THE INTERWEAVING OF PEOPLE, TIME, AND PLACE—WHAKAPAPA AS CONTEXT AND METHOD[1]

Lily George, Te Kapotai/Ngaapuhi/Paakehaa
Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand

Along the Waikare River, in the tiny village of Waikare, for generations my *whaanau* (extended family) from the Te Kapotai tribe has harvested foods. The Waikare River flows into the sea and provides a thoroughfare to places such as Opua and Kororareka, where people from Waikare travel to meet with other whaanau. Trips to the beach by boat (and later by car) were always about food and pleasure; most frequently the pleasure of food. My *tupuna* (ancestors) and those of my mother's generation knew intimately the surrounding islands comprising the Bay of Islands; knowledge that was passed from one generation to another, forming part of the blueprint of our lives. Unfortunately, by the tail end of my generation, the incentive to pass this knowledge forward had lessened—a reflection of our changing world. Yet just as the tides of our *awa* (river) ebb and flow, so too has our culture ebbed and flowed. Deeply interwoven into the history of this land are experiences great and small, and people great and small. *Whakapapa* (genealogy/history) is the bridge that carries us from one experience to another, from one being to another.

Because I am an indigenous anthropologist, who I am as a cultural being has a fundamental influence on how I perceive the world and analyze it. Whakapapa grounds and connects me to other Maaori, to all the lands and people of Aotearoa, and, through the aspects of our shared history, to other indigenous peoples of the world. There is a whakapapa to Maaori

Pacific Studies, Vol. 33, Nos. 2/3—Aug./Dec. 2010

anthropology in New Zealand into which I fit that highlights pathways and pitfalls for current practitioners through the practices of previous Maaori scholars such as Sir Peter Buck and Sir Apirana Ngata. Whakapapa are also "epistemological frameworks" (Roberts et al. 2004, 1) that establish connections and relationships between phenomena and contextualize those phenomena within particular historical, cultural, and social perspectives. My research experiences provide several examples of how whakapapa is embedded within those experiences, reflecting the cultural context within which I engage in research. Whakapapa can therefore be seen as both context and method in which I as a Maaori researcher practicing indigenous anthropology can thrive.

Whakapapa is one of the principal concepts that comprise *maatauranga Maaori* (Maaori knowledge), along with those such as *tapu* (sacredness/restriction), *mana* (prestie/authority), *whaanau*, *hapuu* (tribe), and *iwi* (tribe/people). While there may be tribal differences between definitions and applications of these concepts, there are also shared meanings for Maaori as a whole (Walker 2004, 28), which provide an insight into *Te Ao Maaori* (the Maaori world). Many Maaori believe that whakapapa reaches back in time to *Io Matua Kore* (Supreme God) and *Te Kore* (the beginnings of the universe, the great emptiness yet where anything and everything was possible). This potential manifested in the forming of *Papatuanuku* (Earth Mother) and *Ranginui* (Sky Father), leading us into *Te Po* (the dark realm). From here, their child *Tane Mahuta* (God of Forests) along with other siblings, strove to separate their godly parents, enabling them, and therefore humankind, to move into the domain of *Te Ao Marama* (the world of light and knowledge).

All Maaori can claim descent from these divine beginnings. Our whakapapa can lead us on a journey in which the past is brought into the present (Walker 2004, 56) for the education and acculturation of the descendants. Whakapapa is more than genealogical connections however; it is also the history—the stories—of our tupuna. It is those stories that ensure our tupuna live on in us and around us. They connect us to the physical features of our landscape, which become imbued with spiritual meaning through the narratives. Buck noted in 1929 that "I have always felt, since my Polynesian wanderings, that New Zealand was composed of a number of islands of spirit connected by land" (in Sorrenson 1982: 20–21). These narratives that accompany whakapapa also provide "explanations for why things came to be the way they are, as well as moral guidelines for correct conduct" (Roberts et al. 2004, 1). Whakapapa is the inalienable link that binds us to the land and sea, to people and places, to time and space, even when we are not aware of it.

When I began my acquaintance with the people of Awataha Marae[2] on Auckland's North Shore in 1997, I did so with little cultural knowledge. Yet it seemed the most natural thing in the world to establish whakapapa connections with the people there, with queries such as—Where do you come from? Who do you belong to? Which *whenua* (land) nurtured the lives of your people?—an endeavor that is vitally important to nearly every Maaori engagement, since this establishes our connection to Te Ao Maaori and therefore each other. While there were no close whakapapa connections established, we nevertheless could form connections in terms of distant ancestors and shared experiences. One of the *kaumatua* (elders) had worked with my grandfather many years before; a factor that also laid the foundations for a close bond. In a similar situation, Weber-Pillwax wrote of an incident whereupon meeting particular elders for the first time, their formality was dissolved when they learned who her grandfather was, since he had married a member of their community. She felt that "the sun was breaking out over me, and immediately everything about the introduction was totally different" (Weber-Pillwax 2001, 167).

One of the suggestions made by the kaumatua near the beginning of the PhD in 2002 was that I return to my *tuurangawaewae* (standing place) in the Bay of Islands and seek deeper knowledge of my whakapapa from my own whaanau. Charles Royal asserts that researching tribal histories is a spiritual journey because it leads back to Io Matua Kore and the beginnings of time (1993, 9). For the Awataha project, understanding the histories of the major groups involved and the history of the whenua, as well as the contextual history, was vitally necessary for understanding what is present today. As Te Tuhi Robust contends, "Backing into the future is a concept of thinking ahead with the full understanding of the historical journeys we have taken to be where we are now" (Robust 2000, 30). By grounding myself in the whakapapa of my own people, I therefore stood upon a solid foundation from which I could respectfully seek to research the histories of other people and places. And as noted by Tawhai, "What right do I have to hold a mirror up to other iwi (tribe/people) if I don't firstly hold the mirror up to myself?" (in Walker 2004, 3).

In the whakapapa book for my whaanau reunion held in March 2008,[3] I wrote the following words:

> Whakapapa is the life-blood of all people; both literally and metaphorically. Knowledge of who we are because of those we come from gives us history, identity, and connections to people, lands and Gods. Through whakapapa, the unbroken chain of past,

> present and future becomes visible and real. While the tapestry of self is unique to each new expression of whakapapa, it nonetheless owes part of its shades and hues to those who wove its beginnings.

This reflects first the reason for our being together as a *whaanau*, and second, the reason for us to continue to be so in the future. Whakapapa are the spiritual, emotional, and physical ties that connect us as individuals to the collective body of the whaanau of Te Wiki Wiremu Hoori, and to the *hapuu* and *iwi* (tribes) of Te Kapotai and Ngaapuhi, respectively. Our whakapapa therefore provides a "standing place" and matrix of connection and protection from which we—individually and collectively, personally, and professionally—can reach outward into the world.

Challenges from indigenous peoples regarding research have been insistent over the last few decades, and for Maaori, the development of kaupapa Maaori research methodologies arose out of a Maaori-perceived need to design, direct, and control research in Maaori communities and on Maaori-related issues. Graham Smith defines kaupapa Maaori as simply "the philosophy and practise of being Maaori" (Smith 1993, 1), and as a "theory of change" (1992, cited in Te Momo 2002, 4). Kaupapa Maaori research initiatives, then, advocate the legitimacy of Maaori knowledge, culture, and values. As yet there is no single entity that can be termed kaupapa Maaori research, reflecting the diversity within Maaori communities and among Maaori researchers, which necessitates a freedom with research practice to adjust those practices to individuals and groups participating in research. Also, just as culture is not static but is instead dynamic and ever changing, the same could be said of research processes. This includes the freedom to design our own theories and methodologies based on cultural knowledge.

In his doctoral research of Te Aute College, Graham (2009, 59) "expounds the use of both a traditional and a contemporary illumination of whakapapa as guiding the whole research process." Whakapapa "innately and organically links the past, present and future." This whakapapa links the generations of young Maaori who have passed through Te Aute (including Apirana Ngata and Peter Buck) to each other and the lands, and Te Aute itself has a whakapapa that is intricately entwined with the Te Aute experiences of these young Maaori. The whakapapa shows a "lineage of contribution that has evolved from one era to the next," it is multilayered—including connections to Christianity, rugby, and the armed services—and a whakapapa of leadership and achievement can be perceived. Therefore whakapapa refers both to "the birth of human life" and to "the birth of new knowledge" (Graham 2009, 63).

Royal also sees whakapapa as a useful analytic tool that "organises phenomena into groups and provides explanations for trends and features within those groups" (Royal 1998, 80). Just as a human being has parents who contributed to their birth into the world, so does an event or phenomenon. By searching back along the lines of whakapapa, it is possible to identify the antecedent or parental phenomena, and from there to ascertain connections to other phenomena in an ever-widening picture of this phenomenal world, which Royal calls "Te Ao Marama" (1998, 81). This organic process analyzes relationships between phenomena and uses *whakawhaanaungatanga* (relationship development and maintenance) to signify the interconnectedness of all things (Royal 1998, 82).

Whakapapa-in-context[4] is a useful method, therefore, whereby a particular event or person is contextualized into a particular time period, in what could be called the horizontal or generational whakapapa. We can then understand it further by looking at the vertical or antecedent whakapapa, and there are connections and relationships sideways, upside down, forward, and backward that you could make in order to understand a particular event and the situatedness of the person or event within it. As a simple example, when looking at the Awataha Marae history, we can see that site approval for a marae was finally gained in 1981 after two decades of petitioning local councils and organizations. So what was happening at the time? It was approximately a decade after major Maaori protests that injustices had occurred, and there was a major cultural renaissance. It was six years after the 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act, when the government had to acknowledge these injustices with regard to breaches of the treaty principles. This resulted in a more conducive social atmosphere supporting the building of a marae in an urban center, as contrasted with previous community concerns such as a concern that rats would be encouraged by the dumps that would spring up around the marae.[5]

In terms of vertical whakapapa, we could go back to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840 and follow it forward through the decimations of culture and people. We could identify some of our tupuna whose innovation of tradition helped reclaim and retain our *tikanga* (customs) through times of hardship. Of importance too is increased Maaori urbanization following World War II and how this led to a need for a pantribal marae in this Auckland suburb to serve cultural needs. And finally, we could look forward from 1981 to the present and see what the presence of Awataha Marae has given "birth" to, e.g., a tribally run health center and Maaori language schools on the Awataha site. What does this mean? And how do these developments at Awataha Marae connect to developments in the wider society? Seeking the answers to questions such as these helps fit

Awataha Marae into a wider and multilayered matrix of history that gives a deeper understanding of the particular history of the marae.[6]

Anthropology in Aotearoa New Zealand also has a whakapapa that can be illuminated, which includes a history of Maaori involvement from the early nineteenth century, "not only as subjects but as analysts of their own culture" (Henare 2007, 94). Beaglehole (1938, 152) asserted in 1938 that there had been three divisions or phases of anthropology in New Zealand. The first is as noted by Henare above and consisted also of early visitors who recorded their impressions of the people and land as they traveled through. Owing to the amateur nature of these observers, Beaglehole contended that the writings they left behind must be treated with care and used "as a sort of quarry . . . rather than as a body of validly-established and definitely-defined data on old Maaori life" (Beaglehole 1938, 153), which required rigorous testing to confirm its validity.

The second phase occurred from the latter half of the twentieth century, in a period Beaglehole called that of the "enthusiastic amateur" (Beaglehole 1938, 154), with well-known writers such as Shortland, Grey, Best, Smith, and Hamilton, also noted by Henare as "amateur ethnologists" (Henare 2007, 95). These writers often used Maaori informants, for example, Wiremu Maihi Te Rangikaheke was Governor George Grey's informant, and Tamati Ranapiri was one of Elsdon Best's informants. Thus these first two phases consisted mostly of those who had no specialized training in anthropology or ethnology, were often colonial agents who through circumstance had many interactions with Maaori, and learned their scholarly pursuits "on the job." Ballara (1998: 97–99) contends, however, that these prolific writers contributed to a "grand design," condensing Maaori history and society in an orderly manner that suited the needs of the emerging nation. It was also assumed by Smith and his compatriots that what they were investigating and describing was a culture seemingly inert for hundreds of years, and they did not appear to take into consideration the changes brought about after European contact (Webster 1998a).

Beaglehole's reported third phase of anthropology (1938, 156) began in the second decade of the twentieth century when professional anthropology began in earnest, and it was in this period that Apirana Ngata and Peter Buck came to prominence. Apirana's father, Paratene, was born in 1849 and was adopted into the household of Rapata Wahawaha, who was to become a prominent chief of Ngati Porou, leading his people in the New Zealand Wars, on the side of the British, against the troops of those such as Te Kooti Arikirangi.

Paratene Ngata therefore matured in a "rapidly changing social landscape of tribalism, traders and Christianity," and, like Wahawaha, "believed that education was important for the future wellbeing of his people" (Walker

2001: 41 and 36); Paratene was sent to missionary school at Waerengahika. Following a period of childlessness, which required the intervention of a *tohunga* (priest), Apirana was born to Paratene and Katerina Ngata on July 3, 1874. The auspicious circumstances surrounding Apirana's conception and birth, "occurring as they did in the transition between te ao Maaori and the world of modernity .... singled out Apirana Ngata as no ordinary person" (Walker 2001, 56).

The young Apirana grew up among a wealth of knowledge, having Wahawaha and other members of his household teaching him the traditions of Ngati Porou, as well as introducing him to the changing world. Rapata Wahawaha and Paratene Ngata were impressive role models for Apirana, since they were now considered leaders of Ngati Porou. Apirana entered Te Aute College in 1883, at the age of nine. He was molded from birth to take his place among the leaders of Ngati Porou and to help his people transition more easily into the changing world (Walker 2001, 56).

Born to a Maaori mother (Ngati Mutunga) and *Paakehaa* (non-Maaori) father,[7] Peter Buck was raised primarily in a Paakehaa community, with "little opportunity of coming under the influence of the elders of [his] mother's people" (Hiroa 1926, 185). At eighteen, while visiting friends on the East Coast, he was welcomed onto various marae. He wrote:

> Never shall I forget the tide of shame that surged through me as with trembling knees I stood up to reply in the crowded meetings, and with faltering speech sought to justify my existence. ... My ignorance appalled me, and ever since I have sought to rectify the omissions of a mis-spent youth (Hiroa 1926: 185–86).

Through his many contributions to Maaori and Polynesian society over the coming years, Buck did indeed rectify his lack of Maaori cultural knowledge. He was given the ancestral name of Te Rangi Hiroa later in life and always considered his mixed ancestry of equal importance (Sorrenson 1996).

In 1896, Buck enrolled in Te Aute College, thereby coming into contact with Apirana Ngata, which was the beginning of a lasting friendship, as encapsulated by their exchange of letters from 1925 to 1950.[8] The headmaster of Te Aute, John Thornton, was a major influence in the lives of these student reformers, instilling in them his ideas that in order to raise Maaori from the depths, they must draw out "what was best in the Maaori nature" (Walker 2001, 69). The Te Aute College Student's Association and later the Young Maaori Party, consisting of those such as Ngata, Buck, and Maui Pomare, were instrumental in formulating and carrying out some long-reaching innovations to Maaori society.

In Ngata's 1909 manifesto for the Young Maaori Party, emphasis was put on "the need to preserve Maaori language, poetry, traditions, customs, arts and crafts; and to carry out research into anthropology and ethnology" (Sorrenson 1982, 9), in a "programme of economic and cultural invigoration" (Henare 2007, 100). By this time, both had succeeded in winning Maaori seats in Parliament and had met with Paakehaa such as Elsdon Best and Augustus Hamilton. Ngata had become a member of the Polynesian Society in 1895, having realized its importance in recording Maaori history and customs for future generations in a time when this knowledge was being lost (Walker 2001, 66). Ngata wrote that "our ancestors have gone beyond the veil without having left more than a skeleton of their knowledge to us. . . . It is our duty . . . to try and piece together that knowledge which our old people failed to pass on to us" (cited in Walker 2004, 8).

Buck and Ngata also began to meet and be influenced by British anthropologists such as W.H.R. Rivers, whose 1898 Torres Strait Expedition inspired Ngata to support a series of field expeditions in New Zealand (Henare 2007, 98). Led by Elsdon Best and accompanied by Ngata, Buck, James McDonald, and Johannes Andersen, the first expedition in 1919 began at the *Hui Aroha*; a ceremony to welcome home the soldiers from World War I (including Buck). This was followed in 1920 with an expedition to Rotorua, in 1921 on a trip down the Whanganui River, with the final expedition in 1923 to Ngata's home place of Waiomatatini to record the traditions of his Ngati Porou people. These expeditions served a "Maaori political agenda to ensure the persistence of old skills and knowledge among Maaori. . . . [by] ensuring continuities between the past, present and future" (Henare 2007, 98).

Buck began fieldwork in the Pacific region in 1910 with a trip to Rarotonga and published much on the material culture of the people he studied with. He delivered his classic lecture *The Coming of the Maaori* from 1908 (Sorrenson 1982, 9) and published *The Evolution of Maaori Clothing* and *The Material Culture of the Cook Islands* in 1926 and 1927, respectively. His most well-known text—*The Coming of the Maaori*—was published in 1949. Buck joined the staff of the Bishop Museum in Hawai'i in 1927 and became visiting professor at Yale University in 1932. He continued his professional career as an anthropologist overseas, only returning home to New Zealand a handful of times before his death in 1951.

Meanwhile Ngata had established the Board of Ethnological Research in 1923, and the Maaori Arts and Crafts Act passed in 1926, enabling the founding of the Rotorua School of Maaori Arts and Crafts. His 1928 appointment as native minister gave Ngata "a long awaited opportunity to put anthropology into action" (Sorrenson 1982, 8). Over this time, Ngata

created land development schemes, assisted in the building of twenty-eight tribal meeting houses, and gathered a wealth of material (including those for the *Nga Moteatea* books[9]) in a cultural renaissance with practical outcomes. This was perhaps the first time in *Te Ao Hou* (the New World), that Maaori had been able to bring together research and development for the betterment of Maaori people and society.

In their lengthy correspondence, Ngata and Buck spoke often of their advantage as Maaori in the analysis of Maaori culture. Sorrenson's 1982 article draws its title from Buck's assertion that "The Polynesian corpuscles carry us behind the barrier that takes a Paakehaa some time to scale" (in Sorrenson 1982, 7). Notwithstanding their sometimes patronizing attitudes,[10] Ngata and Buck thought that "No country has better potentialities amongst its native race for working out and recording its own ethnology" (Buck to Ngata 1930, in Sorrenson 1987, 77). It was the cultural training they had received and their status as "insiders" that gave them the advantage of the "approach and the double angle of vision [that] came to us through our blood" (Sorrenson 1982, 19). They also saw themselves as "men who belonged to two cultures and mediated between them" (Sorrenson 1982, 21).

In his 1928 paper *Anthropology and the Government of Native Races*, Ngata spoke of the "method whereby the native mind may be influenced to surrender its concepts and accept new ideas" (cited in Sorrenson 1982, 17). While this may sound a little sinister, it seems more likely that the goal of cultural revitalization and merging the best of Maaori with the best of Paakehaa society underpinned these sentiments. Sorrenson thought that while Paakehaa may see acculturation of Maaori as "Europeanization," Ngata and Buck instead regarded the process as "incorporating useful elements of European culture into an enduring Maaori culture" (Sorrenson 1982, 17). Thus it was a process of conscious adaptation rather than unconscious victimization, where Maaori had the power and agency through which to direct acculturation on their terms. That is—"The Maaori can now select what is suitable in Paakehaa culture and retain that which shows a tendency to persist in his own culture" (Ngata quoting Buck 1928, in Sorrenson 1982, 20). Their expertise as "empirical anthropologists" (Buck to Ngata 1930, in Sorrenson 1987, 36) gave them the advantage in which to press forward their agendas.

Nevertheless, Buck and Ngata complained that Maaori agency was not recognized by their Paakehaa compatriots. While New Zealand administrators were quick to point to their success in "civilizing" Maaori, "They have not given due credit to the part played by the Maaori himself in bringing about the position he now occupies" (Buck to Ngata 1930, in Sorrenson

1987: 11–12). Paakehaa look down from the heights of their presumed superior culture and focus on how far below them Maaori were, causing Maaori in turn to "realise how far we have to struggle upwards." However, a "glance back" showed just how far Maaori had come since their "transition from Maaori into New Zealander" (Buck to Ngata 1930, in Sorrenson 1987, 13).

For the most part, the Young Maaori Party's aim of invigorating Maaori culture and society was viewed at the time as somewhat of a success. In contrasting Maaori with the Marquesan people, Buck stated that he was "going to take the renaissance of Maaori Art as an indication of the presence of some spiritual something that our people never lost though it flickered low in some areas after the [New Zealand] wars" (Buck to Ngata 1931, in Sorrenson 1987, 131). The policies and principles of cultural adaptation began by some in Paratene Ngata's generation and carried forward by those such as Apirana Ngata were wisdoms that had worked in the best interests of Maaori (Ngata to Buck 1931, in Sorrenson 1987, 173). Only by using the "weapons" of the Paakehaa (including anthropology) for physical survival, holding ancestral teachings within their heart while offering their spirits to God,[11] could Maaori succeed in adjustment to the "tyranny of Western civilization" (Buck to Ngata 1931, in Sorrenson 1987, 201).

It was "the most substantial experiment in applied anthropology, as perceived by its two home-made Maaori anthropologists [Ngata and Buck], that New Zealand has ever seen" (Sorrenson 1982, 23), which only ended with the discrediting of Ngata over the land development schemes in 1934. Nevertheless, those innovations instituted by Buck, Ngata, and others during this heady time have had long-reaching effects that remain as inspirational guideposts—as well as cautionary tales—for Maaori today. Their successes in academia, politics, and other scholarly pursuits have ensured that they are among the best remembered role models of Maaoridom.

To return to Beaglehole's contention of distinct phases in New Zealand anthropology, a fourth phase can be seen as beginning in the middle to late 1960s. Reflecting changes worldwide as indigenous and other marginalized peoples protested against their imposed positions, Maaori in New Zealand raised their voices against the continued injustices perpetrated since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840. There was a "series of mobilizations and responses which can be seen as a whole ethnic movement" (Webster 1998b, 28), resulting in a renaissance of Maaori culture. Groups such as Nga Tamatoa rallied increasing support from Maaori and from other New Zealanders. One of the results of this was the creation of the Waitangi Tribunal in 1975 to hear claims against the Crown for breaches of the treaty. It seemed possible that Maaori culture and language would

be reclaimed and gain a new space in New Zealand society, ameliorating the negative social indexes that Maaori featured far too often in.

In the early 1950s, Australian anthropologist Ralph Piddington established the first department of anthropology in New Zealand at Auckland University, and it was from there that the first Maaori Studies department arose in 1952. Piddington, who trained under anthropology greats Malinowski and Radcliffe-Brown, encouraged Maaori participation in anthropological studies once again and instituted papers in Maaori language (Henare 2007, 102). Some of our most prominent Maaori scholars to train in anthropology in the middle to late twentieth century were Robert Mahuta, Pita Sharples, Hugh Kawharu, Pare Hopa, Hirini Mead, Pat Hohepa, Ranginui Walker, and Ngahuia Te Awekotuku.

Webster believes, however, that Piddington "developed a theory of culture as a whole way of life outside its own political economic history" (1998b, 24). This resulted in the reification of Maaori culture, especially following the Maaori renaissance, which was led ironically by some of Piddington's students who were now in powerful academic positions as patrons of Maaori culture. This culturalist ideology had roots back to the aspirations of the Young Maaori Party and was mobilized in the current situation as part of the political challenges thrust into the national spotlight by Maaori protesters (Henare 2007: 102–103). Similarly, these patrons were also using anthropological training "to establish initiatives to ensure the continuation and revitalization of the Maaori language and cultural traditions" (Henare 2007, 103).

In terms of research, Maaori protests precluded, for the most part, non-Maaori participation in research with Maaori. Condemnation and exclusion of foreign and Paakehaa scholars became increasingly the norm (Webster 1998b, 103), with a deeper scrutiny of past commentaries of Maaori culture and society for their contribution to the lingering effects of colonization. There was a separation of Maaori Studies from anthropology, and by 1975 there were three more Maaori Studies programs at other New Zealand universities (Webster 1998b, 30). Research had to be culturally relevant, be overseen and mentored by kaumatua, address the political and institutional ideologies within which research is conducted (Smith 1999, 2), be "by Maaori for Maaori with Maaori" (Smith, cited in Henry and Pene 2001, 236), and have a "methodology of participation" where research was "participant-driven" (Bishop 1996: 224 and 226).

The relationship between research and development became emphasized, and as noted by Durie—"There is no research without development and no development without research" (Durie 1998, 418). While "development" has some negative connotations, as a conscious effort in the fight for self-determination, development was seen as a vital necessity that required

"careful and deliberate planning" through research to ensure that Maaori advancement in all areas is achieved without jeopardizing the integrity of any particular area (Durie 1998, 421). So research "by Maaori for Maaori with Maaori" was not designed as an abstract process, but as one whereby practical and beneficial results could eventuate.

The beginning of the twenty-first century can be seen as entering a fifth phase in New Zealand anthropology, for Maaori at least. Henare noted that by 2007, very little social anthropology by and about Maaori now occurs (Henare 2007, 93), even though research with Maaori by Maaori has increased exponentially. The separation of Maaori Studies from the discipline of anthropology during the Maaori renaissance has meant that "today there does not appear to be a single Maaori scholar employed in any of the country's six anthropology departments" (Henare 2007, 93). Certainly I have noticed while attending anthropology conferences that there are very few (if any) other Maaori present. It seems to me, however, that the burgeoning of Maaori research from within a Maaori cultural paradigm enables an anthropology that can be innovated to suit Maaori needs, despite the negative reputation anthropology has had in the past.

In 1998, Webster still considered that ethnography "is the written description and analysis of *another* culture" (Webster 1998b, 7)[12] and that social anthropologists are "professional outsiders because we live in and study (participate in and observe) cultures, societies, or social sectors other than our own" (Webster 1998b, 10). By contrast, Clifford noted that "indigenous ethnographers," that is, "insiders studying their own cultures offer[ing] new angles of vision and depths of understanding" are now a part of the academic world that can no longer be ignored (Clifford 1986, 10). Kanuha states that "the field of anthropology has been responsible for coining the nomenclature of the native, indigenous, or insider researcher" (Kanuha 2000, 440). She concludes that this is not surprising, given the hearty criticism of anthropologists by indigenous populations. Many indigenous researchers, however, write about the complexities inherent in being both insider and outsider. As noted by Collins, the "research process for Maaori academic researchers who choose to carry out research within their own communities is a daunting exercise," because of issues such as "role duality" (Collins 2007, 28).

Nevertheless, as stressed by Ngata and Buck in the 1920s, the perspective offered by the "double vision" of insiders can provide a deeper perspective to research. Indigenous researchers "necessarily look in from the outside while also looking out from the inside" (Trinh, cited in Te Kawehau Hoskins 1998, 14). Through whakapapa, we are connected to people and places, time and space, and our efforts can result in the birth of new knowledge (Graham 2009).

Researchers, whether indigenous or not, go into the field not as totally objective scientists, but as themselves, carrying within themselves facets of personality, culture, gender, history, and so on, i.e., their whakapapa. This signifies then that relationships and interactions are formed at the interface between one person and another. The researcher's own biases, prejudices, and "truths" consequently affect the way relationships are formed and maintained, as well as the ways in which the research is undertaken, analyzed, and reported. Bishop thinks that researchers are woven into the research processes, and the "methodological framework underlying the weaving is called whakapapa" (Bishop 1996, 232). And as Graham notes:

> the relationship between the researcher and the research community, itself bound by whakapapa, invokes a series of typical research characteristics such as accountability, reciprocity, trust, confidence and ethicality and so innately fulfils ethical considerations (Graham 2009: 65–66).

One of Tai Walker's research participants referred to research as being "of the eyes, the intellect and the mouth" (Walker 2004, 82). Sasha Roseneil describes research as "an exercise in reflexive, unalienated labour, [which] involve[s] the 'unity of hand, brain and heart'" (Roseneil 1993, 205). With the hand you greet and interact with people, as well as writing about your endeavors. The brain provides a tool for thinking about and analyzing ideas and situations you are working with. The heart though—arguably this gives a deeper meaning to what you as a researcher are involved with provides the sense of connection that can make your work more than just labor, and enriches the whole tapestry of the research experience.

An indigenous anthropologist can be defined[13] as an indigenous person who works mainly with his or her own people, who is cognizant of the issues and challenges that indigenous people share and their place within this, and approaches research as a reciprocal and collaborative endeavor that privileges indigenous concerns and indigenous knowledge. Anthropology, as with any social science, provides us with a set of tools we may use as researchers to inform directions for development of our resources, including our people. Some of the advantages of anthropology are that it has a cross-cultural and international perspective, that there is a huge body of literature to draw from, and methods such as fieldwork and participant observation that can work well with indigenous research goals and objectives. As individuals, and as indigenous people, we have the right to use those tools in ways that suit our needs. *We* decide how we use them; I believe we have that power, and therefore we have the attendant responsibility and accountability to those we research with and for.

Maaori Marsden wrote that the "route to Maaoritanga through abstract interpretation is a dead end. The way can only be through a passionate subjective approach" (Marsden 1992, 117). An understanding of Maaoritanga and maatauranga Maaori is essential for those who wish to research with Maaori, from within a Maaori cultural paradigm. Mead described maatauranga as also about "developing the creative powers of the mind. . . . expanding horizons and reaching beyond the limitations of circumstance and adversity." "Te hohonutanga o te maatauranga" refers to seeking knowledge that lies beneath the surface of reality, where the "learner therefore has to dive in and explore the areas of darkness . . . and by exploring come to understand." "Te whanuitanga o te maatauranga" acknowledges the vast breadth of knowledge, those sideways journeys to the "unreachable horizons of knowledge" where the "journey is to seek more light, more understanding and that most elusive of all educational goals, wisdom" (Mead 1997, 51). Whakapapa can also be used to explain these knowledge-seeking processes, in which people, events, or experiences are contextualized in order to explore the depths and breadths of knowledge.

Human identity is intimately linked to whakapapa and is "at the heart and soul of our endeavours" (Durie 1996, 192). We are born into particular environments that are multilayered and multifaceted, peppered with social, cultural, spiritual, and ideological constructs that (often unconsciously) influence notions of who we are and how we conduct ourselves. Moreover, each environment is born out of those that went before and contributes to environments yet to come. Whakapapa provides a structure within which to understand these environments more clearly by illuminating the interconnections between them (Graham 2009). Therefore, whakapapa is a useful research methodology that aids our understanding of ourselves and the people we research with by placing us in a matrix that includes the interweaving of people, time, and place. As an indigenous anthropologist, knowing the whakapapa of anthropology in Aotearoa New Zealand and around the world enables me to know where I fit into the narratives that accompany it and to better contribute to the birth of future knowledge. Through whakapapa we as indigenous anthropologists are connected to the lands and peoples we work with. We are connected to the geographic and spiritual area of Oceania, which includes a history of colonization and other shared experiences. Through the whakapapa of people, lands, ocean, and anthropology, we as indigenous anthropologists are connected to one another. Whakapapa is the foundation upon which we have the right to build, producing structures that are valid and unique, yet which share features with others.[14]

NOTES

1. This article is drawn from the Methodology chapter of my PhD dissertation—*Tradition, Invention and Innovation: Multiple Reflections of an Urban Marae*—submitted for examination August 2009.

2. *Marae* are traditional gathering places for Maaori, in contemporary times most often a complex of buildings, and, as with Awataha Marae, serving the cultural needs of more than one tribe. My PhD is a case study of Awataha, its people and history, contextualized within the general history of marae development. It also engages with debates around tradition, cultural invention, and innovation.

3. The reunion brought together 300 members of the whaanau of Te Wiki Wiremu Hoori and was held on our ancestral marae of Te Turuki at Waikare, Bay of Islands.

4. These ideas are not unique, and draw heavily from previous discussions of the use of whakapapa as a method for research. I developed these in this form, through discussions with other Maaori postgraduate students at a Massey University Writing Retreat in 2007, and acknowledge in particular the input of Felicity Ware and Anaru Wood.

5. These concerns were raised at a local council meeting regarding the development of a marae on the North Shore.

6. A more comprehensive history of Awataha Marae will be available in my dissertation.

7. Sorrenson (1996) wrote that while Buck claimed to have been born in 1880, it was more likely he was born in 1877 per the register at his primary school. Source: Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, www.dnzb.govt.nz.

8. This correspondence was published in three volumes (edited by M.P.K. Sorrenson) entitled *Na To Hoa Aroha: From Your Dear Friend*, between 1986 and 1988.

9. The first volume, *Nga Mooteatea: He Maramare Rere Noo Ngaa Waka Maha, He Mea Kohikohi*, was published in 1928 (Ngata 1928).

10. For example—"In Polynesian research it is right and fitting that the highest branch of the Polynesian race should be in the forefront and not leave the bulk of the investigations to workers who have not got the inside angle that we have." Buck to Ngata, March 8, 1927, cited in Sorrenson (1982, 7).

11. Henare (2007: 97–98), based on Ngata's famous *whakatauki* (proverb) "E tipu e rea i nga ra o to ao" (Grow, child, in the days of your world), "Ko to ringaringa ki nga rakau a te Paakehaa" (Your hand to the weapons of the Paakehaa), "Hei oranga mo to tinana" (As an existence for your body), "Ko to ngakau ki nga taonga a o tipuna" (Your heart to the treasures of your ancestors), "Hei tikitiki mo to mahuna" (As a topknot for your head), "Ko to wairua ki te Atua" (Your spirit to Almighty God), "Nana nei nga mea katoa" (Who is the giver of all things).

12. My emphasis.

13. This definition is put forward as adding to some of the definitions already put forward, but recognizes that issues around defining "indigenous anthropology" are complex, and any definition will therefore necessarily be partial and is expected to be refined and redefined over time.

14. This article was produced partly with the assistance of a grant from *Nga Pae o te Maramatanga, The National Institute of Research Excellence for Maaori Development and Advancement*.

REFERENCES

Ballara, A.
1998 *The dynamics of Maaori tribal organisation from c. 1769–1869*, Wellington: Victoria University Press.

Beaglehole, E.
1938 Anthropology in New Zealand. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 188: 152–62.

Bishop, R.
1996 *Collaborative research stories: Whakawhaanaungatanga*. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Dunmore Press.

Clifford, J.
1986 Introduction: Partial truths. In *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography*, ed. J. Clifford and G. Marcus. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

Collins, A.
2007 Role duality: The implications for Maaori researchers of linking personal and professional associations when working amongst their own communities. *AlterNative* 3(1): 28–43.

Durie, M.
1996 Identity, conflict and the search for nationhood. *Journal of Australasian Psychiatry* 4(4): August.
1998 Concluding remarks. In *Proceedings of Te Oru Ranga: Maaori Research and Development Conference*, July. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Massey Univ.

Graham, J.
2009 Kanohi ki te Kanohi, Pokohiwi ki te Pokohiwi: Up close and personal. In *Te Mata o te Tau, Matariki: Te Mata o te Tau,* Monograph Series 3: 55–82.

Henare, A.
2007 Nga Rakau a te Paakehaa: Reconsidering Maaori anthropology. In *Anthropology and science: Epistemologies in practice*, ed. J. Edwards, P. Harvey, and P. Wade, 93–113. Oxford, U.K.: Berg.

Henry, E. and Pene
2001 Kaupapa Maaori: Locating indigenous ontology, epistemology and methodology in the academy. *Organization* 8(2): 234–42.

Hiroa, Te Rangi (P.H. Buck).
1926 The value of tradition in Polynesian research. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 35(139): 181–203.

Kanuha, V.K.
2000 Being native versus going native. *Social Work* 45(5): 439–47.

Marsden, M.
1992 God, man and the universe. In *Te Ao Hurihuri: Aspects of Maaoritanga*, ed. M. King. Auckland: Reed Books.

Mead, [H] S.
1997 *Landmarks, bridges and visions: Aspects of Maaori culture*. Wellington: Victoria Univ. Press.

Ngata, A.T.
1928 *Nga Moteatea: He Maramara Rere O Nga Waka Maha, He Mea Kohikohi*. Hastings, N.Z.: E.S. Cliff and Co.

Roberts, M., B. Haami, R. Benton, T. Satterfield, M Finucare, M. Henare, and M. Henare
2004 Whakapapa as a Maaori mental construct: Some implications for the debate over genetic modification of organisms. *The Contemporary Pacific* 16(1): 1–28.

Robust, T.
2000 Backing into the future: Motatau bilingual school. *Canadian Journal of Native Education*, *Edmonton* 24(1): 14–30.

Roseneil, S.
1993 Greenham revisited: Researching myself and my sisters. In *Interpreting the field: Accounts of ethnography*, ed. D. Hobbs and T. May. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Royal, T.C.
1993 *Te Haurapa: An introduction to researching tribal histories and traditions*, Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
1998 Te Ao Marama—A research paradigm. In *Proceedings of Te Oru Ranga: Maaori Research and Development Conference*, 78–86. July, Palmerston North, N.Z.: Massey Univ.

Smith, G.
1993 Higher Education for Indigenous Peoples. Auckland: Research Unit for Maaori Education, Auckland University.

Smith, L.T.
1999 *Decolonising methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*, Dunedin/London: Univ. of Otago Press/Zed Books.

Sorrenson, M.P.K.
1982 Polynesian corpuscles and Pacific anthropology: The home-made anthropology of Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 1(1): 7–28.
1987 *Na To Hoa Aroha: From your dear friend—the correspondence between Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck 1925–50, Vol. 2, 1930–32*. Auckland: Auckland Univ. Press.
1996 Buck, Peter Henry 1877?–1951. In *Dictionary of New Zealand biography*, http://www.dnzb.govt.nz, accessed March 30, 2006.

Te Momo, F.
2002 Stories from the field: Developing practical research methods in Maaori communities. In *DevNet conference 2002, contesting development: Pathways to better practice*, ed. Institute of Development Studies. Palmerston North, N.Z.: Massey Univ.

Walker R.
2001 *He Tipua: The life and times of Sir Apirana Ngata*. Auckland: Penguin Books.

Walker, T.
2004 *He Rapunga Whakaaro: A search for knowledge*. Master's thesis, Victoria Univ.

Weber-Pillwax, C.
2001 What is indigenous research? *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 25(2): 166–74.

Webster, S.
1998a Maaori Hapuu as a whole way of struggle. *Oceania* 69 (forthcoming).
1998b *Patrons of Maaori culture: Power, theory and ideology in the Maaori Renaissance*, Dunedin: Univ. of Otago Press.