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Cultural Survival is an international indigenous rights organization with a global indigenous leadership and consultative status with ECOSOC. Cultural Survival, which is located in Cambridge, Massachusetts, and is registered as a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization in the United States, monitors the protection of indigenous peoples' rights in countries throughout the world and publishes its findings in its magazine, the Cultural Survival Quarterly, and on its website: www.cs.org. In preparing this report, Cultural Survival collaborated with student researchers from Harvard University and consulted with indigenous and human rights organizations, advocates, and other sources of verifiable information on New Zealand.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Race relations between New Zealand's native Māori and European settlers have been tense since colonization. In recent decades the government has promised to build a bicultural society, has set up a tribunal to negotiate indigenous land claims under the Treaty of Waitangi, and has produced a host of programs and councils ostensibly to improve Māori well-being. Yet these efforts have not substantially improved Māori economic, social, or cultural rights, eliminated discrimination against them, or resulted in significant remediation of historic wrongs against Māori communities, particularly with respect to the theft of Māori traditional lands and resources. In November 2006, New Zealand led the fight against United Nations adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.
BACKGROUND

The Māori, who trace their ancestry to original Polynesian inhabitants, and the Pakeha, descendants of the European colonists that arrived in the early 19th century, have had an uneasy relationship since Britain annexed New Zealand (Aotearoa) in 1840 by entering into the Treaty of Waitangi with the sovereign Māori rangatira (chiefs). Violations of the treaty began almost immediately; Māori lands were expropriated and Māori people were subjected to systematic efforts at assimilation.

Since the 1970s, the government has taken action to compensate Māori and to reestablish itself as a bicultural community. Māori currently comprise 15% of the population, a proportion that is increasing. The Māori population is young: in 2001, more than one-third (36%) of Māori were 14 years of age or younger. As that population comes of age and begins to search for jobs, housing, health care, and higher education, areas in which Māori traditionally have been at a disadvantage, the debate over the socioeconomic status of the Māori will become even more heated, and undoubtedly will contribute to the exodus of Māori to Australia, where one in seven Māori now live.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND SELF-DETERMINATION

While the Māori tribal system is generally recognized and respected by New Zealand’s government, the incongruity between the traditional iwi and hapu tribal substructures and the national government system creates obstacles to Māori political participation and empowerment. In an effort to reflect the population’s composition in Parliament, New Zealand established the Mixed Member Proportional system which assured the Māori seven seats in the country’s 121 member Parliament. In 2005, the Māori formed their own political party, thereby gaining four additional seats, but this is still not a sufficient number to ensure that Māori rights are given the protection they deserve.

On the local level, the participation of Māori in political affairs is even more disparate. Roughly 15% of the population is Māori, but less than 5% of members elected to local councils are Māori. Surveys conducted by local governments show a decrease in the number of Māori elected to councils over the past 10 years. The Local Electoral Act of 2001 opened the door to the establishment of Māori electoral wards, but instead of doing so, regional councils have consistently retained the status quo.

The Māori’s most prevalent complaint is the government’s unwillingness to respect their collective rights as indigenous peoples. The full extent of governmental opposition to group rights became apparent in 2006 when New Zealand led the fight to oppose UN General Assembly adoption of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. In a Statement issued along with the United States and Australia, New Zealand argued that “[t]he draft text also appears to confer upon a minority, a power of veto over the law of a democratic legislature.” The statement further claimed that the definition of self-determination in the Declaration “could be misrepresented as conferring a unilateral right of self-determination… and possible secession upon a specific subset of the national populace, thus threatening the political unity, territorial integrity and indeed the security of existing UN Member States.”
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**LAND AND RESOURCES**

The Treaty of Waitangi guaranteed the Māori “full exclusive and undisturbed possession of their Lands and Estates, Forests, Fisheries, and other properties which they may collectively or individually possess,” and made assurances that the Crown would recognize the Māori’s resources, cultural heritage, and traditional chieftainship authority. Nonetheless, the government has consistently violated Māori rights to land and resources, and has exacerbated their problems by urbanizing the Māori population.

Under the Māori system, land ownership and use are communal, rendering individual titles and deeds irrelevant and useless. The New Zealand government historically exploited this fact and seized almost all of the Māori’s traditional land. As of January 2006, the Māori trustee controlled 135,400 hectares of land, valued at a total of $117 million. To address Māori land claims, the New Zealand government established the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975, but the treaty does not have the force of law and its findings cannot be challenged in court. In 30 years, the Tribunal has registered 1,236 claims, 49 of which have been settled by the government and others partially settled. In 2008, two land claims were resolved in a step towards recognizing community ownership, although some Māori groups claim the settlements did not adequately reflect original tribal ownership. The Waitangi Tribunal process requires protracted negotiations between the government and Māori groups seeking restoration of their lands. Moreover, it is the only procedure available to the Māori; New Zealand does not have a written constitution, and the country’s human rights legislation does not provide sufficient protective mechanisms regarding collective Māori rights emanating from the treaty. In addition, Māori complainants are required to waive their legal right to the protection of the courts when entering into settlement negotiations.

The 2004 Foreshore and Seabed Act, which declared that the Crown retained property claims over the foreshore and seabed areas of the coast, which are integral to the cultural, social, and economic livelihood of the Māori, brought many of these problems to a head. Claims that the Act constitutes a violation of Māori human rights sparked a backlash from the media in New Zealand, provoking assertions that Māori do not deserve special treatment in the political or legal arena. Tensions escalated and in late 2004 some 30,000 to 50,000 people took part in a protest march (or hikoi) in Wellington.

Lacking tribal lands, as high as 83% of Māori have moved to urban centers in search of work, pushed onward by the government’s urban relocation program. Urbanization has broken down community ties and left Māori vulnerable to discrimination and poverty and associated criminal justice and health problems. The government has promised to address Māori concerns in a manner fitting a newly urbanized population, but the Māori do not want to be permanently installed in cities and accuse the government of using their plight as an excuse to avoid returning their traditional lands.

**DISCRIMINATION**

Māori are discriminated against in education, employment, housing, healthcare, and numerous other ways. The media exacerbates the problem by perpetuating discriminatory stereotypes. New Zealand’s Human Rights Act makes it illegal to broadcast words or matter that is insulting or which “brings into contempt” any ethnic, racial, or national group. Yet a 2004
study on Māori and the media found that television programs denigrate or use insulting comments about Māori, often portraying them as getting unfair benefits or being corrupt or incompetent. Such perpetuation of stereotypes, coupled with a lack of land and relocation to urban areas has left the Māori vulnerable to many other forms of discrimination.

**Discrimination in Housing**

Housing is a critical issue for Māori who are four times more likely to live in overcrowded homes than the national average. Home ownership rates are much lower for Māori than non-Māori and have declined over the past 10 years, a pattern that is expected to continue. The number of Māori renting homes is therefore higher than the proportion of non-Māori, which has led to increased complaints about discrimination and the quality of available rental properties. The government has responded by increasing state housing with traditional Māori design elements, but rental prices often are prohibitive.

**Discrimination in the Justice System**

Urban relocation has also resulted in an explosion of Māori involvement in gang violence and petty theft, and Māori now constitute half of New Zealand’s prison population. Contributing factors include lack of employment, discrimination in arrest procedures, and a lower quality of legal representation, among others. The government, working with Māori leaders, has set up various organizations to deal with these problems, but such efforts ignore the urbanization, discrimination, and economic deprivation that are at their root.

In October 2007, police raided a Maori village (Ruatoki) and nearby town (Whakatane) to break up alleged terrorist camps. Although it is unclear whether any threat actually existed, complaints of police brutality and racial profiling have “set back relations between Māori and the government 100 years,” said Pita Sharples, co-leader of the Māori Party.

**Discrimination in Health Services**

Discrimination and socioeconomic disparity have resulted in significantly reduced access to affordable healthcare for Māori. Life expectancy for Māori is 7.6 years shorter than for non-Māori. Child health in particular remains a crucial problem. Epidemics of vaccine-preventable diseases such as pneumonia and bronchitis overload the healthcare system each winter. Vaccinations are not subsidized so few Māori can afford them. Overcrowded housing contributes to the spread of meningitis, which predominantly infects Māori children. Hearing loss in Māori children is higher than in non-Māori children and tends to be discovered later, resulting in fewer treatment options. Suicide rates in New Zealand are extremely high, and rates for Māori are much higher than non-Māori. Mental health services, for Māori children and youth are sorely lacking. The most successful healthcare improvements have come from Māori initiatives. Today over 230 Māori healthcare providers serve Māori communities, but face severe funding and payment disparities. The New Zealand Nurses Organization has been lobbying for increased funding to address the extreme wage disparity between Māori healthcare providers and their non-Māori counterparts. In order to address these issues, the government should focus on the socioeconomic factors that cause overcrowded housing, insufficient income to pay for vaccines, and limited health care access.

**Discrimination in Education**

For decades Māori were taught in English to encourage their assimilation, and Māori language education has been slow to recover. Excellent headway has been made to reverse the
Discrimination in Employment

The disparity in education retention rates is both a cause and a result of other socioeconomic issues. Average incomes are 29% higher for New Zealanders with a tertiary education compared to those with only upper secondary education, and one New Zealand study reports that the returns from education are even greater for Māori than non-Māori. Given the strong association between education and income levels, it is not surprising that the average Māori income is only 77% of the national average. From 1998 to 2005, Māori unemployment fell from 19% to 8.7%, which is a remarkable improvement, though Māori unemployment is still higher than the total population unemployment rate of 3.8%. The decrease appears to indicate the gradual success of the government's "Focus on Employment" programs. These programs involved Māori communities and promoted such community initiatives such as Mahi a Iwi (helping Māori communities identify opportunities for self-reliance) and Wahine Pakari (a business training program run by Māori women).

Culture

Since the 1971 Race Relations Act, which rejected New Zealand's prior program of assimilation, the New Zealand government has made an increased effort to support Māori efforts to revive their culture. This may be the government's most successful area of work, though it tends to favor those aspects of Māori culture that benefit the promotion of tourism, discrimination in employment, and protection of the Māori language and culture. The government currently funds two radio news services in Māori (Ruia Mai and Mana News), provides incentives to radio stations that produce shows in Māori, and funds bilingual Māori television. Still, a 2004 study on Māori and the media found that few newspapers and television programs covered subjects relevant to Māori and that Māori were unlikely to watch bilingual programs, calling them "frivolous." Officially, Māori have the right to speak their language during legal proceedings, to have a translator provided by the court, and to have documents translated into Māori, but none of these processes is automatic and each requires extensive applications and timely notifications. As a result, few, if any, people use Māori in court.

The promotion of Māori works of art is of great economic importance to a country where tourism is a mainstay of the economy. Currently, the Māori are using this to their advantage. The government has taken steps to develop and protect a trademark for authentic Māori artwork and products. In 1991, six Māori iwi brought a cultural property claim against the Waitangi Tribunal, accusing the Crown of failing to protect the indigenous plants and animals of New Zealand.

Retention is a Tribunal, accusing and products. The government has taken steps to develop and protect a trademark for authentic Māori artwork and tourism is a mainstay of the economy. Currently, the Māori are using this to their advantage. The promotion of Māori works of art is of great economic importance to a country where
Zealand (a treasure, or taonga, of the Māori people protected under the Waitangi Tribunal). This claim raises issues regarding who is responsible for and who is involved in environmental conservation decisions. The claimants also accuse the Crown of failing to protect Māori sovereignty over mātauranga Māori (Māori traditional knowledge) regarding the flora and fauna, and related arts, carvings, or health and medicine. The case has also raised implications for preservation of Māori taonga, such as traditional artifacts, carvings, or mokomokai (preserved heads). While the tribunal’s final report has not yet been released, the fact that this case has dragged on for a decade and a half illustrates how the government uses its legal bureaucracy to stall Māori development.
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to give the appearance of action, when in reality this host thwarts the attempts by Māori to improve their status as a community. Statistical information provided by the government is almost overwhelming, but there has been little evidence of actions taken to mitigate the great disparities in rights, privileges, and quality of life between the Māori and the rest of New Zealand’s population that are evident therein. Most significantly, in— the first legal protection of the principles of collective and minority rights in the international arena.
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The Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples (Articles 10, 11, 26, 27, 28) and the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights (Article 1) both guarantee the right of indigenous peoples to control their land, resources, and the wealth derived from them. Although New Zealand has not signed International Labor Organization Convention 169 concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples, New Zealand is one of the founding members of the ILO and is therefore bound by the main principles of the ILO which include the elimination of discrimination.
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Declaring that the Crown retained property claims over the foreshore and seabed areas of the coast, both of which are integral to the cultural, social, and economic livelihood of the Mäori, the Foreshore and Seabed Act has alienated much of the indigenous community.

According to the Special Rapporteur on Indigenous Rights, this backlash has only fueled racial discrimination against Mäori tribes.
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: 36% of deaf and hearing impaired children in 1994 were Māori.
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In 2006, the Māori infant mortality rate was 6.7 per 1,000, down from 11.5 per 1,000 in 1996, and only slightly higher than the 5.1 per 1,000 rate of non-Māori.
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The United Nations Committee on the Rights of Child noted with concern the insufficient youth
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The Declaration of Rights of Indigenous People and ILO Convention 169 establish the right of indigenous peoples to education in their native language. In order to provision of education in Māori language, its efforts towards furthering the provision of education in Māori language. Partially due to receiving education in a non-native tongue, retention has been a particularly pressing issue for Māori.
Retention is a particularly important issue for Māori. Retention at the secondary school level (ages 16-17) has decreased roughly 5% since 1999, with an increasing gap between Māori and non-Māori students.

In the proportion of students staying at 16 (61%) was one-quarter lower than the proportion of New Zealand European students (83%). At 18, was drastically lower than European New Zealanders the gap is even more extreme (39% Māori students stayed compared with 61% NZ Europeans),.

Furthermore, the proportion of an 50% higher than those with a school qualification except in low-level tertiary certification programs.

And while Māori language and culture should not be relegated to special schools. Instead, the government should embrace the Māori language and culture as a subject relevant to all New Zealanders.
Such a step would go a long way towards eradicating the discrimination that keeps the Māori disadvantaged.

Māori students cite the cost of tertiary programs and loans as prohibitive and the Special Rapporteur has recommended that government subsidies could further increase Māori education participation.

- average weekly income was $658 for Europeans, $506 for Māori.

Education reform and support for community initiatives are important and potentially successful approaches of rectifying the current inequalities between Māori and non-Māori employment opportunities.
Culture is an important aspect of Māori life, and it represents both a means of preserving tradition and a resource for future development.

in some ways the government has promote only are useful for promoting and for placating the international community.

The Declaration on Rights of Indigenous People, Convention on the Rights of the Child, and ILO Convention 169 all support the right of indigenous people to maintaining and using their traditional languages.
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Rather than promote the use of Māori in business or government, the government promoted its use in television programming: a sign of the government’s condescending attitude towards the merit of Māori people and language.
The New Zealand government has made some actions to protect Māori art and culture, though this appears to be an economic decision rather than a humanitarian one.

The promotion of Māori works of art is of great economic importance to a country where tourism is a mainstay of the economy. Currently, the Māori people are using this economic pull to their advantage.

often called the “flora and fauna claim” since the claimants accuse

CONCLUSIONS

Despite a few concessionary efforts to include the Māori in the political arena of New Zealand, the government has offered only transparent and ultimately inefficacious measures to present a façade of good faith to the international community, which has been repeatedly belied by the many obstacles it has placed in the way of a full realization of indigenous rights. Even the most concrete gains, such as the increasing number of Māori seats in the government system, force the Māori to forsake their own traditions, customs, and practices of self-governance in favor of assimilation into the mainstream culture and polity. Additionally, while claiming to support the rights of the Māori people through a wealth of government commissions, publications, and statistical analyses devoted to the issue, the government’s discriminatory seizure of land—most notably of late through the Foreshore and Seabed Act—is an outright affront to the ability of the Māori to survive (let alone thrive) within New Zealand, threatening their existence economically, socially, and culturally. Like the government’s obstruction of the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, New Zealand has systematically used the labyrinthine court system to delay or prevent the redress of Māori lands, even in cases pending from the country’s colonial past. The Treaty of Waitangi, one of the only
statutory bases for Māori land rights, is not treated by the government as a legal
document, and the government has forced the Māori to cede all legal and political power
to their white counterparts, who have little to no knowledge or interest in their internal
structures. In essence, all of these outlets have corroborated to strip the Māori of any
potential power within their rightful legal channels for compensation, undermining not
only their collective rights but their individual rights as citizens of New Zealand.
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