakei, Pakihana Hawke, an elder of Ngati Whatua had lost four cousins to typhoid due to human waste being discharged into the Bay. It was a case of waste going directly into the tribal food bowl. For him there was no looking at compensation for these sorts of losses.

Tom Fookes commented on the issue of being "face to face" and listening to concerns directly and not mediating through others. He was a Planning Commissioner at the Marsden Point resource consent hearings when iwi made their submissions to the hearing. These hearings were held on a local marae in the whare nui (meeting house). A link was made to the past and the history of the ancestors and he was made acutely aware of the power of the mauri of those places. All around the walls were photographs of the ancestors, and around the marae there were the graves of the local people. He said he could not fail to be moved by these experiences and the setting. Tom's difficulty was how to translate that process into the Anglo Saxon legal process of the RMA and the legal framework of the Courts. He believes it could be hard for decision-makers to translate Maori concerns into the decision-making process which seems to have pre-determined boxes selecting the answers. The question is "could we do better?"

Maurice Gray replied. He said that in his experience this is a development situation common to all indigenous people around the world. The responses are not too dissimilar as well. Perhaps they are at opposite ends of a continuum – those who make the decisions and those who are affected by them. Maori communities are now reflecting back how faulty these previous decisions have been. He said those involved need to own the solutions.

Another solution is to hold that interaction at a metaphysical level – which means looking at conceptual boxes at a different level. But society has some way to go to understand collective consciousness and to capture that sort of understanding.

At present some iwi are still in grievance mode while others have moved on. For him, interaction on a marae is a microcosm of the whole world. The question is not changing the conceptual box – but getting rid of it. The box is wrong, he said.

Wiremu Kapea said he believed it took good will and courage. If aspirations are shared there can be a weaving together of a new model for our mokopuna. Wiremu related that his grandparents had cast him out into the Pakeha world, and he was denied use of his *reo* (language). He believed that this was done in the knowledge that it took courage to go out, but it was also possible to reach back for traditional knowledge.

He said he could appreciate where we are going but it takes good will to accept and collective responsibility to manage the environment. We are only part of that environment along with the "little creatures". For example, where Maori see the natural environment, engineers have a

different vision about that environment. No one will share the larger vision if they have to get back to the office by 4-30.

Ian Shirley replied that in the wider cultural and social consciousness, it takes time for things to happen. The Western paradigm of time differs. To shift collective consciousness, people need to come to terms with their own history and paradigm. Where we can, we can bring expertise and forge changes to bring about the alternative.

Ken Tremaine responded that he was amazed that Regional Councils said they had nothing to do with social and economic planning, despite the types of resources that they control.

Nick Taylor commented on the need for a holistic approach to impact assessment. He suggested that the bicycle metaphor is implicit in the RMA process – it is primarily a technical approach that is bolted together all the way up to the Environment Court. He said the Waitangi Tribunal hearings show us that new responses are needed. In particular, he cited the Manukau claim and the impact on kaimoana for Tainui; and more currently, the Turangi claim and the impact on the people of Turangi community. He said it was not just about compensation but about "what was right and wrong." He directed a question about Ngai Tahu's experience to Maurice Gray.

Maurice Gray replied that it would have been possible for all Maori to come together as one group and present issues to the Crown but they had done so separately. Less than 1% of the total settlement had been given to Ngai Tahu. There could be other ways to settle grievances but the outcomes would still be at a lower level – meeting an immediate need. He wondered how far do we need to go? What movements/ associations/waka are needed to bring about mobilisation? For him the best vehicle for this sort of debate is NZAIA. However it needs more paddlers and better mobilisation and understanding.

Jenny Dixon commented that it would take a huge investment in finding new vehicles for a holistic vision, integration, and new investment in new structures. Have we made any difference?

Maurice Gray asked does it have to be affordable – as measured by dollars? The current vehicle is economic- and social policy has become part of this. We have to reverse that thinking. In the context of settlements, the spoils are being measured in terms of who gets them and who doesn't. He advocated a shift to humanity – make people the masters instead of the market. He suggested that all we have done (through impact assessment) over the last fifteen years is shift the furniture.

Wiremu Kapea took a contrary position. He believes that a difference has been made in the last eight years. Relationships can now be established with engineering firms (who undertake developments) under the RMA. They now have to consult with Maori (but they did not do so before). In his organisation of Te Haua there were 5 marae joined at one time but now two remained. Nevertheless Ngati Whatua as a whole remained as kaitiaki and would be there (as a player) anyway. They had established good relations with a number of Councils (Auckland City, North Shore City and Rodney District) over that time. Doug Armstrong (Mayor of Rodney District) was now a trustee on a Maori trust owning land near Gulf Harbour. Originally the trust had wanted to establish papakianga housing near the waterfront – they had carried out an site

survey for archaeological and cultural sites but all that remained of previous Maori occupation were a midden site and terraces, now modified by agricultural activities.

Wiremu said he wrote a report for the Trust outlining two choices. These were to either oppose further modification to the site and possibly go against the Historic Places Trust, or allow development to take place. The question for him was who were the Trust saving the land for, and would they appreciate the significance, especially as the land had already been alienated? He said he felt there was a need to elevate the heritage that still remained. Eight months later (when a decision on development was imminent), at two in the morning, he had the answer. First, he would leave the decision completely in the hands of the elders. Second, he recommended that the elders remove the *tapu* in a ceremony to make the place *noa*. Third, that one day a year be given by the owners to allow the descendants to walk over the land. Fourth, each golf hole on the golf course development be given a Maori name. In return the owner/developers, Gulf Harbour Limited, had allowed the Trust to raise funds through a sponsored golf tournament. In this way they had made progress and had been innovative.

John Waldman referred to the bicycle metaphor (see earlier) and said what we had were Mercedes drivers and perhaps they should be introduced to the horse. He claimed that this biological metaphor had shown how far we (as practitioners) were alienated from the living world.

Tom Fookes responded by reflecting on the sterility of present day culture in terms of the spiritual. Perhaps the European equivalent of the Maori elder was the Irish priest. He recounted a story of when he stayed with relatives in Vancouver last year. A cousin was a member of a local coven of witches and had agreed to play a part in a family ceremony. She had been aware of the significance of a particular place to the local Indian tribe - so gave a simple oration to the local people at the start of the ceremony. Just as she finished an eagle swept down out of the surrounding forest. This eagle was not sighted again over the next three days that they were there. To him, this seemed to be an acknowledgement of those deeper spiritual meanings and a linking to the past.

Again in San Francisco later that year, he was told of a story of a seal which was a symbol important to that area. Next day a seal appeared – it was just a day late. He said he believed that practitioners had lost the ability to think spiritually and feel emotionally (about issues). They didn't often let feelings out – personally he wanted to thank the panellists for reminding them of that.

Stephen Knight remarked that if the "structures" were controlling us, then issues such as the World Trade Organisation (and its controls on world trade) were not some-one else's problem.

Ian Shirley said he believed that not all of us have lost the spiritual dimension. However there are not enough opportunities or support given to changing existing belief structures. He detailed an instance about social indicators research where he discovered that New Zealand researchers had accepted holus bolus the OECD approach – and asked why this was? It was not that people could not be innovative but that people locked in the system set the limits and boundaries themselves. They opted for a consensual approach instead of challenging some of the boundaries.

He advocated that ARC challenge some of the economic assumptions (behind growth) and provide support for others to push the boundaries. He said it was heartening to meet and work with people such as the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment who also wanted more public involvement and input into Councils. He said he believed that the energy and potential (of such an approach) is enormous. But it would require Governments that are supportive and councils that are more open. The danger was that they fall back on legal constraints.

Ken Tremaine concluded the session by saying that the previous remark reminded him of "Yes Minister" [using legal and bureaucratic hurdles to stifle change]. He said we had heard some powerful perspectives and these laid a broad base – we now have to use some of that energy and learning to move ahead. He said he believed that financial and economic determinism would not rule as it had before.