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Abstract
Drawing on a range of national and international literature, this scoping paper explores some aspects of ‘who we are’ within a New Zealand context. Throughout the world the conceptualisation of ethnicity, or in some countries race, is undergoing significant change. There are many drivers including high rates of international migration, a vibrant indigenous rights movement in some countries, growing incidence and recognition of ethnic intermarriage, a concern about racism and discrimination, and, connected with this, a debate around how to support and, in some situations, integrate increasingly diverse populations into the wider community. Against this background, the paper draws together some ideas in the following areas: ethnogenesis; the official construction of ethnicity in New Zealand; ethnic intermarriage, and related to that, the transmission of ethnicity to children and multiple ethnicity; ethnic mobility; indigeneity; genetics, the human genome project and ethnicity; and the recent growth of New Zealander responses in the New Zealand census. It is not possible to draw many strong conclusions from the burgeoning national and international literature except there is a very vigorous and complex debate taking place about identity in most countries around the world. While there are some commonalities in the international debates, many local factors affect country specific discussions. However, some of the very broad threads that can be drawn from the literature include: while it is clear that for some people, and in some situations, ethnicity is a critical and daily part of their identity, for others ethnicity can be a minor part of identity or, in particular contexts, ethnicity might have little meaning; that identities are always emerging; that ethnicity is multi dimensional and that, in most countries, there is some fluidity of ethnicity; that identity is not only expressed but is perceived and observed and this perception of others can forge, reinforce and, at times, restrict identities; that the division of the world population, or the population of specific countries, into neat, non-overlapping groups is increasingly problematic; and that official definitions of ethnicity officially may not match all that closely ideas of ‘who we are’ personally. All of this suggests that, from a New Zealand policy perspective, while ethnicity can be an important analytical variable, much care is needed in its use.
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1 Introduction

This paper explores some aspects of ‘who are we’ within a New Zealand context. The paper is based around the broad research question ‘[w]hat does the evolving research literature tell us about the collection, measurement, and analysis of ethnicity data? This includes a fundamental question of ‘should we count’ and then, if we do count, how should we use such data.’ While the overall focus of the paper is on ethnic identities, it is clear that each of us has many identities. Some of these are individual, others may be related to membership of some group. For some people, factors such as disability, gender, sexual orientation, gang or service club membership, occupation, marital status or maybe religion will strongly influence their identity. For others these types of identity may have little meaning in everyday lives. Some aspects of who we are will be chosen, some of our identity will be beyond our control. For some people, identities will be relatively fixed, for others they will be fluid. Some of the fluidly can be influenced by context, for example where we are located, including which country we might be living in. Various identities might have official meanings, others will be private and these official and private meanings may or may not overlap. Some identities may, in fact, never be acknowledged in public settings. Ethnic identity or identities, like other identities, can be just one element of self for some people. But for others they can be a central part of defining who they are.

Throughout the world the conceptualisation of ethnicity, or in some countries race, is undergoing significant change. There are many drivers. One is the increasingly complex politics of representation and recognition. But this complexity is fuelled by a range of other often inter-related factors. These include high rates of international migration, a vibrant indigenous rights movement in some countries, growing incidence and recognition of ethnic intermarriage, a concern about racism and discrimination, and, connected with this, a debate around how to support and, in some situations, integrate increasingly diverse populations into the wider community. Not surprisingly, one result of all this change has been an explosion of national and international literature on the conceptualisation, measurement and meaning of ethnicity. While only a small country, New Zealand has added to the international literature, and is often seen as a ‘leader’ in the early adoption of the concept of self identified ethnicity. Building on a long history of New Zealand research on ethnicity and identity, some of the most recent examples of this New Zealand literature has emerged through projects supported by the Official Statistics Research fund. In New Zealand, while there has been a range of small-scale ethnic-related projects there has been little recent formal investigation to comprehend what this new national and international literature means in a New Zealand context.

Anecdotal evidence implies that ethnicity is often misunderstood and therefore can at times be misused in many environments, including in public policy development and social policy monitoring. Certainly, in the debate about the large ‘New Zealander’ type response in the 2006 census, there have been many statements made that cannot, as yet, be easily supported by facts. This is partly because we still know very little about how people construct their ethnicities in New Zealand and how this construction may be changing over time or in differing contexts, and what the nature of the relationship between these changes may be.

As background to this project, one of our researchers, Anna Kivi, read widely in a broad range of areas. Her drawing together even the most recent literature simply confirmed the massive growth in writing around broad ethnic issues. For example, the searching for the word ‘ethnicity’ in Google Scholar brings up over 1 million articles and even limiting the articles to those published post 2000 still brings up over 200,000 articles. We therefore decided to concentrate on some specific areas of literature in this initial exploration. Those chosen were:
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- language and ethnicity,
- religion and ethnicity,
- nationalism, national identity and ethnicity,
- ancestry and ethnicity,
- race and ethnicity,
- the influence of the state on ethnic identities, and
- how processes of assimilation and/or acculturation of migrants or minority groups affect outcomes for them.

Realising that there is a limited scope to do many of these themes justice in this present project, we then refocused on a number of issues that we consider of particular importance to New Zealand. These are:

- ethnogenesis,
- the official construction of ethnicity in New Zealand,
- ethnic intermarriage, the transmission of ethnicity to children and multiple ethnicity,
- ethnic mobility,
- indigeneity,
- genetics, the human genome project and ethnicity, and
- the recent growth of New Zealander responses in the New Zealand Census.

The literature came from a range of areas. Some came from searches of academic databases. Other literature came from searches of institutes, think tanks and overseas statistical offices known to have an interest in ethnic issues. Some came from ‘grey literature’ produced in New Zealand, that is official and unofficial working papers and policy papers. In addition, we consulted the main books on ethnicity written in New Zealand in the last couple of decades. However, we cannot claim to have undertaken a systematic scientifically based search across all relevant areas of the international literature. In addition, we were guided by the topics considered at the Should we count, how should we count, and why? Conference held in late 2007. We therefore hope that we do consider (if only briefly) most of the main issues currently being discussed in the international literature, but cannot guarantee this.

In terms of our specific areas of interest, the first area, ethnogenesis, is not, as yet, a term commonly used in New Zealand. But we consider it is important to begin our discussion with some canvassing of this area as it helps set the scene for much of the subsequent discussion. We then follow this with a brief discussion of the official construction of ethnicity in New Zealand. This is ground that has been worked over many times in New Zealand, but the section helps contextualise the following two sections as they rely on the idea that there are definable and measurable ethnic groups nationally and internationally.

Ethnogenesis leads us onto a section on ethnic intermarriage, the transmission of ethnicity to the next generation and, as one result of intermarriage, the affiliation of some people with more than one ethnic group. While drawing on some overseas literature, this section primarily brings together recent New Zealand research in this area. After little research on intermarriage in the past few decades in New Zealand, there is a new interest in the topic. Amongst a range of other influencing factors, complex ancestral backgrounds or multiple ethnicities opens up the possibilities for ethnic mobility. This issue is examined in relation to overseas literature and some recent exploratory New Zealand studies.

We then move beyond current New Zealand classification systems and explore the concept of indigeneity. Discussions of indigeneity often centre around ancestry and inheritance of

---

1 We discuss this conference in more detail in a latter section of the paper.
rights and so this leads us onto a brief discussion of genetics, the human genome project, race and ethnicity, broad issues that comes up in our initial discussion of ethnogenesis.

The last section to be explored draws at times on issues raised in many of the proceeding sections. The growth of the New Zealander response was dramatic in the 2006 census. Is this a case of ethnic mobility, is it a new emerging ethnic group, or perhaps for some it may represent a ‘second’ indigenous group? Based on recent research in New Zealand, we explore what this response may be saying about who at least some of us are.

In undertaking this work we are very aware that making sense of ethnic literature is a task which soon leads into a myriad of definitions, beliefs and perceptions as to what ethnicity may entail. For “to ask what is ‘ethnic’ in literature will elicit as many answers as there are writers and texts” (Davis, 2000: xiv). So we are conscious that there is much left out of this paper. In addition, to add to the complexity, it has to be acknowledged that ethnic literature, and our interpretation of it, is, as with any research in any field, consciously and unconsciously filled with the views, histories, assumptions, and lived experiences of the writer(s).

It is also important to note that in 2008 Statistics New Zealand undertook a review of their ethnic classification in anticipation of the 2011 Census. This paper informed, but did not cross over into their review. Therefore, the paper excludes a review of the measure and any recommendations pertaining to the collection of ethnic data for the 2011 census. While it also excludes specific comments on the usefulness of official ethnic data for public policy, the relationship between ethnicity and public policy is noted as an important context of the politics of ethnicity.

This is not merely a strategic separation of the two aspects. Michael Banton argues that the sociological problems presented by ethnic relations should be distinguished from problems of social policy:

“[Academics have] built up a substantial body of knowledge about inter-group relations. .... One reason why the knowledge is not better organized is that so many of the contributors have been more interested in policy questions, including the political dimensions, than in purely sociological questions.” (Banton, 2008: 1267)

Finally, it is important to set out what this paper aims to achieve and its limitations. The limitations of our search methods have already been outlined. The paper therefore needs to be considered a scoping exercise, a kind of partial ‘stock take’ or ‘brain dump’ of ideas around identity and ethnicity. It certainly cannot pretend to be in any way the final word on ‘who we are’. We have briefly explored some areas we think are important, but each area could provide enough material for a separate book. Our main aim is to simply prompt some wider debate about ‘who we are’ and how this relates to the construction of ethnicity in a New Zealand context. In doing so we are aware that we ask many questions but answer very few of them.
2 Ethnogenesis

There are two principal strands to ethnogenesis. The first and by far the more recent theme lies in the province of psychology and refers to the creation of ethnicity and identity at the personal individual level. This includes the subsequent construction of ethnicity at the societal level based on commonalities between how these individual identities find their public expression.

The second strand has a longer heritage and operates primarily at societal level. It refers to the process through which new ethnicities, as a means of grouping and identifying people, emerge either from within society or as a result of new or changed contact with that society. This strand has spawned a separate paradigm among medieval European historians (Curta, 2005; Gillett, 2006). As new groups emerge, the naming of the ethnicity evolves, with either new terms being created, or old terms being co-opted, to describe the new group.

The two strands are, of course, not independent of each other, though they work in opposing directions – the individual positioning themselves within society versus social forces outside of the group assigning people through an “othering” process. The tension this creates can be seen in the completion of questionnaires about ethnicity, when people perceive a discrepancy between their ethnic identity, that is how they see themselves, and their ethnic identification, that is what they say about their ethnicity (Kukutai, 2008; Liebler, 2004).

In both cases the processes involve a two-way feedback mechanism. In the individual case, people identify themselves in complex environmental ways. They are influenced by how they see themselves, how they imagine other people see them in contrast to or in degree of similarity with other people, and when they interact with discriminatory environments. Sense of identity remains context sensitive – identification may change as the context changes – but it also has history, and as such is influenced by memory. Memory plays a key role in the creation and maintenance of identity (Kandel, 2007; Kandel, 2008). In the case of emergent groups, the process involves aggregate outcomes of these individual process communicated in such a way as to generate a sense of group solidarity and cohesion as well as a sense of difference from other groups. New groups are one outcome of an increasing awareness of difference from existing categories within the normative framework. An important element in both cases is the awareness by individuals of how other people see them and to what degree they perceive other people’s recognition of them as different.

One important aspect of the process which needs to be acknowledged at the outset is that group creation is not generally deliberative. The experimental work of Kirby, Cornish and Smith (2008) on language demonstrates well that the social structure which manifests itself as an ethnicity is the outcome of cumulative adaptive evolution, with structure beginning to manifest itself after very few iterations. However, measurement requires collecting information and it is probably that one aspect of the iterative process is the interaction with mechanisms for gathering the information. The process of collection is such that the questionnaire designer is also subject to the same sets of adaptive behaviours, resulting, for example, in a set of tickboxes that may in fact reify categories which do not map social realities comfortably (Bedford and Didham, 2001) but which are accepted as having some generalised meaning within some externally imposed analytical frame.

The earliest use of the word ‘ethnogenesis’ in English is cited by the Oxford English Dictionary as having been by Lester Singer, who noted that:

“Following Emancipation, the group-forming process moved with much greater speed and intensity than before. I propose that this formative process be referred to as ‘ethnogenesis’, meaning by this term the process whereby a people, that is an ethnic group, comes into existence.” (Singer, 1962:423)
However, the recognition of the process is not new (Taylor, 1979), nor indeed necessarily new to English since the term was current in European academic circles prior to this (Wierciński, 1962). Ethnogenesis as a term to describe the process dates back to the mid nineteenth century, appearing regularly as ethnogénie in French (for example Roget, 1859) and as Stammmeskunde der Völker in German (Lundman, 1952) and Volkstum (Gillett, 2006), though often associated with racial typology and eugenics. One of the early expositions of the process is to be found in André-Marie Ampère’s, *Essai sur La Philosophie des Sciences*.

It is significant that this should be articulated among European thinkers, since this period in history coincided with the rapid expansion of European empires and linked to concepts of nationalism. This was the Europe of the Enlightenment and of Herder, and the continuing basis of thinking about ethnicity (Wimmer, 2007). Among the features of this expansion were the adoption ideas from the more advanced civilisations of the Arabs, Indians and Chinese, idealised by Romanticism as the Noble Savage. One of the darker moments in the history of Enlightenment ideas and ideals was seen in the perverted racism of the 1930s and 1940s that drove much of European politics for people across Europe and North America.

Subsequent increasing interaction between different peoples and cultures, and a rise in migration and intermarriage between European migrant settlers and local populations was entwined with the Lamarckian idea of races, with the emphasis on the heritability of environmentally induced characteristics as an explanation of social behaviour and physical appearance. These changing populations challenged traditional European ideals of homogenous nation states and sought exploration of new approaches to social organisation (Moore, 2001; Voss, 2008). Associated with these challenges were the humanitarian principles current in England in the late 18th and early 19th Centuries and increasing fascination for theories of indigeneity and its articulation with place (Smith and Ward, 2000; Anderson and Perrin, 2008).

Barth (1969) introduced a broad framework of macro-social formulations, meso-institutional and micro-individual levels of society. At each of these levels ethnicity is conceptualised in different ways. Viewing ethnicity within these layers is one way to make sense of ethnicity's many sides whilst demonstrating the interrelationships, the strong links that exist between layers of social structures.

At the macro level are the broad frameworks which underpin the economic and political composition of society. Macro-structures are intertwined with the distribution of power, wealth and authority. Once entrenched, these may have significant influence on outcomes for ethnic minorities and majorities, often with oppressive consequences as attested by the treatment of mixed-race people in Apartheid South Africa, of Chechens in the former Soviet Union and of Mexican informal migrants in the United States of America. On the other hand these macro-scale structures may act as enablers of social justice. Bi-cultural/multicultural New Zealand is driven by its macro composition but, in contrast to the former examples, it is overtly based on the principle of equality and human rights, though still couched in terms of recognition of ethnic difference (Barth, 1969; Wimmer, 1996; Fenton, 1999).

Meso-structures are the institutions which connect the state to the individual. These may be independent or regulated by the state. It is through this level of institution that ethnic identities are preserved or distinguished. The history of Māori language development is an example of the influence of educational institutions on cultural maintenance stemming from

---

2 In a later section on genetics we discuss the ideas of Linnaeus. While the relationships between the two streams of thinking are complex, Lamarck was more concerned with how environments changed things and Linnaeus was an archetypical taxonomist, see

the ethnogenesis of Māori as an ethnonym. From the late 19th century until the late 20th century an English education system dominated which not merely considered mastery of the Māori language to be a social, educational and economic disadvantage, but was actively discouraged. This effectively assisted in the dramatic decline in the use of Te Reo Māori (Barth, 1969; Fenton, 1999). However, since the 1980s support from the government through educational institutions has lead to some revival of the language, at least in a standardised form. Consequential loss of dialect knowledge with the associated cultural components remains an increasingly important issue for iwi identity.

One useful aspect of Barth's schema is that it clarifies the linkage between the two key strands of ethnogenesis. Ethnogenesis occurs at each of the levels through differing but interdependent dialogues. At the micro-scale people modify their identity in relationship to the histories, geographies and social interactions of their everyday life. One implication of this is that ethnic mobility and ethnogenesis have intrinsic connections. Identity creation for the individual is a continuous process, so ethnogenesis at the individual psychological level can never be complete. As these identities evolve with changing environmental stimuli, an individual may choose to adopt a different set of existing descriptors to better encapsulate what is seen as the core set of identities, resulting in ethnic mobility. In some cases, though, these changes of identity may require adoption of a new descriptor as none of the existing descriptors sit comfortably with the individual. Should a significant number of people find resonance in the same or a similar descriptor, this can lead to the creation of a new ethnicity with general social acceptance as a valid ethnic group (Wimmer, 2008a, 2008b). At the macro-scale, this process links directly with questions of otherness, power and authority, and how these relate to the legitimation of identity.

The concept of ethnogenesis satisfactorily explains the manner in which identity manifests itself within society and within the individuals who make up that society (Matsuda, 2001). It approaches the dynamic and fundamental aspects of ethnic creation in three ways. Ethnogenesis is used to describe the process of ethnic identification of self and the labeling of 'others'. The consequence of ethnogenesis is associated with the two linguistic components: the changing meaning of ethnic labels over time and the requirement for new ethnonyms for entirely new ethnic groups. European medieval historians have adopted the term to describe a model with which to interpret historical processes (Gillett, 2006).

The use of the term ethnogenesis by historians of medieval Europe not only is appropriate as a partial explanation of the transition from the Roman world dominated by Hellenistic worldviews to the feudalism of the medieval period, it also sheds a little light on the process of ethnogenesis in the wider context. As Gillett observed, “group identity … was not fixed and simply hereditary, but had to be generated and reified by the efforts of the elites” (Gillett, 2006: 244). Thus, ethnic groups developed by accretion of individuals shifting allegiance as new alliances developed. Ethnic mobility of this type continues to be an element of the process of ethnogenesis. As new groups emerge, membership in the group remains fluid as people choose to identify or choose to cease to identify with the group.

Choice of identity is not independent of context for two reasons. Firstly, the categorisation of others, as opposed to categorisation of self- or own-group-identification, is fundamental

---

3 An ethnonym is the name applied to a given ethnic group. Ethnonyms can be divided into two categories: exonyms, where the name of the ethnic group has been created by another group of people and autonyms, where the name is created and used by the ethnic group itself.
to the notion of ethnicity because it provides a social reference point against which self-identification can be expressed. As Parekh has observed, personal identity "provides a vantage point from which to view one’s past and construct a meaningful narrative of one’s life" (Parekh, 2008:13). The practice of ‘othering’ legitimates perceptions of self in a contrastive sense. Secondly, power and authority have significant influence on the outcome of ethnic categories, especially in the maintenance of a sense of belonging. Power and authority is associated with ethnic self-identification in that people will identify with ethnicities with which they have an empathy. When the established groups do not resonate, individuals will tend to seek out other descriptors to define what they see as their ethnicities. This influence is basic to understanding and examining ethnic identities (Jenkins, 2008).

The social process of creating ethnicity draws on contextual information from the historical, social and political environment. People when thinking about their identity may invoke spiritual beliefs and ancestral connections over material symbols, for instance, or when labeling others consider dress over food (Bonilla, 2005). The scale at which these influences operate differs and offers one way of systematizing thinking about ethnicity.

It has commonly been assumed that identity is not innate but develops from a young age as one starts to consider differences with others and compare themselves – ‘who and what am I compared to ‘them?’” This concept of otherness underlies the bases of individual, and of all, ethnic identity. Without an ‘other’ to compare and be different to there can be no ‘I.’ (Barth, 1969; Nagel, 1999; Voss, 2008). Identity of oneself is, “an unarticulated negotiation between what you call yourself and what others call you” (Hitt, 2005, cited in Voss, 2008: 1) and whatever notion we may have of ourselves must sit within others views of difference (Nagel, 1999). Fundamental to this process of identity creation is the neurological basis of a sense of identity (Kandel, 2008), because the context within which identity decisions are made are set by the individual's prior history, and changes in identification are associated with modifications to the world view defined within that individual's brain. There is a growing awareness that there may however be innate aspects to identity. Current epigenetic research suggest that even though cultural identity is not encoded into the genome, it may be heritable by epigenetic processes. This is suggested by the association of certain mental illnesses which involve identity disorders with epigenetic processes (Durham, 1990; Haig, 2000; Stöger, 2007; Stöger, 2008) and the possibility that cultural preferences may be transmissible by the same mechanism.

Sitting alongside self-identification is the idea that ethnicity is a personal choice. Personal choice does not, of course, mean free choice. Whilst an individual may in theory have freedom to choose, choices are constrained to a set of ethnicities typically defined by the social and political acceptability of ethnic categories available to that individual. Choice of ethnic identity too is set by an individual’s perception of an ethnicity's meaning to other groups and its usefulness in different settings. For example, in the case of the emergent ‘New Zealander’ ethnicity, it is known anecdotally that some people chose the label deliberately to express their rejection of other labels (notably in this context New Zealand European and/or Māori), or indeed a rejection of the validity of the concept of ethnicity entirely. Conversely, others chose the label for a number of other reasons such as making a statement that they see their cultural or political place belonged specifically to some aspect of the concept ‘New Zealand’, while other people who had previously identified with New Zealander as an ethnicity deliberately and explicitly rejected the label because of the

---

4 The term epigenetics refers to changes in gene expression which not only may remain throughout the remainder of a cell’s life, but may last for multiple generations. While there is no change in the underlying DNA sequence of the organism, this may be heritable in some circumstances. Of particular relevance here is the research on heritable mental disorders which relate to dysfunctional forms of normal identity expression. One implication of this is that epigenetic processes are implicated in the ethnogenesis of identity, linking epigenetics with genetics and with the biology of sociology.
Who are we? The conceptualisation and expression of ethnicity in New Zealand

Historically individuals have been defined by the groups they are associated with. Identity has been formed this way from the group level down: individuals are formed and moulded from the top down in the form of nationalism, national and group identity. It has been widely supported that an individual takes their identity from these sets of entities. Recent post-postmodern literature is beginning to challenge this ideal and suggest the importance of understanding ethnic identity from the individual up. Brubaker (2004), Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992); and others have attempted a fresh examination of ethnicity by beginning to dissect prevailing analytical idioms. Brubaker was inspired into this new perspective after a small scale qualitative studying of the everyday preoccupations of ordinary people. Through an examination of these preoccupations, Brubaker recognised Eric Hobsbawm’s maxim that nationalism and national identity, while constructed from above, “cannot be understood unless also analysed from below, that is in terms of the assumptions, hopes, needs, longings and interested of ordinary people, which are not necessarily national and still less nationalist.” (Hobsbawm, 1990:10).

If for Brubaker the tyranny of polities, of groupism and of constructivism, has mislead ethnicists into a blind alley, then it is from the work of geneticists that an escape route seemed to appear. If the source of identity lay in the genes, there would be a ready means scientifically to classify people into useful groups. While there is some correlation between broad continental geographic groupings and some patterns of genetic diversity (Risch et al, 2002), these are rarely simple because of the effect of the many migrations out of Africa over a very long period of time and the subsequent interbreeding between groups as their migration paths have crossed and re-crossed. From a genetic viewpoint, ethnogenesis would occur at the interfaces of these distinct groups – the point at which they intersect and new distinct groups emerge out of the mixing of these races. But it has also been noted (Lewontin, 1972; Frank, 2007; Phillips et al, 2007) that human genetic variation does not cluster into distinct groups, nevertheless this does not render invalid the reality of social distinction made on the basis of genetically transmitted variation (Edwards, 2003). We return to aspects of genetics and identity later in this paper.

While there is potential for substantial further understanding to be gained from genome research, the process of identity creation and the association of ethnicity and factors such as disease transmission or susceptibility, it is only part of the biological story. Environmental factors such as stress and diet can have biological consequences that are transmitted to offspring without a single change to a gene. While this requires a major rethink of some aspects of evolutionary genetics and heredity, this is now regarded as an important aspect of disease and disorder transmission. This is especially so in the study of cancers and mental disorders that may be transmitted along family lines with no discernable genetic cause. There is a strong scientific basis to this in epigenetic change where it is not the presence of the gene so much as the regulation of the operation, at the molecular level, of that gene within a cell that is paramount, and these epigenetic processes are inheritable (Stöger, 2007, 2008). The fact that this process is associated with a range of mental states suggests that this may be associated very directly with the transmission and maintenance of cultural factors such as identity which are constructed and maintained by neurochemistry (Kandel, 2008). This process would satisfactorily explain ethnogenesis, the creation of one’s identities, in the individual mental developmental stages and the ongoing modification of these identities.

At one level, the human genome explains most of the phenotypical differences between people. A number of non-physical attributes also may be explained this way. However, when it comes to ethnicity and the creation of new ethnicities, these differences may be of very small importance. If skin colour, for example, matters – and there is substantial evidence that it does to some extent (Callister, 2008) – it is not everything. A Chinese teenager living in New Zealand may have more in common with a teenage Somali peer.
living in New Zealand than either have with their parents and grandparents, and may express the commonalities of their identity with a range of new or re-assigned terms, such as emos, punks, or kiwis. Equally, two people may have the same skin colour and be from the same ethnic group, but be clearly divided along other lines, such as religious beliefs, income levels or gang affiliation. Ethnogenesis is an outcome of the recognition of these types of similarities and differences that have roots not in genetics but in social interactions. How people choose to identify themselves within their social realities is as much a product of their genetic context as their social context.

How the articulation of identity then translates into groupings of people in data collections shows that the mapping of ethnicities onto ethnic groupings is a distorting one. The state, primarily through categories in the census, significantly shapes the observed make-up of society. As James Scott noted, “the builders of the modern nation state, do not merely describe, observe and map; they strive to shape a people and landscape that will fit these techniques of observation” (cited in Kertzer and Arel, 2002: 2-3). Pre-modern states recorded basic population information for taxation and enlistment. They had little interest in recording cultural identities, therefore, there were fewer societal demands for individuals to assert and rank their multiple identities, than they do today. People thought little about the multiplicity of where they came from, they simply knew they were ‘from here’ (Kertzer and Arel, 2002).

The obligation imposed by bureaucracies on people to ‘pigeon-hole’ their cultural identity has major implications on the construction of how they perceive who they and society are. Equally the way synonyms are collected under a set of agreed labels imposes a lithic character to the data which hides the continuum that is the set of responses people would give in a free text environment. With the rise of European and Euro-colonial censuses, people tended to objectify their culture or to have an objectification imposed on it. At the operational level, the influence each census has is not only on the people filling out the forms but the ‘indoctrination’ that the enumerators receive. The census-taking process, for instance, involves large numbers of people thinking of people, in simplistic cultural categories (Kertzer and Arel, 2002).

Positive influences for New Zealand’s indigenous population have come out of the inclusion or recognition of Māori is written into state legislation (for example, 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act). However, classification systems which seek to impose some form of order onto relatively amorphous information may have the unintended outcome of reifying and stigmatizing specific groups, especially in states which operate population registration systems rather than in anonymised census regimes. There are well-known historical examples where individual identities have been taken from official records and used to counter-benefit those involved. Infamous examples are the ethnical classification used benignly in data collection in Germany in the 1930s which were later used to facilitate the genocidal strategies of Nazi Germany and the specific use of official documents to identify ethnicity during the Khmer Rouge and Rwandan genocides (Brubaker, 2004; Jenkins, 2008).

Official categorization of ethnic groups influences the conception and construction of ethnicity. It conveys a theory for ‘groupness’, by affirming certain social groupings through recognition on enumeration forms. These display contemporaneous understandings of ethnicity. Though, the role of these categories in the shaping of political conceptualizations of ethnicity is difficult to untangle from the perceptions that shape the questions in the first place. It may be particular conceptualizations that are reaffirmed through official categorizations whilst others miss out completely (from being legitimized on an official questionnaire). What is certain is that only a glimpse of the complex nature of ethnicity is portrayed when ethnic groups are categorized and classified for enumeration (Goldscheider, 2002).

Difficulties arise for classifications when a new group emerges. Ethnogenesis is an evolutionary process. Groups do not suddenly appear ex vacuo. As a group emerges the
descriptors used may at first not be seen as significantly different from other established
categories and be included silently in a related group. Eventually the numbers become
significant enough to notice and various strategies may be employed as both the
individuals themselves and the collection agencies need to contend with a series of new
ethnonyms. How this relates to the way in which ethnonyms change is instructive – people
who on previous occasions used an ethnonym may find themselves uncomfortable with the
label as the environment of the label changes. Nor is this new. One of the recurrent themes
in many literatures, such as Sanskrit literature, from the earliest Vedas and throughout the
Upanishad, is the choice of labels and the shifting meanings of labels to identify different
peoples.

Hence, the ethnonym for a new emergent group may change over time, and how inter-
relationships between these ethnonyms change sheds light on the process. This
occasionally becomes seen as problematic because, for practical analytical purposes, data
sources generally group ethnicities into groupings which are relevant to specific purposes,
such as policy formulation. A new ethnicity or identity may emerge and be grouped in one
way but as the context of data use changes the grouping to which it is assigned may
change – an example in New Zealand is the category labelled ‘Eurasian’ which was initially
included within the European grouping of ethnicities, but latterly incorporated more logically
into the Asian ethnic grouping. In this case the number of people is small, so the
implications were not significant. However, a new category may emerge which resonates
with people more generally, resulting in a significant proportion of the population adopting
the label in specific contexts, as appears to have been the case with ‘New Zealander’ in the
2006 Census (Allan, 2007; Kukutai and Didham, 2007). The implications of the location of a
new group of significant size within the analytical frame may matter not only to the group
itself but to the relative between groups.

The history of the handling of New Zealander type responses is instructive. In data
collections in New Zealand the main interest was first in the relative performance of the
Māori population versus the settler populations, primarily of British origins. There was
throughout New Zealand history a side interest in other foreign settlers, often grouped as
‘race aliens’. Over time the focus shifted to group people as Māori, Pacific and European,
and to distinguish contrasting groups there was a tendency to use Māori versus non-Māori
and Pacific versus non-Pacific, although nobody is ever asked if they are non-Māori or non-
Pacific and these non-groups remain seriously problematic, though convenient shorthand
labels. From the 1990s it became clear that distinguishing New Zealand European from
other Europeans was required. However, this sat uncomfortably with people who saw
themselves as New Zealanders but not as Europeans although these responses were
routinely coded to, first European (1986) then to New Zealand European (1991-2001). With
the implementation of the 2005 Statistical Standard for Ethnicity, the New Zealander-type
responses were coded to a separate New Zealander category in the Other grouping of
ethnicities. To some extent this reflects a shift in the ethnonym for these types of responses
and a progressive understanding that there is a new ethnicity emerging which does not
map from a single antecedent ethnicity. Issues of classification, including how to handle the
New Zealander type responses, are discussed more fully in other sections of this paper.

One of the more interesting questions in ethnic politics, of particular importance to
ethnogenesis as a social process, is who owns the state – the relationship between
dominant ethnicity and the nation state (Wimmer, 2004). This issue, explored by Ghassan
Hage (1998) and David Bromell (2008), is particularly pertinent when an emergent
ethnonym happens to be also used as the name of a nationality. The emergence of such a
term may lead to or be motivated by a conflation of the two concepts in the power system.
Is there an overt statement implicit in the use of the term that there is a claim, not merely to
a belonging to the state, but to ownership of the State. In the case of New Zealand, the
creation and maintenance of Māori as an ethnonym provided a term which placed a
boundary around a group of people of related ethnicities, but more importantly the
ethnonym implicated both the concepts of indigeneity and, via treaty partnership,
belonging, as an integral part of the State. It may be in the current enthusiasm for the New Zealander descriptor we are seeing a similar process with the indigenisation of a group of people who see themselves as more than just an ethnic group, but who are laying claim to a sense of ownership of the State.

Ethnogenesis, whether at the individual level of the development and articulation of one’s sense of identities, or at the societal level of classification of people into new groupings that at once reject existing groupings and better reflect how these identities are articulated by individuals, is an ongoing process embedded in the human need to categorise the world in a simplistic way. A very common method to illustrate change is the use of dendritic diagrams. But this approach to human cultural history carries the assumption that social evolution occurs linearly—each time a node splits, the consequential new branches are named and new groups formed. There is a flaw in this view though. The assumption is of a single origin, with increasing complexification, whereby each antecedent culture splits into two or three subsequent daughter cultures. The real world behaves in a much more complex way, with not just one-to-many relationships, but also many-to-one relationships. When populations interact, with individuals partnering and groups merging socially, the outcomes may be new groups which have multiple antecedents, as we see for example, with the emerging New Zealander group. This process is seen in many social situations, though most thoroughly studied in linguistics with the development of creoles (Bickerton, 2008) and the maintenance of human nature (Pinker, 2002).

Research directions in ethnogenesis link themes together, requiring a multidisciplinary approach to the analysis of both strands of the phenomenon. On the one hand the neural work of people such as Eric Kandel and the associated psychological research, along with the genetic and epigenetic work of people like Neil Risch contributes to the understanding of individual identity formation. On the other hand, the use of ethnogenesis as a paradigm in historical research contributes to the understanding of the process at a societal level. Between these two strands, a deeper understanding of ethnogenesis is gained by the ongoing work by demographers, sociologists and ethnographers into the analysis of intermarriage, international and subnational migration, the politics of identity, the relationship between ethnicity, culture and language and other similar themes. In the New Zealand context, a growing literature is developing on all of these themes.
3 The official construction of ethnicity in New Zealand

“...we must take seriously the fact that ethnicity means something to individuals, and that when it matters, it can really matter.” Jenkins (2008: 172, original emphasis)

Discussions of ethnogenesis widen our thinking about ethnicity and identity. But inevitably concerns about official classifications narrow the discussion. Yet, ultimately what is emerging out of the thinking about ethnogenesis will have some impact, even if only in the long term, on the official data collections. There has been much written in New Zealand about ethnicity and aspects of its construction, particularly in relation to the creation of official ethnic categories (for example, Allan, 2001; Broughton, 1993; Brown, 1984; Callister, 2004a; Didham, 2005; Dupuis et al, 1999; Kukutai, 2003; Liu et al, 2005; O'Regan, 2001; Pearson, 2001; Pool, 1991; Robson and Reid, 2001; Spoonley, 1993). Equally there is a very large overseas literature (Arel, 2002; Barth, 1969; Cornell and Hartmann, 1998; Devereux, 1975; Fenton, 1999; Glazer, 1975; Goldscheider, 2002; Morning, 2008; Nash, 1996; Thompson, 1989). In the wider international literature, much is in discussion and dispute, including even basic questions of whether ethnicity is a useful concept and whether such data should be officially collected. These types of debates prompted the convening of a conference in late 2007 in Montreal around issues of race and ethnicity with the title Should we count, how should we count, and why? This conference brought together researchers from many countries, with a range of cultural experience and with a variety of opinions about the collection and reportage of ethnicity or race data. However, despite this diversity of thinking, there was a consensus that countries should count. The conference demonstrated that ethnicity or race is considered to be a very significant dimensional variable in social science research and policy making in most, but not all, countries. Two countries that stand out amongst industrialised nations in not counting ethnicity or race are France and Germany.

In terms of officially counting, Morning (2008), one of the participants at the conference, has argued that it is important for governments to have a clear idea as to why ethnicity data are collected. In some European countries where ethnicity data are not gathered, the potential collection of these data has been vigorously debated. Morning suggests that while supporters believe such collections are necessary to identify and combat discrimination, opponents fear that such data would divide the nation, stigmatize and stereotype some groups, and generally support concepts of difference that have been linked with prejudice and discrimination.

In summing up the conference, Piché (2008) drew on the framework of Rallu, Piché and Simon (2006) who proposed four approaches to ethnic enumeration by governments:

- enumeration for political control,
- non-enumeration in the name of national integration,
- discourse of national hybridity,
- enumeration for antidiscrimination.

Increasingly, the justification for counting in most countries is based around monitoring to see if particular groups appear to be discriminated against, often based on their outcomes in areas such as health, employment, education and housing. Included in this counting is a consideration of integration and, in some countries, assimilation into ‘mainstream’ society.

But, mirroring the international literature, the conference yet again affirmed that ethnicity is not a human characteristic that can be easily identified or measured. Key issues raised included:

---

the increasing recognition of the fluidity of ethnicity (ethnic mobility being one aspect),

that new identities are always emerging, that ethnicity is multi dimensional, with identity being not only expressed but also perceived and observed, and

that there are challenges in thinking about specific groups, for example Roma in Europe and indigenous peoples.

The conference also found general agreement on three further important issues. The first is that people themselves, not just officials, need to be involved in creating definitions. Second, that official data collections, and the categories within them, are always political and that researchers should always be very critical about what such data actually mean. And third, there should be a shift away from prescribed race to self defined ethnicity, a concept that New Zealand has already adopted. Self defining ethnicity brings us back to the question of what is ethnicity might mean to individuals and to groups within New Zealand.

Ethnicity is a term like 'group', 'community', 'custom' and 'culture' which is frequently used by social scientists and the wider public but is hard to define. As noted, various researchers have put forward definitions of ethnicity. For example, drawing on research carried out in Wales, Jenkins (2008: 169) discusses a ‘basic anthropological’ model:

- Ethnicity is a matter of ‘cultural’ differentiation (bearing in mind that identity is always a dialectic between similarity and difference);
- Ethnicity is a matter of shared meanings – ‘culture’ – but it is also produced and reproduced during interaction;
- Ethnicity is no more fixed than the way of life of which it is part, or the situations in which it is produced and reproduced; and
- Ethnicity is both collective and individual, externalized in social interaction and the categorization of others, and internalized in person self-identification.

Morning (2008) points out that in census collections throughout the world terms such as ‘race’, ‘ethnic origin’, ‘nationality’, ‘ancestry’ and ‘indigenous’ ‘tribal’ or ‘aboriginal’ are used. Morning also notes that what might be called ‘race’ in one country might be seen as ‘ethnicity’ in another, while ‘nationality’ can mean ancestry in some contexts and citizenship in others. Morning also point out that within the same country, one term can take on several meanings, or several terms may be used interchangeably. This appears to be the situation in New Zealand. For example, the term ‘race’ has not entirely disappeared. While social science researchers and official agencies now almost always use the expression ethnicity rather than race, there is an understanding that the public often think in terms or ‘racial’ groupings and may be defining themselves, and defining others, on this basis.

While use of the word ethnicity moves the discussions further away from biological characteristics and more firmly into the area of social construction in a US context Collins (2001: 18) argues, “there is no deep and analytically important distinction between “race” and “ethnicity”.” He goes on to suggest:

“Conventionally, races are regarded as physically distinctive (for example, by skin color), while ethnic groups are merely culturally distinct. But ethnic groups also have somatotypical differences (hair, skin color, facial structures, and the like), and these differences are one of the chief markers that people commonly seize on in situations where consciousness of ethnic divisions is high. A sociological distinction between ethnicity and race is analytically pernicious, because it obscures the social processes determining the extent to which divisions are made in the continuum of somatotypical graduations.”

Jenkins (2008: 170) sees a more important distinction. He suggests that identifications of ‘race’ were typically “rooted in categorization rather than group identification, in ascription

---

6 In New Zealand a person’s ‘race’ was recorded in censuses prior to 1971, ‘origin’ in 1971, and ‘ethnic origin’ from 1976 until 1986.

7 For a further discussion of distinctions between race and ethnicity see Cornell and Hartmann (1998).
and imposition rather than subscription, in the external rather the internal moment of identification." He goes on to propose that “[p]ower in this context is the capacity to determine for Others, not just the consequences of identity, but also their nominal identification itself.”

Yet categorisation remains important for ethnicity, with Jenkins arguing that one cannot have ethnic groups, or any other sort of group, without some form of categorisation. However, he does note that “…ethnicity must mean something to individuals before it can be said to ‘exist’ in the social world. The collective cannot be ‘real’ without the individual.”

Ethnicity also cannot be real if it does not reflect changing social conditions and attitudes. As Fenton (1999:10) has well expressed:

“Ethnic identities are articulated around ancestry, culture and language which are subject to change, redefinition and contestation. Thus we cannot talk simply of ‘ethnic groups’. It follows that if ethnic groups are not fixed and uncomplicated entities, then our subject is not ‘intergroup relations’ or ethnic relations as it was once mistakenly conceived. Rather we should understand ethnicity as a social process, as the moving boundaries and identities which people, collectively and individually, draw around themselves in their social lives. Central to the process is the production and reproduction of culture, of acknowledged ancestry and ideologies of ancestry and the use of language as a marker of social difference and the emblem of people.”

In New Zealand, reviews of official ethnic statistics have tried to set in place a definition, but such definitions are not clear-cut and change either in subtle or major ways between reviews. The current official definition is that ethnicity is the ethnic group or groups that people identify with or feel they belong to. Ethnicity is supposed to be a measure of cultural affiliation, as opposed to race, ancestry, nationality or citizenship. Ethnicity is self-perceived and people can belong to more than one ethnic group. In a background paper to the 2001/02 Statistics New Zealand Review of Ethnicity Statistics, Allan (2001: 5-6) lists a set of factors that may influence the construction of an individual’s ethnicity. Many of these are interrelated. In particular, the differences between ancestry and race are somewhat clouded. This list is:

- **ancestry**: ancestors are described as people from whom a person is descended; a forefather; a person regarded as the forerunner of another.
- **culture**: broadly speaking, a person’s way of life, which may include music, literature, dance, sport, cuisine, style of clothing, values and beliefs, patterns of work, marriage customs, family life, religious ceremonies, celebration days/events which have particular cultural significance, e.g. Chinese New Year.
- **where a person lives and the social context**: are they rural, village dwellers, landowners or city inhabitants?
- **race**: defined as ‘the descendants of a common ancestor especially those who inherit a common set of characteristics; such as set of descendants, narrower than a species; a breed; ancestry; lineage, stock; a class or group, defined otherwise than by descent’. This often ‘refers to physical characteristics such as skin colour, treated by members of a community as ethnically significant. ... There are no clear-cut characteristics by means of which human beings can be allocated to different races’.
- **country of birth and nationality**: nationality can be defined as membership of, or the fact or state of belonging to, a particular nation; a group or set having the character of a nation.
- **citizenship**: the status of being a citizen and the membership of a community, or having the rights and duties of a citizen.

---

8 A distinction needs to be made between a legal-political definition of country of birth and nationality, and a sociological definition of the latter, which may or may not, impact on the former if there are choices/constraints on how this might be adjudged by self and others.
• **religion and language**: religion can be a key element of an ethnic group, for example Jews. Language is also commonly a marker of an ethnic group.

Statistics New Zealand notes that while any of these factors can influence the construction of a person’s ethnicity, “they do not necessarily determine a person’s ethnicity.” (Statistics New Zealand, 2003: 4)

As a subset of these influences, Broughton (1993) identifies the three key elements of defining Māori identity as whanaungatanga (the family and kinship ties); te whenua, (the land) and te reo (the language). For Māori of mixed ethnic background, there are potentially influences from other lands, other languages and ancestral/kinship ties to other cultures. Other writers who have explored Māori identity, including biological, self-identity and descent influences, include Kilgour and Keefe (1992) and Kukutai (2001, 2003, 2004). How much these various influences matter often depends on the reason why identity is being determined. As O’Regan (2001: 87) notes when resources are at stake identity definition becomes more important. Reinforcing the views coming from the Should We Count conference that often ethnicity is defined via a ‘top down’ process, Kukutai (2001) identifies the lack of a Māori voice in the process of collecting and reporting data on Māori. She notes (p. 9) “…most of the discourse on defining and counting ‘Māori’ has been shaped, if not dominated, by non Māori academics and civil servants”. Some of issues of defining Māori are revisited in the section on indigeneity.

One factor that was not identified at the time of the last Statistics New Zealand review was that technological advances in communication are diversifying the way in which ethnicity, culture and human knowledge is being maintained and shared. Most significantly cyber space is increasingly used as a space for individuals and groups to actively express, and hypothetically create, identities including perhaps new ‘ethnic’ identities. Sites such as Myspace and Facebook are now in the most top 10 used sites in the world. In the United States alone Facebook receives over 250 million hits per day and has over 200 million subscribers worldwide (Alexa, 2008).

When considering official statistics, Kukutai (2008) makes the important point that there can be a distinction between ethnic identity (that is how people think about their ethnicity) and ethnic identification (what people say about their ethnicity). Kukutai also points out that identification decisions in surveys may be influenced by a range of contextual factors including how, where and why the question is asked. A response to a survey may therefore not accurately reflect a persons underlying ethnic identity.

Regardless of how ‘we’ decide the categorise ourselves in our everyday lives and when responding to surveys such as the five yearly census of population and dwellings, ‘we’ can be further re-categorised, sometimes into groups we may not choose for ourselves. This is because researchers, policy makers and statistical agencies see a need to reduce the complexity of large-scale data collections so tend to regroup the many possible ethnic group responses to a much smaller number of categories. Statistics New Zealand classifies individual ethnic groups into progressively broader ethnic groups according to geographical location or origin, cultural similarities, and the size of the group in New Zealand. Over time these groups have changed.

Six ethnic groupings are commonly used in New Zealand social science and policy making. These are European, Māori, Pacific Island Peoples, Asian, MELAA and ‘Other’. However, there is a seventh group that is important. This is the combined ‘no response’ or ‘not defined’ group. Respondents may be categorised as being in this group for a number of reasons. One is that an individual simply fails to fully complete the census form. Another is that, for whatever reason, a respondent does not want to record their ethnic groups(s). There may be good reasons for this, for example belonging to an ethnic group that has suffered from persecution in the past.

Statistics New Zealand notes that, technically, apart from Māori all the one-digit ethnic groups are not individual ethnic groups but collections of groups (Allan, 2001). While New
Zealand European is a box that can be “ticked”, the higher-level groups of European, Pacific Peoples, Asian are not groups that can be “ticked” in census responses. Therefore, they are not strictly ‘who we are’, but are who statistical agencies group us with. For some people, it is not a grouping they would naturally choose.

The European group covers a wide range of nationalities and ethnic groups from these countries. These include English, Irish, Greek, Australian, Corsican, French, Greenlander, Hungarian, Ukrainian, American (US), New Caledonian, South African, Russian, Maltese and Norwegians. For many people, the term European is not an ethnic group but simply a collection of countries. It is also a collection that, for many people, often excludes the United Kingdom and Ireland.

This term European may be problematic for a range of people from some of these countries, particularly in the case of settler societies where there has been ethnic intermarriage. For example, a ‘coloured’ South African is likely to be classified as European unless they specifically listed themselves as black. Allan goes on to note that there are many people who describe themselves as New Zealanders but “do not have European descent, white skin or cultural roots in Europe. There are recent immigrants from non-traditional source countries such as Malaysia” (p. 12). If these people had recorded New Zealander in the 2001 Census they would be recorded in the census output as Europeans at a one-digit level. In contrast, in 2006 New Zealander responses were place in a new group, ‘Other ethnicities’. Historically, the European grouping was problematic for some of those respondents to official surveys who wrote in New Zealander type responses.

The Asian group includes ethnicities associated with the broad spread of Asia, such as Filipino, Vietnamese, Chinese, Gujarati, Japanese, Korean, and Afghani people, though does not include people of Iranian ethnicities, an increasingly problematic situation (Rasanathan et al 2006). The Pacific Peoples includes Samoan, Cook Island Maori, Tongan, Niuean, Fijian, Hawaiian, Nauru Islander, Papuan/New Guinean/Irian Jayan, and Tuvalu Islander/Ellice Islander, as well as the indigenous ethnicities of Australia.

People represented in MELAA include people of Middle Eastern, African and Latin American ethnicities. The inclusion of Iranian ethnicities in this group should be noted. This disparate group was referred to as ‘Other’ in the classification prior to the 2005 Standard Classification of Ethnicity. The name was changed to better represent what was included in the grouping of ethnicities. The new group, which is now referred to as ‘Other Ethnicities’, contains primarily New Zealander type responses and other groups that do not fit into the five other groupings. This group was developed in response to the growth in New Zealander type response in the 2006 Census and may still not be a grouping that some data users are happy with.

People may or may not be happy with being placed in these broad groups. Nevertheless, they are the key ethnic groups discussed in New Zealand policy and research circles and, because of this, they also form the basis of the discussions in two of the remaining three sections. However, another feature of ethnicity collection is that in New Zealand, as well as in a small number of other countries, in official surveys respondents can record more than one ethnic group. How these data are then reported and analysed is discussed at the end of the next section.

---

9 The background to this illogical anomaly is that ethnicities were frequently associated with a particular geographic location, and it happened that for trade statistics Iran was included in the Middle East and classification designers maintained this position when the ethnic groupings were assigned.
4 Ethnic intermarriage, the transmission of ethnicity to children and multiple ethnicity

Much of the international literature ethnic intermarriage has been used as an indicator of ‘social distance’ between groups (Bogardus, 1925; Muttarak, 2003). Muttarak suggests the study of ethnic intermarriage is of importance because intermarriage is an important measure of intergroup relations, and it acts simultaneously as both a primary cause and an indicator of social and cultural integration. Since intermarriage reveals the existence of interaction across group boundaries, it is often regarded as an intimate link between social groups.

In New Zealand, up until the 1970s there was a considerable interest in marriage between Pakeha and Māori (examples include: Ausubel, 1977; Beaglehole and Beaglehole, 1946; Harré, 1968; Metge, 1967, 1976; Ritchie, 1963; Vaughan, 1964). While in the period to the turn of the century, some studies touched on intermarriage (eg Belich, 1996; Butterworth and Mako, 1989) it has been since we entered the 21st century that the topic is being actively explored again. Examples of historic research include Wanhalla (2003), in terms of a more recent history Archie (2005), and for contemporary patterns (Callister, 2004b; Callister, Didham and Potter, 2005; Keddell, 2007; Walker, 2007& forthcoming). Some of these studies use official data sources, primarily the census, while others are based on qualitative case studies.

The empirical New Zealand research shows that Europeans have relatively low rates of marriage outside of their group. They are also slightly more likely to have a European partner than random sorting would predict. However, when size of group is considered, the intermarriage rates for Europeans do not suggest that this group is particularly adverse to intermarriage. In contrast intermarriage rates are high for Māori, and to a lesser degree, Pacific Peoples. However, based on group size, ethnic intermarriage is lower for Māori, Pacific and Asian Peoples than would be expected had random mating taken place across ethnic groups. While historically the most common ethnic intermarriage was between European and Māori, and more recently between Europeans and Pacific Peoples, the ethnic combinations are getting more complex. For example, marriage between Pacific Peoples and Māori is becoming more common, as is marriage between Asians and Europeans. The data suggest that, in general factors such as group size, age, education and whether a person was born in New Zealand each individually, and possibly interacting with each other, have some influence on rates of intermarriage.

New Zealand is not alone in its interest in intermarriage, with growth in the literature in most industrialised countries. There are a number of reasons for this. One is that rising rates of ethnic intermarriage in many nations, including Canada (Newhouse and Peters, 2003), the U.S. (Snipp, 1997), Australia (Birrell, 2000), the United Kingdom (Muttarak, 2003) and Russia/Latvia (Monden, 2005) have prompted researchers to examine this issue. This interest is often the greatest in countries where there have been, or still is, high levels of migration and/or have a history of colonisation. Part of this interest is on how social and economic networks might be created by intermarriage. For example, in Australia Birrell and Hirst (2002) have argued that intermarriage helps widen the economic base of Aboriginal families. Also in Australia, Meng and Gregory (2005) have explored the role of ethnic intermarriage in the economic integration of new migrants.

In terms of transmission of ethnicity to children, ethnic intermarriage has also sometimes been seen as a site through which future generations become either assimilated into a dominant culture or acculturated.\(^\text{10}\) It has been described as both an indicator, and a final

---

\(^{10}\) Acculturation is the process of acquiring a second culture. Assimilation is the process of replacing one’s first culture with a second culture. Assuming that cultures are dynamic rather than static, the process of acculturation may nevertheless alter original cultures.
outcome, of acculturation (Blau et al., 1982; Pagnini and Morgan, 1990). However, cultural mixing, in a variety of directions, can and does occur with or without intermarriage. In a discussion of biculturalism in New Zealand, Sharp (1995:118) notes that, “although the autonomy and incommensurability of cultures is asserted often enough, cultures are actually leaky vessels, created, renewed and transformed in endless contact with others”. While this contact with others can occur in a variety of ways, intermarriage provides a particularly intense and intimate site for potential cultural exchange. While it is often considered that the acculturation will ultimately be assimilation to the dominant culture, intermarriage research has already shown that intermarriage often has complex outcomes in terms of cultural sharing and ethnic identity. For example, in the US, Eschbach (1995) has shown how intermarriage has both decreased in some instances and increased in others the number of Native Americans (by allowing descendents of marriages between Native Americans and other ethnic groups to choose which ethnic group to identify with).

In New Zealand, Riddell (2000) demonstrates that historical intermarriage between Māori and non-Māori did not, as some early commentators had predicted, result in the disappearance of a once ‘dying race’. Instead, Riddell asserts that intermarriage added directly to the numbers of those who could define themselves as Māori and of Māori descent. More recently a number of New Zealand researchers have considered how intermarriage may affect the transmission of ethnicity to children, particularly for Māori marrying outside their ethnic group (for example, Callister, 2003; Howard and Didham, 2005; Kukutai, 2008). The findings of Kukutai that ethnic identity is not “passed” across generations in a predictable, linear fashion is consistent with the findings of the other studies. Part of the reason that the transmission is unpredictable is that for some children, through a mix of culture, ancestry or even skin colour, there is some flexibility in what group or groups they record, or are recorded for them. In turn, this opens up possibilities for some ethnic mobility, an issue we discuss in a later section. While not focusing specifically on transmission of ethnicity to children, a number of studies now focus on the children of ethnic intermarriages who indicate this through recording more than one ethnicity examples (for example Didham discusses Māori/Chinese interethnic partnering in Ip (forthcoming 2009).

How statistical agencies and researchers decide to record people of mixed ethnicity can be very important. When developing a glossary of terms relating to ethnicity and race for health researchers, Bhopal (2004) notes in relation to mixed ethnic (and racial) groups:

“This glossary omits a clear exposition on these terms, which require fresh thought. The increasing importance of the category mixed (ethnicity or race) is self evident. The increasing acceptance of sexual unions that cross ethnic and racial boundaries is adding both richness and complexity to most societies. The way to categorise people born of such unions is unclear and the current approaches are inadequate, partly because the number of potential categories is huge.” (Bhopal, 2004: 444)

As noted, the collection of multiple ethnicity data is not unique to New Zealand. For example, prior to the 2000 census, in the US the census had somewhat sporadically registered two types of multiracial ancestry: the combination of black and white (generally referred to as mulatto) and American Indian race in combination with others (usually labeled mixed blood) (Morning, 2002, 2008). Morning (2008) also shows that some other census questionnaires allow respondents to identify with more than one ethnicity. This takes three forms. First, like New Zealand some censuses allow the respondent to check off more than one category. Other census questionnaires offer a generic mixed ethnicity response option (e.g., ‘Mixed’, ‘Mestizo’ or ‘Coloured’ in South Africa). This in effect creates a new single ethnicity. Finally, some censuses specify exact combinations of interest, for example: ‘White and Black Caribbean’ in the United Kingdom; ‘Black and White’ ‘Black and Other,’ etc., in Bermuda; or ‘Part Cook Island Māori’ Cook Islands. While these could be seen as a combination of ethnicities, they could also be seen as single groups.
How to work with the multiple responses in the New Zealand and US census examples has been explored by a number of researchers (Callister, 2004a; Mays et al, 2003; Liebler and Halpern-Manners, 2008). One method is to try and work directly with the single and multiple ethnic groups, or at least the main ones. Another broad method is to reduce multiple responses to single responses. There are a number of ways of doing this including:

- Develop a hierarchical system to allocate to one ethnic group.
- Let people choose their own main ethnic group.
- Publish total counts.
- Randomly allocate multi-ethnic people to a single ethnic category.
- Develop a system that can 'predict' likely main ethnic group.
- Use a fractional ethnicity model.  

In New Zealand from 1986 until the 2004 Review of the Measurement of Ethnicity Statistics New Zealand used an ad hoc system of prioritisation that allocated individuals who recorded one group to a single group. Under this system, Māori had priority coding, followed by Pacific peoples, then Asian, then other ethnic groups besides European, followed by ‘Other European’ and, finally, New Zealand European. This prioritisation system meant that, for example, if a person recorded himself or herself as belonging to both Māori and Samoan ethnic groups, they were classified as belonging only to the Māori ethnic group. When prioritisation of ethnic responses was first introduced in New Zealand, multiple reporting of ethnicity was half that of 2001 at 4.2% in 1986. Thus, prioritisation of the responses had less impact on the resulting statistics. However, as Didham (2005) showed, by the 2001 Census this method resulted in major losses to some groups with, for example, just under a third of young Pacific children being counted as Māori under this method and thus losing their Pacific identity in this type of output.

As a result of the 2004 Review of the Measurement of Ethnicity Statistics, Statistics New Zealand recommend using two methods, total counts and directly using the single and multiple ethnic groups. But this review also suggested an exploration of self prioritisation.

Kukutai (2008) argues that main ethnic prompts in surveys can provide additional useful information. The author notes that a main ethnicity question has been included in a 1995 New Zealand Women: Family, Employment and Education survey; two surveys of middle aged and older New Zealanders carried out in 2008; and the longitudinal Youth Connectedness survey of adolescents which began in 2006.

Based on the 1995 data, Kukutai’s 2003 work showed some people recording multiple ethnic responses feel strong belonging in more than one ethnic group. However for others there is a stronger affiliation with one particular ethnic group. In this study those individuals who identified as both Māori and non-Māori, but more strongly with the latter, tended to be socially and economically much better off than all other Māori. In contrast, those who identified more strongly as Māori, had socio-economic and demographic attributes were similar to those who only record Māori as their ethnic group. Based on these data, Kukutai argues that the key differences within the wider Māori ethnic group are between those who identify primarily as non-Māori and all others.

Kukutai’s 2008 study indicated that amongst young New Zealanders who recorded multiple ethnic groups, about three quarters were willing and/or able to record a main ethnic group. While there were a variety of dual or multi ethnic responses in the survey, of those who recorded Māori and European and who were willing to pick a main ethnic group, just over half picked European. Amongst those who did not want to pick a main ethnic group, were included a small number who aligned with the response it ‘depends on who with’. This indicates the potential for some ethnic mobility.

---

11 The strengths and weaknesses of most of these systems has been discussed in Callister (2003).
While sometimes statistical agencies endeavour to simplify ethnicity, researchers also sometimes also do this either consciously or perhaps unconsciously. As an example of this, researchers in the US still often use the term biracial in relation to individuals who clearly acknowledge more than two ethnic backgrounds. An article entitled *The Tiger Woods phenomenon: A note on biracial identity* illustrates this (Hall, 2001). Woods has attempted to downplay race as a primary factor in his identity, but acknowledges African-American, Asian American, Caucasian American and Native American ancestry (ibid). However, the author after listing these four groups describes Woods as biracial (p. 334). If over time, the full complexity of this type of identity becomes more widely acknowledged there would appear to be some element of mobility.

In New Zealand, examples can be found of researchers trying to create some simplicity out of complex ethnic groups, especially when comparisons are being made between ‘groups’. One example is the group ‘non-Māori’, a group which if based on ethnicity will also include people citing Māori ancestry. Another is the use of more complex clusters of people such as non-Māori, non-Pacific and non-Asian, a residual grouping that includes Europeans who do not record these three ethnicities, but also includes people from the MELAA and ‘other’ ethnicity categories. This latter clustering is a grouping that most people who might fit within it are unlikely to have any real affiliation to.

Finally, the complexities of intermarriage, ethnic transmission and multiple ethnicities for children create challenges for ascribing ethnicity to families. While there is some demand from within the New Zealand policy and research community for ways of classifying family ethnicity, research suggests that ethnicity is primarily a personal attribute that cannot be easily assigned with validity to a group (Callister, Didham, Newell and Potter, 2007). This same point is relevant to ethnicity being applied to businesses or geographic communities.

---

12 Woods refers to this mix as being “Cablinasian” (Hall, 2001).
5 Ethnic mobility

Ethnic mobility has already been discussed in relation to ethnogenesis and as a potential outcome of ethnic intermarriage. Concerns about ethnic mobility can come to the fore when concepts of reasonably fixed ethnic groups hold sway because mobility potentially is considered to undermine such groupings. Ethnic mobility, as measured by shifts in expressed ethnic identity, can occur in a number of different ways. People can change their ethnic affiliation(s) at any point in time for any number of reasons. There can be changes in how ethnicity is constructed between cohorts, at different ages, and at different time periods (Simpson and Akinwale, 2007). In addition, if people move between countries, even if their own affiliation remains stable they are likely to be counted in different ways in each country. Given the potential fluidity of ethnicity, Simpson and Akinwale note that in the UK the statistical office accepts that “any ethnic group label is only valid for the period and context in which it is used.” (ONS, 2003: 11)

Ethnic mobility may involve a change of ethnic identification (switching from one ethnicity to another) or it may involve the addition of an ethnicity to (complexification) or deletion of (simplification) an ethnicity from a previous set of identifications.

If the same question is asked each time longitudinal studies provide a way of determining how individuals change ethnic responses to surveys over time. But even repeated cross sectional surveys, where the same question is asked, indicate that people switch all or some of their ethnic groups. The changing of responses has been recognised in many countries, regardless of whether it is 'socially constructed' ethnicity or 'biological' race or ancestry that is being measured. As an example, Waters (1990) in the US reports on a number of American surveys where people were asked about their ethnic identity at two or more different time periods. Waters reported that in all of the surveys she analysed a significant number of people changed their ethnicity over time. Waters notes that while there tended to be a higher level of consistency amongst some minority groups, even amongst these groups there was some switching.

Switching groups can be the result of changing incentives, both positive and negative. As an example of a negative incentive, in Canada, a census taken during WW2 showed that very few people classified themselves as German when compared with censuses taken prior to the war (Ryder, 1955). Reflecting a range of positive incentives, the growth of American Irish in the U.S. had been far faster than natural population growth would predict (Hout and Goldstein, 1994), as has the growth of Native Americans (Light and Lee, 1997; Eschbach, 1993). Waters (2000) demonstrates that the large growth in Native Americans in the last couple of censuses has been primarily due to switching from the 'white' group. Simpson and Akinwale (2007, citing Evans et al., 1993) note the increase of 46 percent in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders between the Australian Censuses of 1981 and 1986 was beyond standard demographic forces. Equally Simpson and Akinwale suggest that in Trinidad, the count of young adult Africans grew rapidly after the successes of the Black Power movement in the 1960s.

In Canada, Guimond (2006) has explored ethnic mobility in relation to the growth of Aboriginal populations. Between 1986 and 1996, the Census count of the population with aboriginal origin went from 711,000 to 1,102,000 persons with a large part of this growth between 1986 and 1991. Guimond noted that this fast growth could not be explained by natural and migratory increases alone with much ethnic mobility occurring. He also noted that the exceptional growth of populations of aboriginal origin seen nationally occurred off Indian reserves and was particularly strong in urban areas. Guimond speculates why the growth occurred, and point to a number of important legislative and social changes that improved the profile and status of Aboriginal Peoples. Guimond goes on to note that understanding the source of ethnic mobility is important and demonstrates that there was a very strong rise in the postsecondary educated graduates of aboriginal origin. He shows
that this increase is in part explained by the ‘arrival’, as a result of ethnic mobility, of more educated individuals, rather than by greater school success among individuals already identified as Aboriginal People in 1986.

Part of the fluidity reflects past intermarriages and that many people have a diverse ethnic ancestry and given that we know that ancestry can influence ethnicity, this can affect ethnic choices of individual. In the US detailed qualitative research undertaken by Waters (1990), set alongside data from official sources, showed that fourth, fifth and later generations of immigrants who were the offspring of several intermarriages would choose either single or multiple ethnicities from the many available to them. In narrowing down their choices these people often did not employ any straightforward process of prioritisation of their ancestries (Waters, 1990). This may of course indicate the difficulty of prioritisation or that ethnicity can detach itself from ancestry.

Marriage itself can alter ancestral and perhaps also ethnic affiliation. Waters (2000) draws on lifecourse research to show that when some people marry they can change their ancestry to match their spouse. This may be the result of rediscovering an ancestry that had been lost. For example, in the US a person with Polish and German backgrounds may have not emphasised their German ancestry around the time of WW2 but if they married someone with strong German affiliations may then re-emphasise this.

Age can have an effect on stability of ethnic group. This can come about through a variety of ways. Simpson and Akinwale (2007) note that systems, which record information at birth and in childhood, can sometimes involve proxy information given by external authorities or parents on behalf of children. These may not be the choices of the children when they reach an age when they can choose for themselves. But even if the person is completing the survey himself or herself, their affiliations may change over time.

Changes in ethnic response over time have been associated with question changes, in official surveys. Simpson and Akinwale (2007) demonstrate that changes in questions in the 1991 and 2001 Censuses in the UK prompted changes in responses, though of course this period was one of a global shift towards complexification of ethnic identification and neither question was amenable to picking this up effectively. In contrast to the findings by Waters in the US that the minority groups were the most stable over time, in the UK Simpson and Akinwale found that membership of the white category was the most stable between 1991 to 2001; between seven and nine percent of those recorded in an Asian group in 1991 had changed to a different group by 2001; but 23 percent of each of the Caribbean and African groups had changed responses.

When studying these changes, Simpson and Akinwale note that not only can questions in surveys change but that all survey measurement has some form of unreliability. They note that if an item is measured twice in the same way and under the same conditions, the outcome may be different because of errors (of response, transcription or coding) or simply question ambiguity. Coding can be especially difficult when people record multiple responses but when only single or perhaps two responses are to be coded. An example of this can be seen with the Australian 2001 Census when up to four ancestries were collected but only two were output – the effect on Māori in Australia (over 90,000 responses collected, 72,956 reflected in the official output and an estimated 17,400 lost because they were the 3rd or 4th response (pers.comm ABS 27/6/2002) gives some indication of the impact this had for some groups.

People respond to questions about ethnicity within the constraints of the categories offered to them, aware not only of their personal self-identification but also of the social acceptability of each category. As an example, in the US, Harris and Sim (2001) use data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health to examine patterns of racial classifications among multiracial populations. The survey had four main indicators of race. These were questionnaires completed at home, at school, by an interviewer who recorded their own observation of racial group, and a questionnaire completed by a primary
caregiver. Harris and Sim found that: around 12 percent of youth provided inconsistent responses to the nearly identical questions; context and age affected the choice of a single race identity; and youth who classified themselves as from mixed racial group were far more likely to be misclassified by the interviewer than those identifying as being from just one racial group. They also found that the processes of racial classification depend on which combination of racial groups were involved. For example, biracial youth with an Asian parent had more flexibility in choosing their ethnic identity than black/white youth.

Hill (2000) notes theories that perceptions may depend on social class, with the idea that ‘lightening’ will occur amongst higher socio-economic groups. In his review article, Darity (2003) notes that many Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and Cubans do not want to self-identify as Black and that members of each group with ‘dark complexions’ frequently report their race as White. This finding that Hispanics with higher socio-economic status were more likely to report as White is supported by research by Herman (2004). This prompted Herman to question whether for potentially biracial Americans it is socio-economic status that leads to self-identification as white, or the reverse? Herman also makes the point that many forces are at work with, for example, some darker skinned Hispanics considering themselves White if they were married to ‘Caucasians’ or lived in White communities where they were treated as White.

As already discussed in the previous section, changing output decisions for those recording more than one ethnic group can also change counts, giving another way of creating apparent ethnic mobility but, in reality, the changes over time simply reflecting changes in methods. At first sight when the system of prioritisation developed by Statistics New Zealand was abandoned, there could have been seen as a major shift to Pacific identity amongst young people whereas this Pacific identity had simply been disguised under the old system. In New Zealand there has been some research completed on ethnic mobility and some, at the time of writing, in its early stages of investigation. Using Census data Coope and Piesse (2000) found examples of ethnic mobility with, as an example, a 23 percent inflow and 6 percent outflow for the Māori ethnic group in 1996 compared to 1991 group.

In on-going research, Hayward and Carter (2008) examined responses of those who completed the ethnicity questions in all three waves of the Survey of Family, Income, and Employment (SoFIE) and found a small but significant number of respondents changed ethnic responses. Equally, ongoing research indicates students ethnicity recorded in tertiary education can differ from that recorded at school (Baldwin, 2008). In both projects there are difficult questions as to what is a major or minor ethnic change. For example is a shift from European and Samoan response to just a Samoan response of the same importance as a shift from Samoan only to European only? The latter project has been investigating whether the changes in response are real changes or differences in how the data are collected and/or coded.

Finally, as will be discussed in the final section, the rise of the strong ‘New Zealander’ response in the 2006 New Zealand Census shows a change in ethnic responses. The question remains as to whether this is ethnic mobility or simply relabelling.

Who are we? The conceptualisation and expression of ethnicity in New Zealand
6 Indigeneity

In a cross national comparison of censuses undertaken in or near to the year 2000, Morning (2008) notes that roughly 15 percent asked about respondents’ indigenous status. These cases came from North America, South America and Africa. Morning suggests that in these official data collections, indigeneity appears to serve as a marker largely in nations that experienced European colonialism. In this context it distinguishes populations that do not have European ancestry (separating them from mestizos, for example, in Mexico) or who inhabited the territory prior to European settlement. Morning also notes that a question on indigenous status was not found on any European or Asian censuses.

Indigeneity is a term that is starting to be found in discussions of official statistics within New Zealand. For example, in April 2005 there was an International Association for Official Statistics (IAOS) satellite meeting held in Te Papa focussing on issues of measuring small and indigenous populations. However, while New Zealand statisticians have either been relatively slow, or reluctant, to bring concepts of indigeneity into official statistical collections, such concepts, as well as lived experiences of indigeneity, are something that are very important to particular groups of people throughout the world, including New Zealand. In New Zealand, many Māori researchers including Smith (1999) and Barcham (1998) commonly use indigeneity as a concept in their work.

Perhaps one reason why it is not part of official statistics in New Zealand is that it is a concept and identification category with some ambiguity. Indigeneity is not a term found Oxford English Dictionary that instead points to “in’digenousness” or “indi’genity”. In this dictionary both are cited synonymously: indigenousness is described as “the quality of being indigenous or native”; indigenity is described as “the quality of being indigenous; indigenousness.”

Its near-synonym, “aboriginality”, is described as “[t]he quality of being aboriginal; existence in or possession of a land at the earliest stages of its history.” According to Waldron (2003: 1), indigenity is derived from “indigenous”, “[b]orn or produced naturally in a land or region; native or belonging naturally to (the soil, region, etc.).

In a New Zealand context the term ‘tangata whenua’ is also used, sometimes interchangeably with the concept of indigeneity. According to Te Ara, the meaning of tangata whenua is:

“literally, people of the land – are those who have authority in a particular place. This is based on their deep relationship with that place, through their births and their ancestors’ births. As tangata whenua express themselves in that place, they gain the authority and confidence to project themselves into the world. This idea, in turn, underpins the notion of mana whenua – spiritual authority in a given area.”

Drawing on his experience with New Zealand, but also other European colonised countries including Canada, David Pearson (2001) states that the term ‘Indigenous Peoples’ describes people who have well-established ties to a territory. One path of thought is that ancestors of indigenous peoples were the original occupants to establish life and community in a particular geographical location.

This concept of a ‘first people’ is not universally accepted. For example, in relation to Canada, Flanagan (2000: 6) notes:

“Aboriginal peoples were in almost constant motion as they contested with each other for control of land. In much of Canada, their present place of habitation postdates the arrival of European settlers. Europeans are, in effect, a new immigrant wave, taking control of land

just as earlier aboriginal settlers did. To differentiate the rights of earlier and later immigrants is a form of racism.”

The second main path for connection to a ‘place’ acknowledges, based on the principle of prior occupancy, that indigenous peoples had an established social structure at the time that people from different cultures and ethnic origins arrived (Asch, 2007; Waldron, 2003). This distinguishes one group of people as different from those who came afterwards. Whilst the difference in these definitions is subtle, the point that comes down to determining the key issue for indigeneity is that it is not important whether indigenous peoples were the original occupants of a territory, “what matters is that they were the last to inhabit it, or be settled in it, before the catastrophic events of European settlement” (Waldron, 2003: 13). This supports Mornings idea that concepts of indigeneity are tied into European settlement.

Bromell (2008), drawing on the work of Waldron, notes that if the principle to be applied is First Occupancy (‘finders keepers’), it is historians who must establish who got to a particular location first. All claims based on subsequent occupation of territory by conquest, even by other indigenous people, are then invalid. If, on the other hand, the principle to be applied is Prior Occupancy (i.e., but only in terms of settled occupancy immediately prior to European colonisation, with no concern about previous occupancy), the principle suggests that injustice occurs whenever a settled status quo is subjected to major disruption, generally by Europeans colonisers, against the will of the then inhabitants of a territory.

Citing the work of Waldron (1992, 2002, 2003), Bromell notes a ‘supersession thesis’; namely, the proposition that certain things which were unjust when they occurred may be overtaken by events in a way that means their injustice has been superseded. In some contexts, the supersession thesis opens up possibilities of a second or subsequent indigeneity, an issue that will be revisited at the end of this section.

Internationally, there has been some focus on indigeneity. As Bromell notes, United Nations examples include the 1992 Declaration on the Rights of Persons belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious or Linguistic Minorities and 2007 Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. The declarations outline a strategy of integration and non-discrimination for minorities, and an ‘accommodationist’ approach towards indigenous peoples based on self determination and governance (Kymlicka, 2007: 4). Kymlicka discusses possible commonalities but also differences between indigenous and minority groups. The differences lie in the nature of the claims and the historically treatment of indigenous people that set this group at a disadvantage to the rest of society (ibid).

Daes (cited in Kymlicka, 2007: 4) makes a clear distinction (in relation to entitlements) between the two concepts:

“Bearing the conceptual problem [of distinguishing indigenous peoples from minorities] in mind, I should like to suggest that the ideal type of an “indigenous people” is a group that is aboriginal (autochthonous) to the territory where it resides today and chooses to perpetuate a distinct cultural identity and distinct collective social and political organization within the territory. The ideal type of a “minority” is a group that has experienced exclusion or discrimination by the State or its citizens because of its ethnic, national, racial, religious or linguistic characteristics or ancestry.”

“... From a purposive perspective, then, the ideal type of [a] “minority” focuses on the group’s experience of discrimination because the intent of existing international standards has been to combat discrimination, against the group as a whole as well as its individual members, and to provide for them the opportunity to integrate themselves freely into national life to the degree they choose. Likewise, the ideal type of “indigenous peoples” focuses on aboriginality, territority, and the desire to remain collectively distinct, all elements which are tied logically to the exercise of the right to internal self-determination, self-government, or autonomy.”

15 Much of the following discussion draws heavily on Bromell (forthcoming).
Daes’s distinction sets indigenous groups apart from minorities on the basis of entitlement and the social and political effects of colonialism.

The Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples adopted by the United Nations in September 2007 avoided offering any definition whatsoever of indigeneity, with the Working Group having concluded that a definition of indigenous peoples at the global level was neither possible nor necessary. According UN (2008) fact sheets on indigeneity, the approach to definitions has similarities to New Zealand’s approach to ethnicity. It aims to identify, rather than define indigenous peoples. It argues that this is based on the fundamental criterion of self-identification as underlined in a number of human rights documents (UN, 2008). The United Nations (2008) use the following guidelines to help identify indigeneity:

- “Self-identification as indigenous peoples at the individual level and accepted by the community as their member.
- Historical continuity with pre-colonial and/or pre-settler societies
- Strong link to territories and surrounding natural resources
- Distinct social, economic or political systems
- Distinct language, culture and beliefs
- Form non-dominant groups of society
- Resolve to maintain and reproduce their ancestral environments and systems as distinctive peoples and communities.”

Parts of the Declaration itself point to concepts of indigeneity based primarily around colonisation. Implicitly this colonisation was primarily by Europeans. In the Declaration’s preamble the UN notes that it is: 16

“Concerned that indigenous peoples have suffered from historic injustices as a result of, inter alia, their colonization and dispossession of their lands, territories and resources, thus preventing them from exercising, in particular, their right to development in accordance with their own needs and interests.”

The Asian Development Bank (2007: Attachment C p. 25) is also cautious about definitions. It notes “[t]here are varied and changing contexts in which Indigenous Peoples live and there is no universally accepted definition of “Indigenous Peoples.” They go on to state:

“Indigenous Peoples may be referred to in different countries by such terms as “indigenous communities,” “ethnic minorities,” “indigenous cultural communities,” “aboriginals,” “hill tribes,” “minority nationalities,” “scheduled tribes,” or “tribal groups.”

5. For operational purposes, the term “Indigenous Peoples” is used in a generic sense to refer to a distinct, vulnerable, social and cultural group possessing the following characteristics in varying degrees:

(i) self-identification as members of a distinct indigenous cultural group and recognition of this identity by others;
(ii) collective attachment to geographically distinct habitats or ancestral territories and to the natural resources in these habitats and territories;
(iii) distinct customary cultural, economic, social, or political institutions that are separate from those of the dominant society and culture; and
(iv) an indigenous language, often different from the official language of the country or region.”

Discussions of indigeneity are closely linked to issues of recognition of indigenous rights. Citing the work of (Asch, 2001), Bromell notes that these rights originated within the political and legal structure of the coloniser, since the rise in recognition of indigenous rights over the past twenty years they have been grown to more accurately support and empower indigenous culture. In New Zealand, Bromell notes that the recognition of these

---

rights has been assisted by a number of Māori court cases as well as protest movements against injustices committed by the crown in breach of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Discussing the place of Māori in New Zealand, O’Sullivan (2007a) advocates a “politics of indigeneity” / ‘self-determination” as a way to move “beyond biculturalism” which, he says (p. 17), “neuters indigeneity”. In an earlier paper, O’Sullivan (2006: 10) notes that indigenous self-determination “transcends…addressing need”. His argument is that Māori have rights as indigenous peoples, not just welfare needs as citizens. The claim to rights as indigenous peoples is a claim to Māori self-determination. Two important areas are seen as important for self-determination: education and language maintenance. In the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, Article 14 states:

1. Indigenous peoples have the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.
2. Indigenous individuals, particularly children, have the right to all levels and forms of education of the State without discrimination.
3. States shall, in conjunction with indigenous peoples, take effective measures, in order for indigenous individuals, particularly children, including those living outside their communities, to have access, when possible, to an education in their own culture and provided in their own language.”

In a New Zealand context, O’Sullivan (2007b: 1) notes that:

“Indigeneity serves a transformative role in allowing indigenous peoples to think about the terms of their ‘belonging’ to the nation state with reference to their own aspirations. It is a discourse of both resistance and transformation responding to what, Hook for example, describes as ‘the attempts of mainstream to impose Eurocentric cultural values and education on Māori’ (Hook, 2007, p.1). It constitutes ‘a fundamental challenge to the prevailing social and political order’ requiring colonial ideas about public policy, authority, and power, to make way for political spaces of indigenous autonomy’ (Fleras, 2000, p.12).”

One of the questions sometimes asked about indigeneity is the validity of linkages back to the original indigenous culture. This questioning takes many forms. It can include questions about whether the traditions and customary practices are ‘genuine’, whether the newly evolving institutions are ‘authentic’, and how individuals can claim to be indigenous, particularly when there has been extensive ethnic intermarriage. As an example, Kolig (2005: 293-294) notes:

“To many Europeans in the dominant White society, ‘indigenous cultural tradition’ means the continuous, uninterrupted maintenance of cultural features and customs dating back to the period when White settlers first made contact with the indigenes, and before this into the grey mist of the pre-European past. The question continuity is thus paramount in the wider public’s understanding of tradition and identity, and this often leads to scepticism, if not cynicism, towards tradition based claims made by indigenous groups; in particular, if such claims cannot be clearly shown to have roots in ‘ancient’ customary practice.”

Barcham (1998) has addressed some of these issues. Against a backdrop of a massive rural-urban migration since the Second World War for Māori and discussions about the allocation of assets from Treaty claims, Barcham considers changes in the structure of Māori institutions. Also considering the question of continuity, Barcham explores evolutionary social change as represented by urban Māori and perceived static boundaries of indigenous culture as embodied by modern iwi.

Barcham also raised questions of pan-Māori bodies, revitalised iwi (neo-traditional iwi) and Urban Māori authorities but sees no possibility for a Māori nation to exist as he suggests
that iwi themselves are nations.\textsuperscript{17} In fact, in many discussions Māori in defining ‘who are we’, either in relation to concepts of indigeneity or in everyday life, do not align with the group Māori but see iwi or perhaps hapu as being the collective identity.

As noted elsewhere, Morning and Sabbagh (2005: 70) has talked about a tension over the “the politics of distribution and the politics of recognition” and, as shown by the work of Barcham, this tension exists within discussions of indigeneity. In terms of Treaty of Waitangi settlements, Barcham notes that with the allocation of assets one cannot go down to the level of the individual with, instead, a need for a collective mechanism. This collective mechanism has been primarily iwi, but Barcham acknowledges that there are Māori who cannot, or will not, affiliate with iwi.\textsuperscript{18}

The fact that not all Māori align with iwi has created a need for ‘non-traditional’ institutions to develop, such as urban Māori authorities. In relation to these Barcham (1998: 311) notes: “[t]he adaptation of indigenous social institutions to the pressures of social change is a reality and must be confronted – new ‘indigenous’ social institutions should thus not be viewed as any less authentic than older institutions” (p. 311). The question of non-traditional institutions to represent Māori continues to be raised, with as an example the question as to whether ‘Black Power’ can represent a group of disadvantaged Māori in lodging Treaty claims (Tahana, 2008).

As Bromell (2008) notes, in relation to indigeneity, there has also been much written about Māori sovereignty (eg Awatere Huata, 1984; Walker, 1995; Ladley, 2005). At an extreme this means “Māori control of all things Māori” (Joint Methodist Presbyterian Public Questions Committee, 1993).\textsuperscript{19} Some iwi focus strongly on sovereignty, such as concepts of a ‘Tuhoe Nation’ within New Zealand.

As Bromell notes, concepts of ‘sovereignty’ are easier when there is a clear geographic separation of peoples, such as can be found in the US and Canada in relation to sections of the native Canadian and native American communities. But even in this type of context Kymlicka (1998a: 31) observes that maintaining a separate societal culture in a modern state is “an immensely ambitious and arduous project.” It requires education at all levels in the language of the national minority, the ability to use that language in workplaces, ability to control immigration within the territory of the national minority, and some forum for collective deliberation and decision-making that the minority substantially controls.

Indigeneity debates operate at both a local level – how indigenous peoples are defined and treated in a local context – and at a global level – the philosophical underpinnings of protection of the rights and needs of indigenous peoples in a globalised world. One of the issues arising out of these debates on indigeneity is how the concept is accepted by the remaining population at the local level. In particular, concern is being raised as to whether indigeneity is bounded and fixed. Generally it is bounded by definition, but this need not preclude the idea that new indigenous groups can emerge within a locality given that length of residence and geographic boundaries are frequently integral to the definition.

\textsuperscript{17} Rata (2000) and Sautet (2008) also discusses the concept of revitalised iwi, or neo-tribes, who the organisations represent, and how well placed these organisations are for advancing Māori economic and social aspirations.

\textsuperscript{18} Iwi membership depends on whakapapa which Barcham notes is effectively descent, but he goes on to state that “if the individual’s whakapapa is unknown, the decision may rest upon the individual identifying as Māori, and being identified as Māori by the wider Māori community” (p. 311). In Canada and the United States official distinctions appear more distinct: more than half indigenous blood is required to receive indigenous status, whereas as New Zealand has a wholly inclusive approach to Māori whakapapa. It is Māori themselves who are left to set the boundaries of defining who is an iwi member, and are therefore, who is indigenous and who is not (Callister, 2007).

\textsuperscript{19} http://homepages.ihug.co.nz/~sai/Maori_tino.htm
In relation to the latter issue, in a Canadian context Pryor et al. (1992) argue that as colonial societies mature and evolve, there is an increasing tendency for the settler populations to see themselves as ‘indigenous’ to the society in which they live. This includes Canadians starting to view the response ‘Canadian’ in official surveys as an evolving indigenous ethnic category.

In New Zealand, historian Michael King has put forward a similar idea (Butcher, 2003: 44 citing King, 1999).

“Maori came to New Zealand from Eastern Polynesia. We don’t know how long it took to actually turn their backs on their culture of origin and decide they were Maori, but it was probably only three or four generations. The point at which it happened was when they stopped looking over their shoulder to the home culture and just got on with being the people they were in a new country. My view is that Pakeha have been here long enough now to have done the same thing and are ‘a second indigenous culture’. And I don’t think that’s a particularly provocative thing to say. Like most Pakeha, I’ve been to Europe and felt that sense of affinity – but I am not European.”

King has not been the only person to question who is part of the indigenous group. For example, Royal has suggested “the concept of ‘tangata whenua’ should no longer be exclusive to Māori but be part of a new language to include all those who share and are committed to a spiritual relationship with the natural environment” (Gurunathan 2003: 1).

The Treaty Minister of the Labour government, Trevor Mallard (2004), also claimed in 2004 to be an indigenous New Zealander. Looking to the future Colin James (2008) has also noted:

“But look out 25 years. There will be Maori whose whakapapa is only one two hundred and fifty-sixth, even less, of their bloodline. Will they be accepted as tangata whenua and some seventh-generation English-descended New Zealander not be accepted as indigenous?”

These questions are around people who have no Māori ancestry. But already census data indicate that more than half of Māori are not only Māori and therefore their inherent indigeneity rubs off in a way that may attribute indigeneity to all other people in New Zealand (Pacific, European and Asian).

In addition, a second indigeneity raises questions about the ‘rest’ of the New Zealand population. Is there a potential for a hierarchy to develop with Māori and descents of the ‘first’ European sailing boats at the top in terms of belonging? Are people any less ‘New Zealanders’ if recent migrants? Is there any difference in ‘who we are’ and who we might be allowed to be between the permanent migrants and the increasing number of temporary migrants to New Zealand?

Just some of the above examples suggest that it is likely that as time goes on in New Zealand that the debates about indigeneity will become even more complex. But there are other reasons for this prediction. Hamer (2007) has identified that perhaps one in seven Māori live in Australia. What does it mean to be an indigenous New Zealander who has migrated to Australia? What will it mean for second or third generation Australians with Māori ancestry? As a more extreme example, a child born in Vietnam during the American War to a Māori father has Māori ancestry and, if the father is known, may also have knowledge of Whakapapa. But the child and their offspring may not speak or understand any of New Zealand’s three official languages and may not, through the various migration streams, be eligible to live in New Zealand. In these contexts, what does it mean to be indigenous? While this is an extreme example, as Māori form an increasing proportion of New Zealand’s diaspora and as intermarriage continues, both in New Zealand and

---

20 The idea that allowing settlers to identify with the country they live in will automatically undermine indigenous rights is potentially challenged by an article based on the experience of Australia. Moran (2002) explores the idea that “indigenizing settler nationalism” has potential for supporting rather than resisting the extension of indigenous rights and claims.
overseas, the questions of indigeneity and ‘who are we’ will inevitably become more difficult.
7 Genetics, the human genome project, race and ethnicity

"...the last great battle over racism will be fought not over access to a lunch counter, or a hotel room, or the right to vote, or even the right to occupy the White House: It will be fought in the laboratory, in a test tube, under a microscope, in our genome, on the battlefield of our DNA." (Gates, cited in Anthony, 2008: 36)

In February 2001, the Human Genome project, a United States federal government effort and Celera Genomics, a private company, successfully completed drafts of the entire human genome (genome 5). This project, and what has so far flowed from it, has created a new set of debates enhancement and development of research into the links between genetics and human behaviour, particularly health outcomes (Anderson and Nickerson, 2005). However, the human genome project is only one of the more recent in a long line of scientific ‘advances’ in thinking about genetics, race and ethnicity.

While having no understanding of genetics, early classifications of ‘race’ tried to draw links between physical characteristics and behaviour with, not surprisingly, those doing the categorising placing themselves at the top of perceived hierarchies. For example, according to Lee et al (2001), eighteenth century botanist Carolus Linnaeus identified in his 1758 work four groups:21 (Americanus, Asiaticus, Africanus, and Europeaeus). As an example of linking physical characteristics, he classified the North American group as ‘Americanus rubescus’ (American red) with characteristics of “reddish, obstinate, and regulated by custom”. These early classifications were based on an idea that there were some clearly definable racial groups and these groups could be linked to the main continents.

Lee et al note that the Linnaeus classification was based on an amalgam of physical features and behavioural traits that reflected the social attitudes and political relations of the times. The authors go on to suggest the resulting ideology of race was used to explain, predict, and control social behaviour. Lee et al then suggest that the concept of immutable, biologically based human races suited the process of colonialism, providing a scientific justification for economic exploitation and practices such as slavery.

While having a major long term impact on thinking about human classification systems, Malik (2008: 81) suggests that the Linnaeus system was not without critics when it was developed. For example, Malik cites Comte de Buffon and Johann Friedrich Blumenbach as being his main critics at that time.22 In particular Buffon, believed that neither species nor races could be easily distinguished from each other, with instead a continuity between groups having no distinct boundaries and having much within group diversity. This is a debate that continues throughout discussions of race, ethnicity and genetics.

In common with other countries, race was the basis of most early New Zealand statistical collections. While the term race continues to be used in countries like the US, social scientists such as Stephan and Stephan suggest that race is now more properly viewed as a social rather than a biological construct even if biology still plays a role in the phenotypic expression of some physical characteristics.23 24 As an example of the thinking of Templeton (1998: 632) notes:

---

21 According to Malik (2008: 80), ‘Linnaeus never referred to these groups as ‘races’.
22 Malik (2008:82) notes it was Blumenbach who introduced the term ‘Caucasian’, an expression that continues to be still used in some contexts (for example in New Zealand, Shaw 2008).
23 There has been a parallel shift in social science towards the upholding of social rather than biological construction of father and motherhood.
24 Phenotype is defined as “the observable physical or biochemical characteristics of an organism, as determined by both genetic makeup and environmental influences”.

Official Statistics Research Series, 4, 2009
“Genetic surveys and the analyses of DNA haplotype trees show that human ‘races’ are not distinct lineages, and that this is not due to recent admixture; human ‘races’ are not and never were “pure.” Instead, human evolution has been and is characterized by many locally differentiated populations coexisting at any given time, but with sufficient genetic contact to make all of humanity a single lineage sharing a common evolutionary fate.”

This negation of any scientific foundation to classifying people on the basis of race has been promoted in the mainstream media by a group of scientists (e.g. Bone, 2003). However, there remains some debate about the genetic basis of race amongst the wider scientific community (Graves, 2001). In these debates, potentially race-related differences are being analysed on at least four levels: societal, individual, cellular, and subcellular levels.25 There are three broad levels. One is that race has no biological basis. The second is that there are racial differences, but they are primarily cosmetic. These are superficial characteristics such as skin and hair colour features that involve a very small number of genes that were selected historically in particular environments.26 However, these superficial differences do not reflect any additional genetic distinctiveness. The third is that genes and race remain an important linkage, particularly in health (for example of this type of debate see Graves, 2001; Kaufman and Cooper, 2002; Satel, 2000; Schwartz, 2001). The idea is that particular sets of genes are more common in particular racial groups and these genes alter the propensity of groups to be at risk from types of illness. Such a concept raises questions as to whether medical treatment should vary on the basis of ethnicity/race.27 In this context, Malik notes that particular drugs have already been developed that appear to be more effective for particular ‘racial’ groups, but that there are potential costs and benefits of such approaches which require further research and debate.

In New Zealand and the wider Pacific, examples can be found of medical research that considers race/ethnicity to be critical variables with some hint that underlying genetics may be important. These include studies of body size and health problems in Polynesians (Swinburn et al, 1999) and Tongans and Australians (Craig et al, 2001). Other research in this field points to an accurate record of ancestry being important when considering health risk factors (Grandinetti et al, 1999).

Skin cancer is one example of where genetic determination of skin colour is important. Shaw in 1988, and again in 2008 (Shaw et al), notes that malignant melanoma is rare amongst Māori and, using language that had racial undertones, shows that it is primarily a disease of Caucasians. Taylor (2002) discusses the lower incidence of skin cancer amongst certain darker skinned individuals compared with fair-skinned persons; a lower incidence and different presentation of photo aging; pigmentation disorders in people with more heavily pigmented skin type; and a higher incidence of certain types of alopecia (hair loss) in Africans and African Americans compared with those of other ancestry. However,

25 Although the vast majority of the human population shares the same genes, it can be the minute differences between individuals and among groups that researchers focus on as they seek to explain the incidence and severity of disease at the molecular level. This examination can take place at the level of single nucleotide polymorphisms – SNP - (a Nucleotide is one of the structural components, or building blocks, of DNA and RNA. A nucleotide consists of a base (one of four chemicals: adenine, thymine, guanine, and cytosine) plus a molecule of sugar and one of phosphoric acid. A single nucleotide polymorphism is a common variation of a single nucleotide at a particular point in the genetic sequence. SNPs occur in human DNA at a frequency of one every 1,000 bases.

26 Graves (2001) estimates that perhaps only six genes determine skin colour out of between the 30,000 and 40,000 genes individuals have. However, some scientists argue that even very small differences in some key genes can have major effects. For example, just one chromosome determines the sex of a person (Bone, 2003: 24). However, while these differences might be seen as cosmetic, skin colour may matter in a number of outcomes, including being the subject of racism (Callister, 2008).

27 Graves (2001) suggests there are major dangers in practicing “race” based medicine. If doctors focus on risk factors that are associated with particular groups then they may overlook far more important risk factors such as family background, lifestyle and the living environment.
Taylor also argues genetic factors are not the only ones impacting on these differences in skin disorders. Taylor suggests that cultural practices can also have a significant impact.

Yet, other New Zealand health researchers have suggested that “genetics plays only a small part in ethnic differences in health, and other factors are often more amenable to change” (Pearce et al., 2004:1070). The researchers go on to suggest that an “overemphasis on genetic explanations may divert attention and resources from other more important influences on health” (p.1071). It has been shown that some diseases that had previously been cited as evidence of particular genetic propensities are more clearly linked to factors such as life-style and diet as has been shown in various recent studies (Wang, 2008; Rush, 2008). This is a position taken by many overseas researchers as well (e.g. Nazroo, 2003; Soo-Jin Lee et al, 2001). Soo-Jin Lee et al note:

“A naïve genetic determinism will not only reinforce the dangerous idea that discrete human races exist, but will divert attention from the complex environmental, political, and social factors contributing to the unfair distribution of illness.”

A further line of thought suggests that while ‘races’ based around continents of origin is flawed, it may be useful for scientists to develop a genetically based classification system especially in relation to health. For example, Condit (2005) suggests.

“If it is unsound to refer to genetic clusters as races, one might turn instead to the underlying scientific basis of the clusters themselves to begin to formulate an appropriate classification strategy. Instead of referring to genetic clusters as “races”, one might reasonably refer to them as LDGP (Large Diffuse Geographically-based Populations). Instead of using the inaccurate labels of “Asian” and “African” and “Caucasian” to describe specific clusters, one might derive distinctive, technical labels that more accurately capture the geography involved. As a first pass, one might identify LDGP-EAS for the East Asian cluster, LDGP-EM for the European/Mediterranean cluster, LDGP-SWA for the cluster located in southern and western Africa, LDGP-API for the cluster deriving from Australia and the Pacific Islands, and LDGP-AM for the populations indigenous to the two American continents.”

However, Condit acknowledges that such a classification remains problematic because the LDGR do not correspond systematically with medically relevant alleles. Malik (2008) also discusses such approaches in relation to health and notes that systems of classifications have involved a range of variables including blood type and certain combinations of genes. Some techniques have involved clustering people into predetermined groups or allowing computer programs to create their own clusters. However, in the latter situation, generally the number of acceptable clusters is predetermined.

Further complicating the thinking about genes and health, environmental factors such as stress and diet can have biological consequences that are transmitted to offspring without a single change to a gene. While this requires a major rethink of some aspects of evolutionary genetics and heredity, this is now regarded as an important aspect of disease and disorder transmission. This is especially so in the study of cancers and mental disorders that may be transmitted along family lines with no discernable genetic cause. These epigenetic effects have been discussed above as an important element in ethnogenesis At one level, the human genome explains most of the phenotypical differences between people. A number of non-physical attributes also may require explanation by other mechanisms such as epigenetic effects and social environmental contexts.

Discussions about genetics and race are now taking place at two broad levels. One is via the academic research that has been briefly touched upon. The other is the popular discussion, often taking place via websites such as Wikipedia. But the two overlap in various ways. Selective scientific discoveries are reported in the popular discussions, sometimes with exaggerated claims, while scientists make attempts to communicate some of the scientific knowledge from time to time with the public. For example the American
Anthropological Society has an interactive website that discusses aspects of the Human Genome project as well as issues such as skin colour, history and genetics.28

One of the areas with potentially exaggerated claims that has captured public attention is DNA testing. On one level DNA testing for ancestry has allowed people to take ancestry beyond what parents or perhaps grandparents ‘choose to tell us’ or actually know for certain themselves. But places like the United States commercial companies, primarily tracking African ancestry, are now making statements such as:

“Find your roots on your mother’s side over 500 years ago! The MatriClan Test traces maternal ancestry by analyzing the mitochondrial DNA (mtDNA) women and men inherit exclusively from their mothers. Find your roots on your father’s side over 500 years ago! The PatriClan Test traces paternal ancestry by analyzing the Y-chromosome men inherit exclusively from their fathers. Since only men carry a Y-chromosome, women CANNOT take the PatriClan Test. But luckily, women may trace their paternal lineage by having a male relative with their father’s last name take the test for them.” 29

Such companies can make statements saying they find African ancestry for a significant number of the paternal lineages they test, stating also “If our tests indicate that you are not of African descent, we will identify your continent of origin.”

Malik (2008: 63) suggests this new use of genetics for tracking ancestry, changes some aspects of ‘who we are’. Commenting specifically on black identity, which he sees as in recent decades being primarily a cultural or political expression, he now argues that it is increasingly being seen as a genetic heritage, “inextricably linking race, culture and belonging.”

Another popular view that has some links to studies of genetics is the acceptance of the Recent African Origin (RAO), or “out-of-Africa” hypothesis that modern humans originated from Africa and only very recently migrated outwards into the rest of the world. 30 Back in 2002 Kaufman and Cooper commented on how the US Office of Management and Budget define the Black population in the U.S. This definition links ancestry back to Africa. But Kaufman and Cooper note that “[i]n the broadest interpretation, all of humanity meets this definition” (p. 292). However, this RAO theory is currently being challenged by an “Out of Africa Many Times” theory. While still subject to a number of unanswered questions about the interaction of modern humans and earlier humans, the multiple African exodus theory fits human genetic history more satisfactorily.

It is almost certain that the human genome project will continue to generate debates about genes, ‘race’ and, ultimately, ethnicity. But perhaps the final word, for the moment, needs to go to Anthony (2008:36):

“…the more detail with which science maps our genome, and the more precise its analysis of genetic differences between populations, the more elastic becomes our understanding of race.”

---

28 http://www.understandingrace.org/home.html
29 http://www.africanancestry.com/index.html
30 Archaeogeneticists have been collecting evidence of this theory since the 1990s, replacing the competing multi-regional hypothesis which sets humans originating from independent hominid populations.
8 New Zealanders

As we noted above in the discussion of ethnogenesis, a new category may emerge which resonates with people more generally, resulting in a significant proportion of the population adopting the label in specific contexts. This appears to have been, at least in part, the case with 'New Zealander' in the 2006 Census (Allan, 2007; Kukutai and Didham, 2007). In this section we briefly outline this phenomenon and offer some speculations on what the significance of this may be. It should be stated at the outset that there is ongoing work on this topic and much of the basic analysis remains to be done.

In the 1986 Census of Population and Dwellings just over 20,000 individuals classified themselves as “New Zealanders” in response to then ethnic origin question. By 2001, over 89,000 individuals recorded a “New Zealander” type of response to the ethnic group question. Purely on the trend over time, we might have expected around 135,000 people providing such a response in the 2006 Census, but in the event this jumped significantly to 429,429 people. In 2001, this represented 2 percent of the population but by 2006 it had risen to over 11 percent of the population, with a significant increase in the proportion identifying with multiple ethnicities. In 2001, and previous censuses, the New Zealander ethnic group was counted in the European category, but in 2006 the responses were placed in a new group “Other ethnicities”.

One of the key observations is that the large number of people giving "New Zealander" as a response is currently, at least, a phenomenon restricted to the census. While there has been an increase in New Zealander type response in the census this has not been seen in other official data collection with examples being: Birth Registrations (2006-08) 1 percent; Death Registrations (2006-08) 1 percent; Housing NZ Applicants (2007/08), 1.4 percent; NZ Crime & Safety Survey, 2006, 3 percent; NZ Health Survey, 2007 0.9 percent.

Because of the unexpected nature of this change, largely associated with a media and email campaign promoting the response, the rise in the New Zealander type response has created debate within official agencies (including Statistics New Zealand, the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Education), within academic community and within the wider public about what this rise in responses is signalling and, secondly, how to deal with it in research and policy making.

The debate about the use of the term "New Zealander" is not entirely unconnected with the older and ongoing discussion about terms such as Pakeha, which also involves concepts such as indigeneity (though in the case of Pakeha it is an overt statement of non-indigeneity and exclusivity from Māori). There have also been consideration of whether there should be a "New Zealand" label on some other census tick boxes (such as Chinese, so people can tick “New Zealand Chinese” to distinguish themselves and descendants of migrants rather than recent migrants), and how the term European relates to many people with backgrounds or ancestry that could be considered to traceable ultimately back to Europe.

Concern about the rise of the proportion of the population giving a "New Zealander" type of response has not been restricted to people who use the data for administrative purposes. Their concern centres on the effect this appears to have had on the European ethnic grouping and smaller current effect this has had on other groupings of policy significance. People have expressed concerns on the grounds that it raises fundamental questions

---

31 The New Zealander category comprises people who gave responses such as "New Zealander" and "Kiwi" along with a number of similar responses, including some containing references to skin colour such as "White" and are coded under the "Other ethnicities" ethnic grouping. However, terms such as "Pakeha" and "Palangi" are coded to "New Zealand European" under the European ethnic grouping.

32 This is not an isolated example. In the 2001 Census an email campaign promoting "Jedi" as a valid religion resulted in a significant number of such responses.
about the nature of ethnicity, the validity of ethnicity as a mechanism for analysing social
trends, and more generally the key question of what exactly it means to be a "New
Zealander" in the sense of ethnic identification (Dupuis et al, 1999; Spoonley, 1993;
Callister, 2004c).

Among the concerns expressed by people commenting to the 2004 Review of the
Measurement of Ethnicity were that New Zealander as an ethnic category:

- creates potential problems for Māori/non-Māori comparisons,
- does not sit easily with concepts of Treaty partnership between two distinct
  peoples,
- is seen as a first step in the creation of a second indigenous group and this
  undermines Māori as the indigenous group within New Zealand,
- is seen as a way of denying the existence of ethnicity.

These are frequently expressed but are not so much problems at all as indicators that the
concept of ethnicity is fluid and far reaching. The practice of comparing Māori with non-
Māori is done for purely mechanical analytical convenience. This is problematic for several
reasons – not least of which is that the non-Māori group is a meaningless fiction in that it
includes people who at the time of collection simply failed to tick the Māori box (Didham
2005). Not infrequently, this group also includes people who did not specify their ethnicities,
as was routinely done in death rate data until the mid-1990s. Moreover approximately half
of the stated Māori population identify with at least one other ethnicity, invoking a number of
the concerns about the use of the term Pakeha as a synonym for New Zealand European.
The use of the term New Zealander is seen as more inclusive and for this reason it is
thought that a number of people who previously responded as both Māori and New
Zealand European may have moved to New Zealander as an alternative response.

The Treaty partnership issue is already complex for a range of reasons, including that the
Treaty is between Māori and the Crown, the latter who also represent Māori. Viewing New
Zealander as a possibly new ethnicity transcends and includes Māori and changes ethnic
boundaries in the process. It adds to the long history and extent of interethnic partnering
that has already long rendered the concept of a clear boundary an anachronism. In the
longer term, this potential processes of indigenisation of those without Māori ancestry will
raise questions about the utility of the Treaty of Waitangi as a basis for public governance.

Similarly, even if indigeneity were to expand to encompass other groups this is not
restricted merely to those who claim New Zealander ethnic status. Were this to occur, it
may well be that there would be a further semantic shift in the use of terminology - Māori
would be relocalised as autochthones and other indigenous people as indigenes. However,
this begs the question of whether indigeneity is a useful concept in the first place.

The denial of ethnicity derives from the view that ethnicity is a nebulous, apparently
meaningless concept, and that to differentiate people along ethnic lines is offensive in a
variety of ways. However, the vast majority of countries collect this information, all
literatures in the world are strewn with examples of the centrality of ethnicity or its
surrogates for social cohesion, and the few countries (such as France) in which ethnic
information is not collected because of constitutional prohibition are demonstrations of the
problems that arise when this data is not available.

Linked to the denial of ethnicity is the view that New Zealander is a nationality and not an
ethnicity, or at least not yet an ethnicity. According to this argument, New Zealander is a
nationality, as indeed are the labels used for a number of other categories in the current
classification. Certainly the term is used as a nationality but this does not invalidate the use
of the term, ipso facto, as an ethnonym. One of the key elements in the definition of
ethnicity is a 'common geographic origin'. In a world in which nation states dominate and in
which nationalism remains an increasingly dominant component of political philosophy, it is
not surprising that a degree of synonymity should exist between terms used as nationalities.
and those used as ethnonyms. New Zealander in this context may be seen as a statement of belonging to this place.

Why this should, or should not, matter has been rehearsed in a number of previous places (DuPuis et al, 1999; Callister, 2004c; Allan, 2007; Kukutai and Didham, 2007). Generally the arguments settle around the compatibility with other data sources and the analysis of time series trends. This is a potential problem but there are mechanisms to adjust for this. One of the strategies for handling current data is essentially retrospective: the people who gave New Zealander as an ethnicity without also giving a European ethnicity are added back into European for the purpose of comparability. This is done because that is where they would have been coded had the 2004 review not happened. It does, however, completely sidestep the reasons why these were separated from European in the first place. Nevertheless people with a need for trend data also need a reasonably long comparable time-series to derive their measures.

The New Zealander category represents a break in the series in this respect, but more concerning for derived rates there are no comparable changes in other data sources as noted above. One example of where this is problematic is in population projections which depend on trend information on births and deaths – effectively according to these data New Zealanders are not being born and not dying and therefore cannot be projected as a population. The solution was the one noted in the previous paragraph – reincorporation of New Zealanders into the European group. This was done on the grounds that it appeared that other groupings of ethnicities were not subject to similar perturbance due to these responses. This may be an issue requiring further consideration when this is shown to be not completely correct.

There are a number of reasons for suspecting that simplistic solutions may not be lasting solutions is that there a great number of reasons why people may be using the term. Certainly in 2006 a significant prompt was the campaign promoting the idea that "we are all New Zealanders" which targeted census as a protest vehicle. However we have very little clear information on whether or not this group were all motivated by the same sentiments. It is also anecdotally known that some people at least perceived that as a red-neck male campaign and deliberately chose not to give this response even though it had been their wont to do in previous censuses. Thus the campaign provided a reason the some people to give this response and for others to not give it. It is not known how these two opposing pressures affected people who would have previously given Māori as a response.

Of more interest are the reasons what is motivating the underlying trend towards New Zealander responses in census. Despite the effect of the campaign, it was expected that the number of responses would have continued to increase. The difficulty is that there has been very little extensive enquiry into the key question of who are “New Zealanders' and then all too often this has been based on conjecture rather than fact. We do not know what is motivating the underlying trend: is it related to the growth of nationalism, or a reflection of republican trends in Australia, or is there an implicit recognition of a changing sense of a unique identity that is unique to this place and somehow transcends other aspects of ethnic identification? The problem is that at this stage we simply do not know.

If it is related to nationalism, it is not clear where New Zealander as an ethnic category sits alongside other categories. There seems to be in the assumption that they are "European" an implicit racism – a view that these people are white skinned and ‘belong to' the ‘dominant' culture. As Tapu Misa has so succinctly expressed it:

“What makes racism so complex is that much of it is unseen; it is so ingrained in our structures and attitudes we hardly recognise it. I'm not against reporting ethnicity, as one man suggested, but if we're going to make an issue of race every time a crime is reported, we should do it for everyone, including those "ethnically unmarked" white "New Zealanders" who seem to think they're getting rid of racial division by conflating nationality with ethnicity, as happened in the last census.”
Tapu Misa goes on to note:

“Actually it just reinforces the idea of whiteness as the default setting. "New Zealander" as ethnicity means white, just as in the US, says Nobel-winning author Toni Morrison, "American means white. Everybody else has to hyphenate."

As indicated by the Tapu quote, many commentators note that most of the people migrating to a New Zealander response come from having previously responded with a European ethnicity and have ‘white’ skin. Just based on size of European group, this has to be correct. However, the view downplays that there is likely to have been migration from other ethnic groups. Yet, even if the migration is disproportionately from the European response, a number of writers have suggested that there is a group of New Zealanders, many who have no connection or feel no connection to Europe, who do not wish to be recorded as ‘Europeans’ in official surveys. Yet, they have been counted as ‘Europeans’ in recent years. Alongside socio-cultural difference, a lack of connection to Europe may have been created through having: complex mixed ancestry perhaps including Māori ancestry; Asian or another non-European background; or European ancestry but having lived in New Zealand for a number of generations. There is also the possibility this thinking also affects some groups of people with other ancestries who have lived in New Zealand for a number of generations, such as Chinese who arrived in Otago during the late 19th Century In doing so, they may want to differentiate themselves from new migrants and may not see themselves as belonging to the same ethnic group (even if, based on some visible characteristics, others sometimes do).

Related to this, one alternative to the term New Zealand European used in the 1996 Census as part of the "New Zealand European/Pakeha" tickbox descriptor was the term "Pakeha". ‘Pakeha’ is a term that has not been universally accepted in New Zealand either because of its use as a specific term meaning non-Māori (remembering that around half of all Māori also identify as New Zealand European) or because for some people it is regarded as a demeaning derogatory term when used in English, not helped by folk etymologies pointing to uncertainties about the original meanings of the term (for discussions of this issue see Bedggood 1997; Pearson and Sissons 1997; Spoonley 1993). For instance, in a submission to the 2001 Review of Ethnicity Statistics, the Human Rights Commission records that one of the most common complaints to the former Race Relations Office was from people objecting to being labelled ‘Pakeha’ (Barnard 2001). Early uncertainty about the status of the term Pakeha can be observed in the book Tauiwi. The publishers, citing ‘generally accepted usage and the rule of the New Zealand Government Printing Office Style Book’, decided that the term ‘Pakeha’ should not be capitalized while Māori was (Spoonley et al, 1984: 5).

There remains much work to be done to fully understand what is happening. Key questions are outstanding, not least of which is an understanding of the characteristics of people who gave a New Zealander response in 2006 but not in 2001, or gave that response in both censuses, or chose not to in 2006 having done so in 2001. This raises questions of whether New Zealander is simply a shift in labelling reflecting growing dissatisfaction with NZ European as a tickbox label as has been contended by some or whether there are other dynamics. Ethnic mobility, ethnogenesis, protest against ethnicity, rise of nationalism and republicanism and the scope of indigeneity are all implicated in this debate. More importantly given our penchant for analysing trends over time, is an exact meaning of what people mean by New Zealander. It is by no means certain that New Zealander responses given in 2006 cover the same set of meanings as those given by people in 1986. It is simply not known, and probably unknowable, whether people are making the same ethnic identification or are telling us something different but using the same vocabulary. One hint that New Zealander in 2006 data may mean something different from New Zealander in 1986 data is the increasing incidence and complexity of multiple responses over time.

Also unknown at this stage is whether or not the leap in New Zealander in 2006 is symptomatic of an ongoing situation or principally a consequence of a campaign similar to
the effect of Jedi responses in the religion data in the previous census. This has two implications - first these two events may indicate an increasing vulnerability of census to internet and email based protest – second, whatever the results of the 2011 and 2016 Censuses may deliver it can be assumed that even if the 300,000 or so ‘extra’ responses in 2006 are ephemeral the number of New Zealander responses will continue to increase until they reach some as yet unknown plateau. Currently this is essential a census phenomenon. It is not known how other data sources may perform in the future.

Fundamental to the New Zealander type response is that this is a symptom of who we are. How this is then handled in the analytical, political and policy processes suggests that the issue is also who other people let us be.
9 Conclusions

The 2007 Montreal conference on race, ethnicity and social statistics had a title with three questions in it: Should we count, how should we count, and why? In New Zealand there is general agreement that we should count and some broad consensus as to why it might be useful to count. However, how we should count is the subject of ongoing debate. As part of this latter discussion, in the run up to the 2011 Census Statistics New Zealand is again considering some aspects of measuring ethnicity. In particular, there is ongoing debate about New Zealander type responses. While this type of focused debate is important, in this exploratory paper we have attempted to move beyond these official measures and consider more widely the question of 'who are we'. This is also a question that is being debated both nationally and internationally. This debate is driven by a wide range of factors including significant global migration; increased mixing of groups, including through intermarriage of groups who were previously geographically isolated; a better, but still very incomplete, understanding of genetics and of human evolution; and, primarily through longitudinal studies an increasing awareness of ethnic mobility.

As discussed in the introduction, this paper needs to be considered as a scoping exercise, a kind of partial ‘stock take’ or ‘brain dump’ of ideas around identity and ethnicity. It does not pretend to be in any way the final word on ‘who we are’. We have briefly explored some areas we think are important, but each area is a major research project in itself. Our main aim is to simply prompt some wider debate about ‘who we are’ and how this relates to the construction of ethnicity in a New Zealand context.

It is not possible to draw many strong conclusions from the burgeoning national and international literature that we have considered except to re-emphasise that there is a very vigorous and very complex debate about identity in most countries around the world. While there are some commonalities in the international debates, many local factors affect country specific discussions. But there can be some very broad threads drawn from the literature.

It is clear that, for some people, and in some situations, ethnicity is a critical and daily part of their identity. But for others ethnicity can be a minor part of identity or, in particular contexts, ethnicity might have little meaning. Reinforcing the findings of the 2007 Montreal conference, the literature demonstrates that identities are always emerging, that ethnicity is multi dimensional and that, in most countries, there is some fluidity of ethnicity. It is also clear that no matter whether it is race or ethnicity that is being discussed, that the division of the world population, or the population of specific countries, into neat, non-overlapping groups is increasingly problematic. However, it is also recognised that identity is not only expressed but is perceived and observed and this perception of others can forge, reinforce and, at times, restrict identities.

Examining the wider question of ‘who we are’ against official definitions of ethnicity, indicates that ‘who we are’ officially may not match all that closely who we are personally. That is, for some people ethnic identity, or how we see ourselves, and ethnic identification, that is what we say about our ethnicity, may not match. Much of the literature suggests that in an ideal world people themselves, not just officials, should be involved in creating definitions of ethnicities. But the literature also shows us official data collections, and the categories within them, are always ultimately political constructs. All of this suggests that, from a policy perspective, while ethnicity can be an important analytical variable, much care is needed in its use. As emphasised at the Should We Count conference, researchers and policy makers need to be always taking a very critical approach as to what the data they are using are actually telling them about how individuals think, behave or view their place, or the place of others, in wider society.

Finally, despite the major expansion of both the national and international literature in relation to ethnicity, there is much still to investigate. Both nationally and internationally
more questions are being raised than answers being provided. In some areas, such as genetic research, most of this investigation will be carried out overseas. But local ethnic related research is important. In New Zealand, there is scope for more research in a wide range of areas including ethnic intermarriage, the meaning of identity for children, the relationship between ethnicity and indigeneity and, indeed, whether indigeneity is a useful concept in the wider sense, emerging identities and relationships between identity and well being. Ideally, this research will draw on a wide range of methods and perspectives but, in particular, there is a need for research that goes beyond numbers in order to better understand ‘who we are’.
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