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Abstract

This thesis examines modern iwi governance systems and their effect on whakapapa as an organisational framework in Māori societies. The main question addressed was; can whakapapa survive as an organisational process, or will it be stifled, as Māori societies struggle to establish a strong identity in contemporary New Zealand.

As an organisational framework for Māori societies, whakapapa works through a series of principles that function through relationships between people, and between people and other elements that make up the world. Contemporary Māori groups continue to claim that they are whakapapa-based societies. This thesis examines that claim by investigating to what extent of “being Māori” today is about adherence to those principles and to whakapapa-based processes and relationships, and how much is it about being shaped by non-Māori constructs that have been formed by state-intervention and legislated changes to Māori social organisation. If being Māori today has as much or more to do with the latter, what place does whakapapa have in contemporary Māori society, and to what level and to what extent can the principles of whakapapa be upheld as the basis for contemporary Māori societies.

A series of stories and case studies were used to answer the questions posed in the thesis. The case studies demonstrated the ways in which whakapapa worked in everyday situations, and how the people who take part in whakapapa-based relationships understood them to work. They also demonstrated how state intervention through legislation has challenged the way Māori groups structure themselves when new circumstances have required compromise and change. The institutionalised evolution of Māori societies is examined in more detail using one example of a modern tribal structure, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. The Ngāi Tahu example typifies the implications for Māori if they choose to move from a whakapapa-based organisational model of governance to a centralised legal-bureaucratic model of governance.

The adoption of the new centralised governance structures, such as Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, will mean that Māori hapū and iwi societies are in danger of disappearing
to be replaced by a generic group, shaped by legislation and integrated into the wider nation-state of New Zealand. Whakapapa can only remain at the core of Māori societies if Māori allow it to, but when Māori adopt centralised “generic” system of governance, hapū and iwi societies become censored versions of their former selves.
Prologue: positioning myself into the dialogue

The primary theme throughout the thesis is whakapapa, and its ability to survive in a culturally significant way as part of modern iwi governance structures. In the Māori world, everything has a whakapapa that explains the relationships that exist between all entities and the environment in which they reside. It is appropriate therefore that I begin with a whakapapa to explain the relationship between the contributors and the thesis, and their space within the thesis environment.

My place in this thesis is both as participant and observer, and as the originator of some thoughts and ideas that help to explain the relationships between the themes of the thesis and the arguments that make up the overall work. One theme concerns whakapapa and its role as the key to understanding the processes that shape Māori social structures and relationships. The second theme concerns the forces that have reshaped Māori social processes and contributed to the modernisation of Māori governance structures. I will begin by using two ways of presenting my own whakapapa as a model to help explain the two interwoven themes in the thesis.

Ko Aoraki te maunga
Ka tāhuri ia, ka tiro ake ra ki te tae tonga
Kī te maunga paenga o Takitimu
Kā tiro atu rātou ki te maunga o Motupohue
Kā tāhuri ia, kā tiro atu ki te maunga o Rau Uira, kei te noho ia i te wāhi o Tautuku, o Waikawa hoki.
Kā rere noa iho ngā awa o Mataura, kei te hono ai ki te Awa-a-Kiwa, kei Motupohue.
Ko ēnei taonga ko ngā whai take o Murihiku, Ko tōku turangawaewae.
No reira,
Ko Motupohue te maunga,
Ko Te Rau Aroha te marae
Ko Te Rapuawai, Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, Ngāi Tahu ngā iwi
Ko te whanau Wybrow tōku whanau
Ko ēnei taonga, ko ahau
No reira
Ngā mihi aroha ahau ki ngā tūpuna nāna i tautoko tēnei mahi, Kei te noho mai koutou i te rangimarie,
Tēnā koutou
Ngā mihi aroha hoki ki ngā whanaunga ora nāna i tautoko anō tēnei mahi. Tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā ra tātou kātoa

The mountain, Aoraki, is the supreme ancestor under whose mantle the land and all the people living upon it are protected.
The mountain range, Takitimu, and the mountains, Rau Uira and Motupohue, are the boundary markers of my hau kainga – the place of my origins.

The river, Mataura is the river that runs through part of my hau kainga and links the realm of Tāne, the origin of the natural world and people, with the realm of Tangaroa, the origin of the sea, rivers, lakes and the water ways and everything that lives within them. The Mataura is also the river that has special significance in the history of my own family.

The land is Murihiku, the southern most region of New Zealand’s South Island, and the people are the past, present and future generations of Te Rapuwai, Kāti Mamoe, Kāi Tahu and Waitaha peoples who occupy the space within the landscape.

This whakapapa is part of my whakapapa and it provides a key to understanding how I, as a Ngāi Tahu woman, am related to all the elements of my Ngāi Tahu environment – the snow, the various winds, mists, and the geographical features, are within my whakapapa and are all within me as Ngāi Tahu. It provides a key to explain how I am part of, and a product of, my Ngāi Tahu environment. The lands, the stratosphere, the elements, the resources, are all part of me, as per according to my whakapapa. Whakapapa shapes my experiences and relationships with place, space and other people.

There is another way, however, of writing down my whakapapa. Connections to contemporary Ngāi Tahu are often spoken about in the following way.

I am Ngāi Tahu, Ngāti Mamoe, Waitaha and Te Rapuwai. These are the Māori groups that occupy most of the South Island of New Zealand and are collectively referred to as Ngāi Tahu whānui. The term, Ngāi Tahu Whānui, was awarded to us through the passing of two pieces of legislation that gave us a legal identity and organisational rules and structure: The Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act, 1996 and The Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act, 1998. The name, Ngāi Tahu whānui, is stated in the 1998 Act preamble as meaning ‘the collective of individuals who descend from the primary hapū of Waitaha, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu, namely Kāti Kurī, Kāti Iremehe, Kāti Huirapa, Ngāi Tuahuriri, and Kai Te Ruahikihiki’.¹ When I recite these names I am considered to be giving my whakapapa or my genealogical relationship to the various groups. This identifies me as part of well-defined, highly structured

groups who share kinship, have distinct cultural traits - Ngāi Tahutanga - and hold mana whenua in areas of Te Waipounamu, which are defined by legislation. I connect by some degree to about 29,000 other people who are classified the same way. There may be more than this of course, but it is only those who have registered with the governing body called Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu who are officially recognised. It is only the registered beneficiaries who can access the benefits that Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu administers on our behalf. That is, the benefits of being Ngāi Tahu which come to us through whakapapa. I have often been told that this thing, whakapapa, is like a family tree and tells people how I fit in with the rest of Ngāi Tahu whenui. The base of Ngāi Tahu whakapapa is the Blue Book, which is administered by the whakapapa unit of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. This book is made up of lists of names of Ngāi Tahu ancestors alive in 1848. In fact, I have also been told that if a person cannot whakapapa to one of the ancestors in the Blue Book than the person is not Ngāi Tahu. So the book is pretty powerful as obviously it distinguishes me from everyone who is not Ngāi Tahu and enables me to substantiate my claim to various benefits as outlined in the 1998 Settlement Act. It was the subject of this Act, the Waitangi Treaty settlement with the New Zealand Government, that recently made being Ngāi Tahu something more desirable. Now lots of people want to be able to prove they have an ancestor in the Blue Book as this entitles them to join an elite group: it gives them a whakapapa thereby substantiating their Ngāi Tahuness. The person may have always known that he or she is Ngāi Tahu but somehow this connection to a list of names taken down in 1848 makes it official. Therefore two Acts of Parliament and a census list in a blue book explain by example what whakapapa Ngāi Tahu is.

Ngāi Tahutanga, is our distinct cultural difference; our language dialect, our material culture, our waiata, stories, shared history and all manner of things that make us culturally Ngāi Tahu. This is managed and controlled through programmes organised and directed by the Ngāi Tahu Development Corporation, which is in charge of overseeing Ngāi Tahu cultural development. Ngāi Tahu mana whenua (power and authority over land) is now measured through all the assets that identify us as the owners of certain parts of Te Waipounamu. All the assets and economic ventures are administered by the Ngāi Tahu Holding Corporation, which is the financial division of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.

Both the above whakapapa create different images of me as an Ngāi Tahu woman. One is the traditional image of whakapapa in its entirety that explains the way all entities are integrated into the world. It is an image of inclusiveness. The other is a re-imaged identity that explains my position within an ethnic group. The way the whakapapa is constructed makes the group appear to be excluded from the environment in which they exist. It is an image that suggests exclusiveness.
The second whakapapa excludes most of the relationships between Ngāi Tahu and other entities. It describes members of a group who have a shared history, stories, genealogies, ancestral home, language and culture. It describes a generic ethnicity devoid of any specific connections with the knowledge, belief and values systems of the first whakapapa. The images are in tension with each other, because in the second whakapapa, there is no hint of the experiences and practices that make up the connections, alliances and relationships between all the elements that co-exist in the environment. As described in the second whakapapa, the image of Ngāi Tahu identity has been shaped by forces other than whakapapa and, as a result, part of the total Ngāi Tahu identity is missing. It is an incomplete image of who Ngāi Tahu whānui are as a people.

The use of the two whakapapa to portray contrasting images of myself as an Ngāi Tahu woman serves as a model to portray what is happening in wider contemporary Māori society. There are two significantly contrasting images of Māori that are in tension with each other. One concerns the image of tradition-based groups whose organisational processes use whakapapa as the fundamental measure of their identity. The other concerns the image of Māori groups who are being reshaped by forces external to whakapapa processes, which have, in turn, contributed to the shape of modern Māori governance structures. The external forces have provided special challenges to the way Māori groups are modernising to fit with changing national and global environments. Yet Māori insist that whakapapa remains as the key to understanding their unique identity and organisational processes. There is some question, however, in what form and to what degree the tradition-based processes will be allowed to occur in the future. The overall aim of this thesis is to examine the development of Māori strategies for restructuring their governance structures and, if during this process, they are able to successfully maintain their distinctive identities as Māori societies.

Whakapapa is about relationships based on experiences in the past and present that help to shape the future. For me, writing *Whakapapa and the State* has been a way of reflecting on how past and present experiences and relationships, both from whakapapa and from external forces, have helped to shape future identity. Therefore
the thesis offers an opportunity to explore themes of identity, challenge, and compromise that are changing both the Ngāi Tahu and the wider Māori worlds.

Some thoughts as to the shape of this thesis: Contributions and acknowledgements

One of the difficulties of writing this thesis has been the use of my own iwi, Ngāi Tahu, as the main case study. I often thought that I should have been writing from a third person, observer position. But, as both an observer and a participant in the changes that are occurring within my iwi, I found it difficult to separate out my personal experiences and observations from the reality of my participation in the iwi’s modernising process. Therefore I make no apologies if parts of my writing are personal and subjective. After all, the thesis is about whakapapa and relationships, and these are often fuelled and shaped by subjective processes.

Another difficulty that had to be overcome in the writing process concerned the idea of whakapapa bringing together the past, present and future generations. Sometimes it was difficult to know what tense to use when writing about particular matters. In order to explain matters concerning whakapapa it may appear that I have confused tenses, but this may be because some whakapapa-based systems are very much part of contemporary Māori societies. In the nature of whakapapa, the past is with us in the present and the past has not been replaced by the present. If referred to in the past tense, the subject will become locked into the past and have no active connection with the present. In some cases, such as Māori leadership, this is not the case. There are many examples of tradition-based leadership roles still operating efficiently and effectively; Te Ariki of Tuwharetoa, Tumu te Heuheu is one such example.

In all whakapapa, there are many layers that interweave and add to the experiences and dynamism of its many relationships. That is also the case with the whakapapa of this thesis. In order to both explain existing relationships and concepts, and develop new ones, several alliances have been undertaken between me and interested parties. The alliances have created new opportunities for expansion and development of the
thesis itself, just as each new layer added to a whakapapa expands and develops the relationships layered within it.

Special thanks should go to my supervisors who have helped shape my thoughts into this thesis. They are Emeritus Professor Sir Hugh Kawharu, Department of Māori Studies, and Professor Andrew Sharp, Department of Political Studies, at the University of Auckland. Others who offered advice and contributed to the early stages of my writing were Professor Ngapare Hopa and Professor Patu Hohepa. Tēnā koutou kātoa i ō koutou tautoko, i ō koutou awhi ki ahau.

The thesis would not have had the same depth to it if people had not agreed to be interviewed and share their thoughts on the very complex topic of whakapapa, and to openly discuss the changes occurring within their own iwi. The interviewees were chosen because of their connections to various themes of the thesis. Edward Te Kohu Douglas, Ngāti Mamoe and Ngāi Tahu, and Tumu te Heuheu, Te Ariki of Tuwharetoa, were approached for participation because of their connection with the Volcanic Interior Plateau claim [VIP]. Ted had worked on the ‘Find a Whanau’ project that was conducted to help each hapū find a process for locating all their members. Tumu was a member of the VIP taumata and one of the claimants listed on the initial claim. Margaret Mutu is the Kaiwhakahaere of the Ngāti Kahu rūnanga and she was able to further explain the issues surrounding their former membership of the central governance group, Te Rūnanga o Muriwhenua. Margaret explained the development of Ngāti Kahu since the disbanding of Te Rūnanga o Muriwhenua, and how they were planning to operate post-settlement as Ngāti Kahu. Mark Solomon was interviewed in his capacity as Kaiwhakahaere of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu, and as the rūnanga representative of his own rūnanga at Kaikōura. Mark was able to explain issues surrounding the tension between operating as mana whenua, and operating as a democratically elected member of a central rūnanga collective. Both Kelly Tikao and Reina Whaitiri are Ngāi Tahu taura here living in Auckland, but have also lived within their hau kainga areas. They were able to talk about their experiences as hau kainga and as taura here in their relationships with the wider iwi, Ngāi Tahu.

The interview questions were primarily to do with what each participant thought whakapapa was, and how they saw it as operating within their own particular context.
For example both Ted and Tumu responded as was appropriate to the VIP claim that they are involved with. In the course of the interview, Tumu also spoke about his role as ariki of Tuwharetoa, because he found he could not separate his role from his responsibilities and comments concerning VIP. Each participant was also asked about their thoughts on the modern governance structures of their prospective iwi groups. The taped interviews were then transcribed and edited for grammatical purposes only. All the interviewees were given the opportunity to examine the transcriptions and revise the information, make suggestions as to content, or have information excluded from the thesis draft. I also explained how I had incorporated their interview material into the main thesis and in what contexts this had happened. Their co-operation and further suggestions were very helpful towards writing the final draft of the thesis. Therefore, mihi nui aroha ki Edward Te Kohu Douglas, Tumu te Heuheu, Margaret Mutu, Mark Solomon, Kelly Tikao, and Reina Whaitiri. Tēnā koutou kātoa.

Many of the stories that feature in Chapter Two were taken from evidence given before the Waitangi Tribunal during hearings for the Ngāi Tahu Claim, the Whanganui-a-Orutu Claim, the Pouaki Report, the Muriwhenua Fisheries Claim, and the Te Roroa Report. All these reports are on public record and are held in the Canterbury University Library [Ngāi Tahu claims evidence], and the University of Auckland General Library.

The following people have also contributed their thoughts and their stories over the years spent in writing this thesis and their comments and guidance were much appreciated. Their contributions were not the result of formal interviews, but each were given the opportunity to further discuss the information and how I had incorporated it into the thesis. Terry Ryan, Ngāi Tahu, is the kaitiaki of Ngāi Tahu whakapapa and heads the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu whakapapa unit. Terry contributed informally over the four years spent writing the thesis, providing insights and comments about various experiences he had had while working with the whakapapa of Ngāi Tahu. Isobel Roderick is from Ngāti Hikairo and Ngāti Rangiwehehi. Her contributions were as a result of many discussions and conversations during family gatherings. Miki Roderick is my partner and as with Isobel, his contributions were from the many conversations we have had over the years spent writing the thesis. Maruhaeremuri Stirling, Ngāti Mamoe, Ngāi Tahu and
Te Whānau a Apanui, and Huata Holmes, Te Rapuwai, Ngāti Mamoe, and Ngāi Tahu are two of my whanaunga, who have been supportive and willing to share their knowledge of various things relating to whakapapa. Hineira Woodard, Tuhoe, and Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Ngāti Awa, Ngāti Porou, are colleagues at the University of Auckland who offered advice and comments on various issues surrounding their experiences of whakapapa. Ngā mihi aroha mai ahau ki a koutou katoa.

I have chosen not to follow standard academic procedure to refer to people by their surnames, when their contributions have appeared in the thesis text. The personal relationships that I have with each of them deemed it more appropriate to use their first names. However, when I have quoted or referred to an academic journal or text, the author(s) has been cited in the usual way of using the surname, date of publication, and page number.

The support I have received from friends and colleagues in the Department of Māori Studies, University of Auckland, was valued and appreciated, particularly their tolerance and understanding during the long, long, long process of writing a thesis. Ngā mihi nui aroha ki a Merekaraka Gillman, Jane McCrae, Rangimarie Rawiri, Ann Sullivan, and Deanne Wilson, Roberta Wilson, and to PhD and MA members of the post-grad room in Māori Studies who shared thoughts and ideas during visits to our alternate PhD venue, ‘Gloria’s.’ Mihi nui ki Susan Healy, Tane Mokena, Dinah Paul, Hazel Petrie, Verity Smith, Yvonne Sutherland, and Te Aroha Rountree. No reira, tēnā koutou, tēnā koutou, tēnā ra tatou katoa.

On reflection then, this thesis is very much about people and relationships and the challenges that have brought changes to the way they organise themselves socially, politically and economically in order to meet the expectations of an emerging modern national and global Māori identity. The people are my people, Ngāi Tahu whānui, and the many other Māori people whose whakapapa remains at the key to their identity. The challenge has been, and always will be, the way it is allowed to remain as the key to Māori identity, and Whakapapa and the State attempts to provide some insights into the lessons of the past, and how they may contain pathways for the future. The challenge will be how to learn from past lessons and develop new pathways without losing sight of who Māori are as people.
Table of Contents

CHAPTER ONE
The practice of whakapapa and the contexts of challenge: Introductory remarks

| Illustration – koru (spiral) | 13 |
| Method | 18 |

CHAPTER TWO
The living tradition of whakapapa

2.1 Whakapapa stories
- Photo – Matiaha Tiramorehu
- Photo – Mataura river falls
- Ngāi Tahu Seasonal gathering round
- Illustration – Matariki
- Photo – Making kelp bags
- Photos – Tūi islands
- Illustration – Hākari stage
- Illustration – Pātaka

2.2 Changing the face of whakapapa: Disconnecting the worlds
- Table – ‘Kinship terms’

2.3 Imposed restrictions: Mystifying whakapapa

2.4 Interruptions to whakapapa: Internal changes

CHAPTER THREE: The State

3.1 Land legislation
- Fig.1 – Grey’s rūnanga plan
- Fig. 2 – The Runanga Iwi Bill

3.2 The Rūnanga Iwi Bill: Redefining and re-organising iwi

3.3 The Rūnanga Iwi Bill and participation: Choosing a layer of co-operation

3.4 The Rūnanga Iwi Bill and Kotahitanga: The National Māori Congress

CHAPTER FOUR
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

4.1 The Institutionalisation of the Ngāi Tahu tribe
- Fig. 3, Ngāi Tahu Māori Trust Board structure
- Fig 4, Te Rūnanganui-o-Tahu structure;
- Fig.5, Proposed TRONT structure;
- Fig. 6, TRONT Vision 2025 structure.

4.2 From the House of Tahu to TRONT

4.8 Beneficiary lists: Redefining whakapapa tīpuna

4.10 Is legal-rational-bureaucracy the way forward? Case studies of The Volcanic Interior Plateau claim, and Ngāti Kahu.
CHAPTER FIVE
Whakapapa and the State: Closing remarks

Glossary
Bibliography

Prologue: Positioning myself into the dialogue
Some thoughts as to the shape of this thesis: Contributions and acknowledgements

Pronunciation guide
Language and translation conventions
Māori terminology

MAPS
New Zealand
Ngā Runanga o Ngāi Tahu

PHOTOS/ILLUSTRATIONS
'takarangi' spiral

Matiaha Tiramorehu, ATL. F-162572-1/2
'Falls of Mataura River,' ATL. E-174-031/032

Diagrams:
Seasonal gathering round (Anderson A 1998: 117)
Wakawaka boundaries (Anderson A 1998: 115)

'Matariki' (NZ Herald 15/7/02)
Poha manufacture, HL E-2918/10

Tītī Island photos and map

'F. G. Angus')

ATL: F-147221-1/2; c/n E6772/42A; E 2918/11; c/n E6773/40A

'Whatas 1847' ATL PUBL-0014-30
(From: The New Zealanders Illustrated, plate 30, F.G. Angus)

'Flow diagram of the 1861 Runanga Scheme'

Insert page 1
Insert page 1
Insert p. 13
Insert p.34
Insert p.41
Insert p.53
Insert p.55
Insert p.55
Insert p. 56
Insert p. 56
Insert p.77
Insert p.81
Insert p.110

197
207
212
Flow diagram of the Runanga Iwi Bill (my own)
Flow diagrams of the Ngāi Tahu structures (my own)

ABBREVIATIONS

AJHR  Appendices to the Journals of the House of Representatives
ATL   Alexander Turnbull Library
HL    Hocken Library
FoMA  Federation of Maori Authorities
NZPD  New Zealand Parliamentary Debates
SNZ   Statutes of New Zealand
TRONT Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu
UAL   University of Auckland Library
VIP   Volcanic Interior Plateau
The vowel sound in the Māori language is essential to the correct pronunciation of Māori. The vowel sounds are constant except in cases where they vary in length. The lengthened sound is indicated by a macron over the vowel, e.g. ‘a’ becomes ‘ā’.

The vowel a is pronounced as in the English far. Avoid all trace of the flat a as in hat.

The vowel e is pronounced like the ea in leather. Avoid the double sound of the vowel as found in hay and may.

The vowel i is pronounced as in the Latin languages. It is equivalent to the vowel sound in the English words me or he.

The vowel o is pronounced as the English word awe. Avoid all trace of the English pronunciation of oh!

The vowel u is pronounced like the double o in moon. Avoid saying it like the ew in few.

When two vowels occur together, begin by practising each separately until you can speed up without spoiling the clarity of the vowels when they are run together, e.g., ‘koe’ should be practiced as ‘ko-e’ until the vowels can follow each other smoothly.

The consonants:

r must not be rolled. It is pronounced quite close to the sound of l in English. The tongue is near the front of the mouth.

p is generally softer than in English, not an explosive sound.

wh is usually pronounced liked f. In some districts it is spoken like an h (e.g., in Hokianga) and in others like a w (e.g. in Taranaki), in others again like the wh in when.

ng is a softer sound than the English, especially with regard to the g. The sound is similar to the middle ng in singing.

Language and translation conventions

I have used the macrons where appropriate to indicate vowel length; however there are some instances where I have not used them. For example, I have not added macrons to quotes if the author has not used them. Secondly, I did not add them to Māori language manuscript material, but chose to transcribe the manuscripts as they appeared in the original form. I have not added macrons to place names or proper nouns if they do not appear in the original research material because it is inappropriate for me to suggest how the hapu or iwi pronounce their place names or ancestral names. Some of the titles for government departments that appeared in official

documents such as AJHR documents, did not use a macron, therefore I have not added them.

Māori language is made up of different dialects. One of the main dialectal differences in the South Island is the use of the allophone, [k], in place of the phoneme, /ng/. This occurs in words such as Ngāti, which is often pronounced, Kāti, in the Ngāi Tahu dialect. I have used the [k] substitution only where it has appeared in quotations and where my informants have used it. This is primarily because there is on-going debate even amongst Ngāi Tahu whānui as to the authenticity of the [k] substitution.3

In the transcriptions of Māori language manuscripts I have added words into square brackets for clarification and where there appears to be a misprint in either grammar or spelling. Otherwise I have transcribed the manuscripts as they appear in the original material. Each manuscript is footnoted with details of translation sources.

Maori terminology

A Glossary is included in the thesis. However, it must be made clear that the glosses for each word are as they appear in the context of this thesis only. I realise that many of the terms used are terms that represent concepts surrounding Māori processes and cannot be defined by a simple English phrase or one word. Many of the words have more than one meaning and not all are given in the Glossary.

Throughout chapter two and the other chapters of the thesis Māori groups will be referred to as “tradition-based” societies rather than using the word “tribe.” The word, “tribe,” is problematic because it assumes that each group is a closed society whose beliefs make it difficult for the entity to adapt and grow when faced with challenges and changes from outside its closed reality. A main argument in this thesis is that instead of the word, tribe, Māori societies are better described as tradition-based societies. This type of society is more capable of movement and development

because knowledge and values that are based in the past do not limit or inhibit growth or adoption of new technology or ideas, but form part of a framework of knowledge and experience that can be drawn from in order to move a group easily into a contemporary situation. Likewise the terms, whānau, hapū, iwi and waka are defined as whanaungatanga relationships, or layers of co-operation between groups. This concept allows for the fluidity of whakapapa to be expressed when the thesis discusses the various layers of relationships, and does not characterise the groups as immovable social structures.