

1 May 2007

TE OHU
KAIMOANA



MĀORI FISHERIES TRUST

How to Stay Maori as We Go Global

Rikirangi Gage

2nd Annual Maori Fisheries Conference
War Memorial Conference Centre
Hosted by Treaty Tribes Coalition / Ngati Kahungunu

My being asked to present here today has its genesis, in a discussion I had with Ngahiwi some weeks ago prior to the Te Ohu Kai Moana's AGM.

I was recounting my experiences as part of Te Whanau a Apanui negotiating team in terms of some visits overseas we had recently undertaken and in particular a relationship we had begun developing with The Confederacy of Treaty 6 First Nations from Alberta Canada.

As part of a strategy, we sought and gained membership to the International Indian Treaty Council, the Chairman of which I might add sits on the CERD committee, and we have been "in ceremony" with this Confederacy of Treaty Six First Nations.

Our last visit with them was to attend a UN Treaty Experts Seminar hosted by the Enoch and Ermineskin Cree Nations.

I concluded our discussion by saying that basically our negotiation team had been involved in a "kura", an indigenous Kura, built in indigenous thought and focused on indigenous development.

For me personally the experience has had some resonance with the "kura" that Te Kooti referred to in his version of the famous Ngati Kahungunu oriori Pinepine te Kura. I can remember the Pahipoto kaumatua and chief, Eruera Manuera quoting Te Kooti's korero to his followers "tukuna atu o koutou tamariki kite kura kite ako kite tuhi o ratou ingoa engari he kura ano taku". So that's why I think I've been asked to speak here. To comment on and share our experience our kura.. hei pai ma koutou he kino ma koutou a hei aha ma koutou

In terms of the topic Ngahiwi has set me "How to Stay Maori as We Go Global"

What's become apparent to me - for us as Maori - are two things:

1. We will get marginalized, and basically colonized all over again, at a global level if we do not educate ourselves and engage and challenge the emerging global framework;
2. We have become complacent about insisting on the legitimacy of our own framework, and have walked blindly into globalization as quasi-colonised peoples.



We can not stay Maori as we go global if we do not act to address these two things, as a matter of urgency.

The topic poses interesting questions about finding a way, *a right way*, forward. Essentially it's about navigation, how we are going to chart a course forward into the future.

We are already global, and globalization exists as a reality today. It is not a tide we can stop, and, given its potential benefits and opportunities, it's arguable that we should try. But globalization is a double edged sword – according to Jane Kelsey - *Globalisation becomes a double-edged sword. For indigenous peoples in particular, the global 'free market' represents a new form of colonisation, potentially more devastating than the last. At the same time, globalisation may hasten the fragmentation of the colonial nation-state and open the way for new ways of thinking and doing politics, culture, identity, economics and law.*

Our challenge is to ensure that globalization doesn't become macro level colonization, and in order to do that we need to secure a sufficient amount of influence over international affairs and we need to actively participate in the shaping of the international legal and political framework.

We can't even hope to do that unless we sort ourselves out. And we need to do that here in Aotearoa first. Unless we make some deliberate decisions about the way forward, and back those decisions with some strategic planning and committed implementation, we are going to get rolled, both here and overseas.

Reality is indigenous people are already getting rolled, and most of us are unaware of it. We don't challenge it, we don't revolt against it. Traditional colonial powers have already done a lot of work to establish a global order that suits their needs, and services their agendas. International law underpins globalization, and international legal institutions were built by colonial powers, based on their values, and to support their fictions. This is how we come to have the erroneous situation where, in international law, indigenous peoples have no legal personality; we are not even acknowledged as peoples. Decisions about our territories, our lands, our resources, our social structures and our identities are being made by colonial governments. In fact, to serve these ends they have been making, and are continuing to make (unilateral) decisions about the content and interpretation of our treaties.

Getting it right here first

Our first challenge is getting it right here, in Aotearoa, first.

First, we need to deal with the current frame in front of us – here, with our relationship with the Crown. They have assumed the right to unilaterally define our bi lateral treaty – and we, for a large part, are complacent about it.



We allow the Crown to define their relationship with us – unilaterally. Every time we accept a framework that the Crown have created and imposed upon us. We do it every time we are reactive to Crown policy, every time we go to Parliament to ask for those things that are in fact our inherent rights. Effectively we become actors in our own colonization because we swallow the Crowns rhetoric about our mana being lesser than theirs We do it every time the Crown dictate terms to us and encourage us to accept a position that is inconsistent with our mana ; we swallow this fiction of Crown supremacy – hook, line and sinker.

WE MUST REASSERT OUR RIGHTS – AS PROTECTED BY THE TREATY - AND INSIST ON ITS HONOURABLE IMPLEMENTATION.

Our interaction with the New Zealand government, pursuant to that Treaty, is international in nature. Our interaction with the Crown is, or should be – if they honoured it! - governed by the Treaty of Waitangi, an *international* document, a sacred covenant, signed by our ancestors, *in their sovereign capacity*, and the British Crown.

The Crown seems, conveniently for them, to dismiss this interpretation of the Treaty relationship. Historical documents^[1] in this country show their interpretation as flawed and self serving. They tell us it's a domestic document rather than an international one. That's so they get to be the only adjudicators of it – answerable only to themselves, or their self appointed Tribunals.

They tell us it's about cession of sovereignty rather than honoring our ancestors' good faith arrangement for consensual partnership. This is so they don't have to address the issue of our sovereign capacity – our *tino rangatiratanga* - and can continue to create myths about the unfettered sovereignty of the Crown .

The Crowns sovereignty here was never unfettered. It was, and is, always subject to the Treaty agreement made with our tipuna and the conditions contained therein. Their mana here derives from ours, not the other way around as they would have us believe while they purport to 'grant rights' or 'delegate authority' to us.

The scope of that power and authority is contained within the Treaty itself; although the Crown would have us believe that Article 2, despite its clear wording, is without meaning. We, as partners to that document, can not allow them to continue construing our tipuna's intentions like that.^[2]

Every action and decision of the Crown should be measured against the power and authority given to them by our tipuna, the indigenous peoples of this whenua - examples of this are too numerous to mention – but notably the foreshore and seabed legislation; likewise the declaration last week in Parliament that the Crown consider themselves 'owners' of water; the Shared Fisheries proposals - which are all inconsistent with the clear wording of Article 2 of the Treaty and interfere with our lands, territories and resources without our consent.



Despite Crown assertions, our treaty is neither a domestic document nor a treaty of cession. International law disagrees with them, on both counts. Our oral tradition and tribal law disagrees with them, on both counts.

We need to be clear about this – because this is about legitimising OUR framework and OUR worldview

As Treaty partners we have

- A framework governing our relationship with the Crown
- Protection of our lands, territories and resources
- A protected right to be Maori and to exist *as Maori*
 - To live according to our worldview

As Indigenous Peoples we have

- The INHERENT and INALIENABLE right to self-determination, including the right to self-define
- The right to culture
- The right to be recognized as PEOPLES, and take our rightful place within the family of nations

The Treaty is still being framed exclusively from a British, colonial, perspective and we must recloak it in our worldview, legitimizing the interpretation that reflects the intentions of our ancestors.

What is our framework? Firstly, before the arrival of the Crown to these shores we were **sovereign** peoples, nations in our own right. When they came our ancestors brokered an arrangement with them for peaceful co-existence. When they did so our ancestors protected their rights, and our tribal patrimony. Never mind about the tricky phrasing and the delicate legal games that can be played with words – the good faith intention of our ancestors was to enter into an agreement to provide some framework for the settlement here – and to protect their rights. They did this by way of treaty – a legal document of international status, entered into between sovereign peoples.

Nationhood – Is about reclaiming our legal personality

Our first and primary global interactions were, and remain, with each other, between ourselves as tribal nations. That's apparently a controversial statement, but it's not really a controversial concept. We were pre-European contact, sovereign peoples.

What is a nation?

“The term nation refers to the geographically bounded territory of a common people as well as to the people themselves. A nation is a cultural territory made up of communities of individual who see themselves as ‘one people’ on the basis of common ancestry, history, society, institutions, ideology, language, territory, and, often, religion. Thus a nation is both the cultural homeland of a people and a people who have a cultural homeland. Furthermore a nation is self-identifying it is a community of self-identifying people who have a common culture and a historically common territory”.^{[3][4]}

We need to stop doing nothing / or engaging in activities that have the net equivalent of doing nothing

It seems a fairly simple task to understand what we’re doing and why we’re doing it.

There must be a kaupapa that compels us to act or interact. It may be internally or externally derived, but it must be identifiable.

It was, in ancient times, as it is now, important to discuss the compatibility of that kaupapa with our worldview. This is, in effect, a preliminary strategic filter.

Much has been made recently of our ability, as iwi or as Maori, to maximize our economic leverage in commercial activities. There is unquestionable benefit in this, but it can not be allowed to become an isolated activity. There is only value in economic self determination only if it is packaged with cultural, political and spiritual self determination. Ideally political self-determination would occur first, and our struggle for that in national and international arenas continues. But it is a struggle, and we are dealing with colonial governments well versed and well practiced in denying the full measure of our indigenous and our treaty rights.

Pragmatically it may be that the quest for economic self determination is easier to lead with, and that the achievement of cultural, political and spiritual self determination will follow, if we use the economic leverage strategically. But we can not allow ourselves to progress one without continually reminding ourselves that the others are intrinsically linked, and vitally important to our survival as peoples, as Maori. To advance only economic development without reference to cultural integrity is tantamount to self-assimilation, and consensual colonization. We might as well be someone else if we are going to act and mimic someone else, and adopt their values, and measure ourselves by them. Without reference to our worldview, and implementation of our development according to the framework set out in that worldview, we will, for all intents and purposes, cease to be Maori.^[5]

We’ve learnt that we should, without question, strategise our development. Our tipuna did that – and we need to do the same. We can not hope to crash land our waka into global opportunities and fumble our way through those interactions when they happen.



Strategic development does not happen by mistake, it happens by intention and design.

We also will be tasked with implementing the strategy once it's developed, and not compromise on matters of core importance. There is a vital link between strategy and implementation. Once there is common agreement about matters over which we will not compromise this is easier to ensure.

We need to be able to adapt, *where appropriate*. Variable conditions in politics sometimes require this. A carefully mapped strategy will allow for this, and indeed should have anticipated it. It makes no sense to chart a course and be compelled to stay on it even when progress is not being made, or worse, when it becomes dangerous (that is, anything that endangers ourselves, politically or culturally, or our mokopuna)..

Protecting the Sacred

Clarifying what's tapu & what's noa

It is important to ensure that we maintain our cultural and spiritual integrity. Our ancestors did this by holding on to their tikanga and participating in sacred ceremony. We must first contextualize ourselves within our world, and maintain the obligations we have in relation to the exercise of our mana.

The set of rules that govern us remain deeply entrenched in our societies. They are the result of inter-generational learning's, our common law. They are not legal fictions dreamt overnight in Wellington, but rather they are a complete code that is based on accepted and immovable values. We should not buy in to having those laws, and therefore the values upon which they are based, transplanted and replaced by foreign systems. We must, from planning through to execution, hold fast to those things which define who we are – and our system of values-based laws is integral to that. Abandon that and we abandon our essence .

An Indian leader by the name of George Manuel says “We do not need to re-create the exact forms by which our grandfathers lived their lives – the clothes, the houses, the political systems, or the means of travel. We DO need to create new forms that will allow the future generations to inherit the values, the strengths, and the basic spiritual beliefs – the way of understanding the world – that is the fruit of a thousand generations’ cultivation on this soil.”

Enduring values, strengths, and the basic spiritual beliefs that can be refashioned locally to meet the changing needs of future generations; specific cultural technologies or artifacts are secondary. To become museum curators should not be the present generations aim, our chief role is to forge, as in the emblematic figure of the grandparent – grandchild bond, a vital link “to the ways of our grandfathers” which will ensure that future generations are ‘strong’ enough to become indigenous ancestors themselves’



At this critical junction, in time, we need to ask ourselves how the decisions we are making are going to impact on the type of world our mokopuna will inherit.

Get specialists / tohunga / advisors – import knowledge when you need to

We must wananga, strategise and korero about what is on the horizon and what sorts of expertise that are going to be required to deal with those things. This, in modern speak, is the combination of due diligence and systems design – the research required to make informed decisions combined with the creation and maintenance of robust systems for specific task management.

Expert advice still needs to be filtered by us, and contextualized within our cultural frame. It needs to serve our purposes and accommodate our social needs, and be consistent with our ancestral teachings. We need to make use of our specialists where their knowledge is relevant to the kaupapa being explored.

Likewise our structures need to be internally sustainable and robust and indigenous to our people. From our people, for our people. Kia tupato ki Te Waka Umanga.

We need to stop being fragmented

Our strength and our future lies in our Kotahitanga

We are at a critical junction; and we need to gather our strengths. We need to work together. A waka will not go forward without cohesiveness, without unity.

Uniting is one thing – and I don't think we've got a choice about that. We can bicker and squabble about the form of kotahitanga (like we have been for years) – and we will get steamrolled by the juggernaut before we've even opened our eyes – our own egos will get in the way of our mokopuna's self sufficiency and self determination.

Unity brings our collective weight together – economically, politically or socially; and allows us to strategise together, enables us to economise our resources, our brainpower, our experience and our energies. If the value system underlying the kotahitanga is sound, the form will follow.

We don't all have to do the same thing all at the same time, and this is probably where efforts to unify our political stances have been resisted; and rightfully so – each iwi needs to be able to make its own decisions under their own mana. But they should be informed decisions.

At times this is seen as divisive, but it is not intended to be – kotahitanga can still be achieved through a unification of purpose and values – but need not necessarily be limiting in terms of manifestation.¹⁶



Sometimes they collaborated with other nations, or other organizations, and paddled as a fleet – acted in federation. This increased their skills base, their efficiency, leverage and potential influence. We should, where it politically or economically suits us, do the same.

The next question will be – for what purpose are we united? What are our benchmarks, our measures? No point being united to follow each other down the road to ruin. (In fact that may be where we are now – all united in our tacit acceptance of someone else’s value system).

Globalisation

We should remind ourselves that ‘going global’ is not a destination.

‘Globalisation’ is merely a set of interactions . Our task is to determine the nature of those interactions.

So, **who is setting the framework** on a global scale? And for **what agenda** was this framework constructed?

The United Nations was born without ANY indigenous representation, and in fact Asia , Africa , South America and the Pacific were also absent at its conception.^[7]

It is from this foundation that the current structure was developed.^[8]

Currently, with a few exceptions, our presence globally is being frustrated by the Crown. This is typical of indigenous nation and state relationships. When the UN was created, despite recognizing the inherent rights of ‘peoples’ the system itself only allowed state parties to become members.^[9]

In international legal and political fora they assume our voice for us, and leave us politically mute. They position themselves to define the scope of our presence by domesticating our existence. To ‘be Maori’ globally we need to challenge that, and affirm our own identity – speak with our own voices, and chart our own pathways. We need to reclaim the right to define ourselves.^[10]

Globalisations impact at home

Once upon a time international law and politics had very little impact on our shores, save for the historical colonial doctrines. Those days are over. Technology, commerce and the application of ‘universal standards’ over human rights and social sectors has changed that. More and more the policy and law that is implemented (or imposed) domestically has its genesis in international conventions or treaties. Without influence at international policy making forum and without recognition of our legal personality our values are not represented. The individual capitalist values of the Anglo-American world are left to dominate.^[11]



The challenge for indigenous peoples

First, Macro-level Kotahitanga

As we must pool our strengths here in Aotearoa – to unite together – we must also do this on a global scale with our indigenous brothers and sisters.

To deal with the tide of globalization, and to be influential at all within that arena we need to unite.

We are not going to be able to deal with the collective state governments of the world one tribe at a time. We have to be real about the complex and sophisticated machine that exists between state parties, and appreciate that they act collectively to protect and promote their interests. We, as indigenous first nations, must do the same.

We should seek out international indigenous forums that provide synergies with our political ideals. We could be instrumental in creating forum where there don't currently exist – for example – an International Indigenous Fisheries Forum; to meet regularly and provide a base for a think tank that can provide advice and advocacy, and concurrently provide a platform for commercial co-operation.

At the same time we should recognise each other – the politics of recognition is powerful

Our interactions should be governed by OUR cultural protocols, and institutions, and mutual respect for the cultural protocols of the people or institutions with which we came in contact.

We can not and should not strive to be anything but who we are.^[12]

We need to control the tenor of our relationships externally. Whilst history impacts on the relationship we have with the Crown it does not necessarily need to impact on our global relationships in the same way.

It may prove easier in some cases to develop relationships at a global level, because the relationships are new, and not tainted by the difficult history that weighs down Crown – Maori relations sometimes.^[13]

So we should remain vigilant that our position as first nations, as indigenous peoples is not undermined. We can not allow our global experience to mirror our Treaty experience, and in order to avoid that trap we must, from the outset, set our own agenda and operate within our own framework. As with our relationship with the Crown our commitment to our value system must be steadfast. Values and political integrity, as opposed to assets, should not be viewed as negotiable, or for sale, at any cost.

We shouldn't think that our tikanga, and our culture, and our reo are not globally relevant. The same people responsible for those types of messages use our symbols, our performing arts, our visual arts, and our haka, to promote their own global interactions. We must take ownership of this 'brand Maori' that's being developed and do two things – first, ensure its integrity, so that we don't prostitute ourselves and the patrimony of our



mokopuna; second - manage its use so that our people, *from whose intellect this property derives*, reap the benefits.

Intellectual property and the protection of indigenous knowledge, both traditional and contemporary, is a huge emergent kaupapa for us, and one that we should be investing in now. If knowledge is the currency of the new age then we, as indigenous peoples, must be involved in crafting the rights regime that will protect and regulate that asset.

Asserting ourselves as Nations

Willie Littlechild spoke at the Preparatory Session for United Nations Treaty Expert Seminar held at Enoch Cree Nation last year, and at which representatives from Te Whanau a Apanui were honored to be in attendance, and made the apt statement – **‘you are only as sovereign as you act’**. We must (continue to) act like sovereign people, to honour the mana of our tipuna; and stop allowing others to define the limits of that mana for us, or to create fictions about our surrender of that mana.^[14]

Likewise we should acknowledge the rangatiratanga of other indigenous nations, and engage with them on this basis. We actually don’t need the permission of governments to do that. We can, and should, enter into bilateral and multilateral treaties of our own, and seek to further international relationships built on (1) recognition of our mana (2) consistent with our values.

Te Whanau a Apanui have entered such agreements with the International Indian Treaty Council, and the Confederation of Treaty Six Nations in the state known as Canada . We didn’t need anyone’s permission but our own – that is the essence of our mana.^[15]

Where Maori are are currently positioned in global politics?

Our participation in international forum is limited by either state party interference OR our own actions – and whilst there is a small group of Maori attending international forum (and working hard) there is a definite lack of iwi level participation on a consistent basis, and certainly no consistent macro level representation of Maori issues stemming from, and accountable to, an iwi base.

It is clear that our participation is adhoc or unorganised. It lacks clear strategy and does not have any consistent presence. We appear on the global scene intermittently.

Sometimes, and most notably with the Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples discussions last year, Maori are just absent. In fact our absence was so obvious (and it didn’t help that the NZ government were the major opponents of the declaration at times) that the rest of the indigenous world petitioned to have Maori wake up, attend the meetings and address the issues.



Its hard to tell if this is because we don't understand the nature of the processes (which is able to be remedied) if we don't care and are paralysed by apathy (which is harder to accept and harder to overcome, because we have some sacred obligations to our tipuna and our mokopuna), because we don't see it as a priority, or because we lack resources.

Given our standard of living, and our comparative rich resource base our absence from international forum is seen as voluntary.

We're being stripped of our rights, and facing exploitation of our resources and we're choosing not to participate - which creates the perception, justifiably, that Maori, are free riding on the efforts of other indigenous advocates.

Concluding Remarks

Active work in international forums and hard work at home making indigenous self-government and use of territory practical realities are the two sides of indigenous internationalism. Both are necessary; neither should be abandoned.

In our global interactions it remains crucial to ensure the internal workings of our nation are maintained, and that they endure in a healthy and positive state. There seems little point in paddling out beyond the horizon to pursue appealing opportunities just to find that our people are left to disintegrate or fall into disrepair. This is about ensuring the physical, cultural and spiritual wellbeing of our people is guaranteed, and about ensuring **our** territorial and political integrity is secured.

Our ancestors would ensure that their spiritual integrity was maintained, **always**. This impacts, obviously, on our wellbeing. It also contextualizes our existence within our environment, both spiritual and physical. It ensures the appropriate relationships, both sacred and secular, are maintained in balance.

Our people have always been dynamic, and have always been adaptable. Now we are at a critical junction for our development – and the decisions we make now will have a profound impact on our mokopuna and on the political and social survival of our people, and our unique identity as Maori, or as iwi, or as indigenous nations, in the future.

So, we have a choice – about the way forward. We need to exercise it. We need to make conscious decisions.

Tena Koutou



Notes

¹ These are all pretty mainstream documents – like Constitutional white papers - 1990, Claudia Orange Historical Account of Treaty Michael Kings History of NZ, research reports commissioned by CFRT / Tribunal

² Instead, we should be insisting that every policy and law should be measured against the promises made in that sacred covenant. Inconsistent actions should be deemed what they are – ultra vires – outside the authority of the Crown.

³ Stavenhagen – Politics of the Fourth World Paper

⁴ By definition, and by inherent right, Te Whanau a Apanui is a nation. When we engage with other nations, like Ngati Kahungunu, that is an interaction, global if you like, between sovereign peoples.

⁵ Stavenhagen says that the idea of social and human development has become the “step-child” of international priorities and that, rhetoric aside, development does not always take into account human values and social goals; rather, development is often confused with economic growth.

All human beings have to satisfy material, cultural, social and spiritual needs, and it is the purpose of development strategies and policies to contribute to their fulfilment.

⁶ This is relevant, especially for commercial endeavors. It essentially comes down to risk management, and diversification always helps minimize exposure to risk.

⁷ The international legal and political system that exists today had its genesis in the Winston Churchill – Franklin Roosevelt era – and those two men, representing Britain and America, were instrumental in guiding the formation of the UN Charter, and other key documents. It's probably not necessary to say that they did so with the protection and promotion of the political agenda of those countries in mind.

⁸ Sharon Venne, an indigenous rights advocate appointed as Special Rapporteur to the UN Expert Seminar on Treaties describes indigenous interaction with the UN system by saying:

When Indigenous Peoples came to the UN in 1977 as "outsiders" looking for our rightful place, we were met by state governments and the inherent prejudices against Indigenous Peoples. To overcome the prejudices, Indigenous Peoples have had to find our way among the different procedures and forums to create a space for ourselves. The struggle has been to break down the barriers that state governments have raised against Indigenous Peoples within and outside of the state system. Going to the UN was not intended as a promotion of the system but rather to concentrate efforts to break down the barriers of racism and colonization. Our struggle at the UN is a history of continued efforts to decolonize. Our focus has been our collective rights to our lands and territories, and this has been crystallized around the concept of self-determination.



⁹ This is mirrored ‘domestically’ with crown recognition of mana belonging to hapu vs dealing only with state approved governance entities....you’re limited in being able to make the entity / state accountable because the actual rights holders are silenced and have no avenues of redress

¹⁰ We are entitled to do that; self-determination, even in its most limited forms, entitles us to determine our journey for ourselves.

¹¹ An example of this, with global relevance, is the concept of sustainability. Resource management and climate change are huge political issues. Our worldview and our complex inter-relationships with our environment already encompass sustainability principles. Our tikanga provides the framework for management in relation to resources, which is subtly, but notably, different from resource management. Our framework regulates how we interact with our environment, and accounts for our taina status within the inter-related whakapapa web that makes up our ecosystem. In this system sustainability is not a goal it is a minimum standard; it is a binding and sacred obligation. ‘Resource management’ conversely places humans in tuakana status, and purports to manage the environment for exploitation. It is in this framework that erroneous systems like Shared Fisheries and Carbon Credits are conceived.

¹² It is our inherent and inalienable right to maintain our identities, and this is protected in our Treaty, and in international legal conventions. A prime example is the United Nations Charter, and the specific references contained in Articles 1, 14 and 27 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

¹³ In regards to our somewhat dysfunctional relationship with the Crown, we have some work to do by requiring the Crown to acknowledge and interact with us in a way that honours the implementation of our Treaty. That will take some time, but will be significantly progressed by our continued assertions and by our refusal to interact with them in any way that undermines our position. If they can not, or will not, recognize the full measure of our rights we must require them to do so or walk away. To continue to engage them while they are occupying a dishonorable position is to consent to our own degradation.

¹⁴ When your mana comes from a spiritual source it can not, and was not, ceded to any other party.

¹⁵ We met with their people, talked, spent time together. Three times we met and didn’t talk ‘business’ once – we talked politics – we scoped each other out to see if there were synergies between their worldview and ours. There was, overwhelmingly – it was like talking to another iwi of Aotearoa – and we, most importantly, engaged in spiritual ceremonies with them. They stayed on our marae, inside our whare tipuna – we attended sweat lodges, with them we smoked their sacred peace pipes and prayer ceremonies inside traditional round houses.