



What is whānau research in the context of marae/ hapū-based archives?

**A literature review for the
Whakamanu Research Project**

What is whānau research in the context of marae/ hapū-based archives?

**A literature review for the
Whakamanu Research Project**

**Meri Haami
Dr Rāwiri Tinirau**

Copyright

Copyright © 2020

Te Atawhai o Te Ao Charitable Trust

Publisher

Te Atawhai o Te Ao Charitable Trust

PO Box 7061

Whanganui 4541

Aotearoa

ISBN

Print: 978-0-473-53454-7

Digital: 978-0-473-53456-1

He mihi

E rere atu nei te ia o mihi ki ngā puke tuku kōrero, ki ngā wai herunga, ki ngā taonga tuku iho ā ngā tūpuna. E ngā mate o te wā iti nei, moe mai rā kautau, haere oti atu. Ko te hunga mate ki te hunga mate; ko te hunga ora ki tātau. Tīhei mauri ora!

We wish to acknowledge the: Health Research Council, for the funding of the He Kokonga Ngākau Research Programme (14/1005), including the Whakamanu Research Project; Rānana Māori Committee and Rānana Marae Reservation Trust (Rānana Reserve No 10 Part Māori Reservation) for the use of the taniko design for this publication and photography at Rānana Marae; Pūtiki Pā (Te Pakū o Te Rangi Marae) for the photography at Pūtiki Pā; and, Te Morehu Whenua for the modeling of the taonga, specifically those included in the photographs: Atarau Lind, Jodeci Morgan, Connor Pauro, Cruz Pauro, and Te Aotahi Whaanga.

INTRODUCTION

This literature review examines the definitions, methodologies, and practices of whānau (extended family) research within the context of marae-based (traditional Māori place of gathering) archives and taonga (Māori treasures; highly prized artefacts, tangible and intangible) preservation. This literature review will explore six areas of inquiry, namely: understanding whānau research; whānau research and the nature of taonga; the impact of colonisation on oral whānau research; the intersection of archives and museums; digitising taonga and whānau research; and lastly, the revival of whānau archival research. This literature review illustrates the historical context surrounding whānau research through the lens of archiving, preserving, and housing taonga. The historical context can inform future issues of organisation, access, and management, as taonga has the potentiality to be housed on marae or use contemporary storage methods involving online and digital spaces.

UNDERSTANDING WHĀNAU RESEARCH

Literature pertaining to whānau research is scarce; however, where whānau research is mentioned, there are a range of definitions within many contexts and disciplines. The term 'whānau research' has been used as a part of Kaupapa Māori (Māori methodologies and frameworks) methodologies and strategies (Cram & Kennedy, 2010; Eruera 2010; Jones et al., 2010), with the term 'whānau' being able to denote a collective or a research group, rather than a family of blood relations (Bishop, 1999). The term 'whānau' can invoke specific marae, hapū (collections of whānau), and iwi (tribe; collections of hapū, descended from an eponymous ancestor) meanings. For example, Tinirau et al. (2009) discusses 'whānau' as being interconnected with

whakapapa (genealogy; genealogical table; lineage; descent) and ahi kā (continuous land occupation; burning fires of occupation). Kawharu & Newman support this view, stating:

"The fabric of Māori [indigenous people of Aotearoa] social organisation permeating all key groups (whānau, hapū, iwi) is whakapapa. Whakapapa is the key organising principle in Māori society. It is the scaffolding that structures not only human but also material and non-material worlds: it indicates and describes networks and relationship defined through descent and kinship". (Kawharu & Newman, 2018, p. 78)

If 'whānau research' is defined as the needs of whānau researched by whānau, then studies have been conducted surrounding the well-being of whānau and hapū members (Tinirau et al., 2011). Comparably, studies conducted by whānau members investigated intergenerational research relationships in creating culturally appropriate methodologies when collaborating with whānau and hapū (Tinirau, 2008). These studies have used different ideas of whānau research within the scope of health, well-being, and Māori development.

Research on whānau conducted by whānau within the context of tribal knowledge retainment and transmission has been described as "critically important for hapū and iwi" (Smith, n.d., pp. 1-2).

The wider implications of whānau research are significant as they examine the nature and relationship of connections while understanding its complexities and its ability to change over time with the addition of each generation. (Smith, n.d)



Smith (n.d.) calls this process, 'whānau research' and highlights key negotiating points researchers must understand when researching their own whānau. Smith (n.d.) employs kōrero (discussion) as the overarching oral medium to facilitate 'trigger points,'¹ which are visual representations to spark conversations of participants' lived experiences and memories.

WHĀNAU RESEARCH AND THE NATURE OF TAONGA

Smith (n.d.) provides two key methods in conducting whānau research: kōrero, as the oral medium containing knowledge, which can be considered intangible taonga (Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; Mikaere, 2011); as well as the images, pictures, papers, or videos used as trigger points that associate with contemporary ideas of tangible taonga (Henare, 2007; McCarthy, 2011). However, the interdisciplinary meanings of taonga are broad and challenging to define through English translations.

Subsequently, meanings of taonga have been subjected to different perspectives over time but is consensually defined as 'Māori treasures' (Colmer, 2011; Hakiwai, 1996; Henare, 2005; Henare 2007; Mead, 2003; National Services Te Paerangi, 2006; Salmond, 1984; Tamarapa, 1996). Meanings of taonga are further marked by interconnected ideas of tapu (sacred) and mana² (power) as well as Māori well-being. These meanings include its representations of tūpuna (ancestors) while expressing both Māori self-identification and whakapapa in physical and spiritual forms (Mahuika, 1991; Mikaere, 2006).

The two ideas of taonga illustrated by Smith (n.d.) align with the aforementioned broader definitions of taonga. Furthermore, these two ideas of taonga can be considered representations of whānau research that are significant within three contexts, which include museology repatriation (Henare, 2007; McCarthy, 2011), Treaty of Waitangi claims (Corbett, 2012; Henare, 2007; Waitangi Tribunal, 2011), and whānau knowledge (Smith, n.d.). Museology practice has used these three contexts to define taonga as intangible and tangible items of "cultural significance to the tāngata whenua (people of the land) as recognised under the Treaty of Waitangi" (McCarthy, 2011, p. 173).

However, curator Awhina Tamarapa expands on these taonga definitions beyond the confines of Treaty settlements, which are evocative of Smith (n.d.), Mahuika (1991), and Mikaere (2006) relating to whānau research, Māori identity, and whakapapa:

"[taonga is] a cultural treasure, an anchor point to our past, present and future... it's who we are and what we want to be. They're our tūpuna [ancestors] and we're the living face of that". (Tamarapa, cited in McCarthy, 2011, p. 135)

The literature discusses the term taonga tuku iho³ (Māori treasures handed down from ancestors), or prized treasures handed down intergenerationally, amongst whānau primarily within the frame of tangible taonga (McCarthy, 2011; McRae, 2017). Tangible taonga within the context of taonga tuku iho can consist of pounamu (precious greenstone found in Te Wai Pounamu), korowai (cloak), toki (adze), matau (fishhook), and waka tūpāpaku (coffin) (Colmer, 2011; McCarthy, 2011; McRae, 2017; Te Awakōtuku 1996).

1 These trigger points are visual representations, which include pictures, images, videos, or a collection of papers (Smith, n.d.)

2 Both tangible and intangible forms of taonga have varying levels of tapu and mana. These terms are interlinked and relate to how the taonga is spiritually charged with mauri or vital life forces that connect to its tūpuna or atua (Colmer, 2011; Mead, 1997). This relates to Māori interactions with taonga housed in heritage or collection institutions, such as museums. Mead (1997) discusses how taonga can represent particular tūpuna who are related by whakapapa to living descendants and who view this taonga as their tūpuna. This was observed through Te Māori (national and international exhibition showcasing taonga Māori) exhibition of kaumātua, rangatahi, and tamariki embracing their tūpuna, speaking with them or laying green leaves at their feet. Mead (1997) notes how this interaction illustrates Māori worldviews and associated behaviours towards taonga from western approaches within museum contexts.

3 Taonga tuku iho can refer to the retention and transmission of tribal histories of places, people and genealogies (Forster, 2006) as well as something being handed down, heritage, cultural property, or an heirloom.

However, taonga tuku iho can encapsulate interwoven meanings of both tangible and intangible taonga. These intangible meanings are formulated from the Māori oral tradition and histories such as the kōrero or the contextual narrative encompassing karakia (ritual chants), whakataukī (proverbial saying), and waiata, which further illuminates the kōpaki⁴, mauri (life force), mana, and level of tapu attached to the tangible taonga.

The kōrero reinforces the highly-valued characteristic of antiquity within taonga, which connects descendants to their ancestors, thus forming the basis for whakapapa, Māori identity, history, and as a conduit for whānau research and knowledge (Colmer, 2011; Mead, 1997; Moorfield, 2005; Tapsell, 1997; Te Awekotuku, 1996).

The literature illustrates that the past and continuous use of oral media, which are embedded within Māori oral tradition and histories, have been used to conduct and transmit whānau research through both forms of tangible and intangible taonga (Colmer, 2011; Forster 2006; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2012; McRae, 2017; Mead, 1997; Mikaere, 2011; Ngata, 2017; Royal, 2003). Historically, Māori had no written text and utilised the oral tradition and histories as a type of historiography to record narratives of genealogy, deeds, warfare, love, and stories of tūpuna (Colmer, 2011; Forster, 2006; Henare, 2007; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; McRae, 2017; Royal, 2003). McRae discusses the pivotal roles of Māori oral tradition and history in all sectors of Māori society, stating:

*“Evidence of how the ancestors preserved and transmitted their traditional knowledge is also indicated in the old texts, and in fact the oral tradition was the source of almost all that Māori knew, akin to a library”.
McRae (2017, p. 22)*

Therefore, tūpuna used oral tradition and histories as a methodology or historiography to conduct whānau research for the purposes of knowledge retainment and transmission (Henige, 1982; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010).

THE IMPACT OF COLONISATION ON ORAL WHĀNAU RESEARCH

The contemporary centrality of marae and pā (village) as a source, beginning reference point, and oral legacy for whānau knowledge and research is indicative of Māori cultural well-being (McRae, 2017; Ngata, 2017; Smith, n.d.). However, Durie (1998) and Walker (1990) note that the way in which the marae and pā have become the only cultural site able to safely and fully express Māori knowledge is due to oppressive colonial policy and legislation.⁵ Furthermore, the intergenerational development and transmission of specific oral knowledge forms about whānau have been predominantly limited to the marae and pā⁶ setting as well as other activities or occasions including, wānanga⁷ (traditional form of learning) and tangihanga⁸ (funeral) (Forster, 2006).

The introduction of English and by extension western legislation, values, beliefs, and religion,⁹ coupled with the seizure of tribal lands, resulted in the suppression of Māori knowledge systems, institutions, and language. These factors were detrimental in restricting the Māori oral tradition and histories used to transmit whānau knowledge (Durie, 1998; Forster, 2006; McRae, 2017; Mikaere, 2011; Walker, 1990). During this time, some of the oral tradition and histories of whānau were recorded as written text in both te reo Māori (the Māori language) and English either by Māori and Pākehā (European settlers of New Zealand) and were

4 Kōpaki refers to the kōrero enveloping a story or issue (Colmer, 2011).

5 This refers to the Tohunga Suppression Act 1907 (Durie, 1998).

6 Marae and pā are focal ceremonial and meeting places of kinship groups (Forster, 2006).

7 Wānanga is a tribal activity of knowledge transmission (McRae, 2017).

8 Tangihanga is an important funeral process and occasion.

9 This refers to Christianity (Mikaere, 2011), which is argued to have intersected with imperialism and colonisation at various levels to subjugate Māori from their pre-colonised traditions, values, and beliefs (Smith, 1999).



regarded as taonga, occupying both intangible and tangible spaces (Henare, 2007; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; McRae, 2017). However, the methodological practices of Māori oral tradition and histories used for whānau research declined in use.

Western academia prioritised written text and arguably tangible taonga and consequently criticised the oral tradition and histories authenticity, legitimacy, vulnerability to data contamination and accuracy. However, the oral tradition and histories were misunderstood as it highlights collective memories, use of mnemonic qualities¹⁰ and the ability to provide a multitude of realities (Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; Mahuika, 2009; Mutu, 2009).

The recordings of Māori lifeways and whānau research on written text as well as other tangible taonga from whānau, hapū, and iwi were taken or sold by scholars, private collectors, museums, and archives to be displayed and preserved nationally and abroad (Henare, 2007; McCarthy, 2011; Ngata et al., 2012). This process has been criticised for its paternalistic views of stockpiling Māori knowledge, which deemed Māori culture as an 'other' and would perish as a result of imperialism (Holman, 2007; Mikaere, 2011; Smith, 1999). Genovese (2016) has argued that this paternalistic worldview stemming from imperialism has shaped the foundations of past and current archival methodologies and examines this within the United States.

Genovese (2016) explores how this worldview becomes particularly overt when archives, as well as museums, interact with Indigenous peoples and contextualises this through enacted protective legislation¹¹. Genovese

(2016) advocates for collaboration with Indigenous people regarding their intangible and tangible cultural artefacts. Furthermore, Genovese (2016) argues that an increased diverse workforce of Indigenous peoples within information science programmes can contribute towards decolonisation and subverting the hegemony over traditional collection institutions. Within the context of museology nationally, whānau research can be viewed as tangible taonga, and the paternalism threaded throughout scholarly archival methodologies and museum practices on Māori culture has been criticised for taking and displaying tangible taonga (Holman, 2007; McCarthy, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; Smith, 1999).

INTERSECTION OF ARCHIVES AND MUSEUMS

Western practices of archiving, museology, and library study are regarded as traditional collection institutions often housing whānau knowledge primarily through tangible taonga. These institutions are interconnected through their similarities of preserving material but are distinct in purpose, output, and access (Henare, 2005; 2007; McCarthy, 2011; Rayward, 1998). Rayward (1998) advocates for the redefinition and reintegration of archives, museums, and libraries on the advent of unknown digital and technological change at the time of the publication. In doing so, Rayward (1998) explains the Western definitions of these three collection institutions (see Figure 1).

¹⁰ These mnemonic qualities refer to the rhythmic patterns associated with Māori oratory forms such as waiata, whakataukī, kōrero, karakia, as well as many others that help in aid of memorisation. This has been a key characteristic of Māori oratory forms and illustrates how the oral tradition and histories were pivotal within Māori historical knowledge retainment and transmission (Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010).

¹¹ This includes the enactment of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (1990) and the Protocols for Native American Archival Materials (2006).



Institution	Traditional Western definition
Archives	Repository of records. Identification, organising, and cataloguing are important. Both tangible and intangible materials are kept for informational and evidential value. Access is limited.
Museums	Collection of physical, three-dimensional objects for educative display and exhibition. Access is open to all.
Libraries	Centred on the acquisition of printed books, journals, or microfilm. Libraries are a place of research, leisure, and are open to all.

Figure 1. Figure 1 illustrates the definition of archives, museums, and libraries, according to Rayward (1998). Again, this was written during a period of digital and technological change for materials housed within these institutions. Although somewhat dated, these definitions have relevance for current views of these collection institutions, as these terms and definitions are still in relative use among the literature, particularly with museology (Henare, 2005; 2007; McCarthy, 2011).

These definitions set by Rayward (1998) are relevant when contextualised within current literature regarding tangible taonga housed in museums. Museums have coincided with colonial history and visually represent the debate of “culture, identity, history, restitution and social inclusion” as well as taonga display (McCarthy, 2011, p. 2). McCarthy (2011) and Henare (2007) examine imperial museology interactions with Māori and these studies both adhere to the traditional definitions of collection institutions (Rayward, 1998) while providing future considerations for museology practices.

McCarthy (2011) provides a historical overview of museology within Aotearoa (New Zealand) revolving around Te Māori (international and national exhibition showcasing Māori treasures) exhibition and examines case studies of regional museums.¹² McCarthy (2011) explores the repatriation process of tangible taonga as well as controversial taonga, such as kōiwi tāngata (human remains; bones) and mokomōkai (preserved head of an ancestor) through Karanga Aotearoa¹³ (New Zealand government mandated repatriation programme). McCarthy (2011) acknowledges that museums have a tainted perception among Māori due to these institutions previously excluding Māori input, using a suspicious means of acquiring remains and taonga as well as past substandard taonga organisation¹⁴ and care¹⁵ (see Figure 2).

12 These other smaller regional museums include; Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tāmaki; Auckland War Memorial Museum Tāmaki Paenga Hira; Canterbury Museum; Christchurch Art Gallery Te Puna o Waiwhetū; Govett-Brewster Art Gallery; Hawke’s Bay Museum and Art Gallery; Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa; Nelson Provincial Museum Pupuri Taonga o Te Tai Ao; New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga; North Otago Museum; Puke Ariki; Rotorua Museum of Art and History Te Whare Taonga o Te Arawa; Tairāwhiti Museum Te Whare Taonga o te Tairāwhiti; Te Manawa; Waikato Museum Te Whare Taonga o Waikato; and lastly, Whanganui Regional Museum (McCarthy, 2011). There are also art galleries that were examined and interviewed as they overlapped with museology practices.

13 The New Zealand government in 2003 mandated that Te Papa Tongarewa create a formal programme overseeing the return of kōiwi tāngata, mokomōkai, and koimī tāngata repatriation from both domestic and international collection institutions to their respective iwi. This programme was named Karanga Aotearoa (Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa, 2018).

14 Taonga was arranged typologically or in terms of functionality with little reference to its kōrero, history, rohe, hapū, or iwi, which was an established practice before 1900 until 1950 and in some cases, 1981 (Butts, 2003, cited in McCarthy, 2011).

15 McCarthy (2011) discusses the experiences of Jodie Wylie arriving at Tairāwhiti Museum in 2005 who stated the poor conditions of tangible taonga in terms of storage preservation and dislocated documentation. This led to the Taonga Māori collection, as the tangible taonga was photographed and rehoused, which incorporated Māori values. Wylie also discussed finding kōiwi tāngata stored in banana boxes in a corner.



Figure 2. Figure 2 shows an assortment of tangible taonga on display at the Auckland War Memorial Museum during the nineteenth century with a pātaka (storehouse), joins antlers, plaster casts, and a moa skeleton (McCarthy, 2011, p. 31). McCarthy (2011) discusses how tangible taonga were displayed in a haphazard manner with no consideration for the laws of tapu and noa (unrestricted), ritual observances, or tikanga (correct and accepted practises).

McCarthy (2011) supports the introduction of kaitiakitanga (custodianship), which is a philosophical and practical framework underpinned by tikanga taonga (correct and accepted practices for taonga Māori) and mātauranga Māori (Māori knowledge).

Another framework called tikanga taonga encompasses the careful handling and storage of taonga through ritual observances. Tikanga taonga is exemplified through current practices at the Museum of New Zealand, Te Papa Tongarewa. This comprised of restrictions on food near taonga, having water bowls near collection stores, the availability of green leaves and signs for pregnant or menstruating individuals.

Te Papa's collection categorises under iwi affiliations where possible and includes the laws of tapu and noa separating every day and ceremonial tangible taonga. Horwood (2015) echoes these processes and attributes the democratisation of museum practice as a result of increasing Indigenous political power, presence, and autonomy, particularly within Aotearoa, Australia, and Canada. Horwood (2015) examines how mātauranga Māori and tikanga taonga are integrated within national museology practice through a contrastive case study of Aotearoa and the United Kingdom, where there is reluctance to negotiate and move forward with Indigenous source communities on the storage, organisation, and return of their treasures or artefacts. These studies exemplify both the aspirations of Genovese (2016) for diverse workforces incorporating Indigenous frameworks but also the implementation of Māori philosophy and epistemologies within current museology practice.

McCarthy (2011) frames this through biculturalism, which is both a theoretical and practical approach that aims to bridge Māori and Pākehā relationships, particularly through law (Māori-Crown settlement relations) and museology. Biculturalism negotiates the co-management and co-governance of materials and natural resources while attempting to cater for the safety of Māori and Pākehā worldviews concurrently (Harris, 2017; McCarthy, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; O'Sullivan, 2007; Schubert-Arthur, 2019). However, biculturalism navigates through issues surrounding institutions with power becoming tokenistic or contrasting ethics and values leading to inconsistencies in practice and outcomes (McCarthy, 2011; Mikaere, 2011; Schubert-Arthur, 2019). Most literature indicates that biculturalism leads to rangatiratanga (self-determination), sovereignty, and Māori autonomy (Durie, 1998; Fleras & Spoonley, 1999; Harris, 2017). O'Sullivan argues biculturalism is colonially hegemonic stating, "biculturalism is enthusiastically embraced by



state institutions as a strategy for managing resistance” (O’Sullivan, 2007, p. 30); “one step towards self-determination is permitted, but the next prevented” (O’Sullivan, 2007, p. 2). Horwood (2015) also briefly discusses the inequality of biculturalism and states that community-led strategies using Kaupapa Māori as well as maintaining long-standing relationships between museums and Indigenous communities are paramount (Christen 2009; Hafner et al., 2007). These relationships can be neglected due to death or staff leaving the museum institution. However, Horwood (2015) holds museums accountable for creating long-term succession strategies and policies that ensure the maintenance of relationships over time.

McCarthy’s (2011) stances highlight the conflict between rangatiratanga and bicultural museology principles and approaches. These views involve: Māori taonga ‘ownership’; the philosophical principles and operational complexities of repatriation; a disinclination for marae-based museums; and lastly, questioning whether marae have the facilities to accommodate and preserve tangible taonga. However, McCarthy (2011) discusses how museums changed fundamentally by incorporating Māori approaches as well as museums being facilitated on marae.¹⁶ Schubert-Arthur (2019) outlines these issues of biculturalism and further provides an ethnographic overview of both its theoretical and practical approaches through the lens of Te Papa museum staff. Schubert-Arthur (2019) is critical of biculturalism theory and state use but illustrates nuanced views and practices of the Te Papa museum staff who navigate and adapt biculturalism contextually. Mikaere (2011) echoes similar situations of utilising biculturalism within the Waikato Law School

but advocates for structural and institutional change from key decision-making positions as Māori.

Henare (2007) attempts to contextualise intangible taonga ‘ownership’ rights of Māori within traditional collection definitions of museology as well as other disciplines including ethnography and social anthropology. Henare (2007) examines the historical and colonial effects of taonga exchange, considers new legalities, and presents queries surrounding what artefact-oriented anthropology would look like if it were not about material culture (Hicks, 2010). Although not explicitly stated, Henare (2007) touches on issues relating to repatriation as well as past whānau, hapū, and iwi preservation methods through analysing the reciprocal relationship¹⁷ of taonga exchange and by examining the Treaty of Waitangi claim, Wai 262.

Wai 262 was submitted during 1991 on behalf of Ngāti Kurī (Northland iwi), Te Rarawa (Northland iwi), Ngāti Wai (Northland iwi), Ngāti Porou (East Coast iwi), Ngāti Kahungunu (Hawkes Bay and Wairarapa iwi), and Ngāti Koata (top of the South Island iwi) (Mills, 2006; Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). Treaty claims are a way for whānau, hapū, and iwi to repatriate taonga from museums, archives, or collectors (Henare, 2007; McCarthy, 2011). Wai 262 sought not only tangible taonga, including fisheries, land, and tools, but also intangible taonga, such as intellectual rights and property rights¹⁸ (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). This claim revealed a conflict in the perceptions and meanings of taonga between Māori and Western law:

16 Museums on marae explored by McCarthy (2011) shows its region in Aotearoa as well as dates of when it was proposed (if given). These museums located on marae include: Pāpāwai (Wairarapa, 1900s); Mahinārangi meeting house at Tūrangawaewae marae (Waikato, 1930s); Koriniti (Whanganui River, 1970s); Waiwhetū (Lower Hutt); and lastly, Kōpinga Marae and museum on Rēkohu Chatham Islands.

17 Henare (2007) views taonga exchange within the frame of hau or ‘the spirit of the gift’ that creates a reciprocal relationship of gift exchange where something will be returned. This relates to her argument that the term taonga has untranslatability within western (English) terms, legal, or otherwise.

18 These intellectual and property rights included indigenous flora and fauna, and ‘me o rātou taonga katoa’ within the respective tribal rohe including but not limited to: te reo Māori; mātauranga; knowledge systems; laws; customs and values; whakairo (carvings); wāhi tapu (sacred places); biodiversity; natural resources; genetics and genetic derivatives; Māori symbols; images; designs involving their use, development, and associated indigenous, cultural, and customary heritage rights. This further included intellectual property and property rights in relation to taonga, which encompasses, “all the elements of the claimants’ estates, both material and non-material, tangible, and non-tangible”. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 4, cited in Henare, 2007, p. 51)



“The key issue for the claimants is that the IPR [intellectual property rights] system is limited to the protection of economic and commercial rights. It was not designed to protect cultural values and identity associated with mātauranga Maori”. (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011, p. 71)

Henare (2007) explores how the untranslatability and differences between English and te reo Māori (Māori language) can affect meaning and worldviews of taonga when brought within the same context as commerce and property. Henare (2007) questions Māori adopting Western meanings to encompass intangible taonga definitions as well as the current validity of Māori identity and authority of claiming taonga as intellectual and property rights due to colonial history. Henare states:

“At one level, dispute centres on the validity of Māori claims to ownership of taonga in a variety of spheres. Yet more is at stake here than property rights alone. Some who question Māori interests do so on the grounds that over two centuries of cultural engagement and intermarriage have removed Māori from their privileged status as an Indigenous people, rendering even their claims to a distinctive identity suspect. It is increasingly held that globalisation and life in the twenty first century, first world society have adulterated authentic Māori identity, leaving a hybrid, post-colonial relic in its place”. (Henare, 2007, pp. 48-49)

Henare (2007) then explains how other anthropologists provide support for this view and uses whakapapa as well as te reo Māori definitions as further justifications. Moreover, she agrees with other commentators that similar Waitangi Tribunal claims to Wai 262 regarding intangible taonga are “ludicrous in the scope of its demands” and contextualises this within global capitalism (Henare, 2007, p. 50).

Henare (2007) explores the transactional nature of taonga as a form of establishing and maintaining

relationships historically within Māori life, which has often been used to delineate between taonga being gifted to museum institutions rather than being acquired under dubious means. The gifting of taonga and its exchange is further discussed by Horwood (2015) as being a part of a long-term succession plan and the maintenance of relationships between museums and Indigenous presently. However, Henare (2007) queries the ‘Māori worldview’ within the Wai 262 claim, and argued that Māori creatively appropriating European notions of property and ownership while simultaneously viewing taonga as “distinctively Māori kinds of objects with a creativity of their own” (Henare, 2007, p. 63). This analysis requires further clarification and shows residual paternalism relating to the commodification of taonga being decided by the coloniser majority (Smith, 1999). This intersects with conflicting worldviews between museology or archiving institutions and whānau, hapū, and iwi when repatriating different forms of taonga (Genovese, 2016).

When contextualising Henare’s (2007) view within biculturalism, typically employed by settlement negotiations and museology practices, Schubert-Arthur notes that Māori staff at Te Papa museum feel that biculturalism is compulsory for them, and that “Pākehā seem to be able to opt in and out of it and if given a choice, they will opt out. The playing field there is not level” (Arthur, 2019, p. 80).

These views echo the Māori struggle for survival in becoming self-determining and that Māori are forced to adopt Western worldviews, principles, and practices due to imperialism and colonisation (Smith, 1999). Smith’s words highlight the power imbalances of Māori being forced to creatively adopt Western practices in order to survive towards self-determination.

This is further exemplified through the intersection of settlements (specifically Wai 262) and museology repatriation views, which illustrate how Henare’s (2007) criticism of Māori adopting Western practices

neglects ongoing power imbalances as a result of imperialism and colonisation.

Gimblett (1995) theorises heritage through examining taonga commodification and museums utilising tourism, simulating authenticity as well as propagating a new mode of cultural production.

Gimblett (1995) agrees with Williams (1960, p. 343) who states that a “culture can never be reduced to its artifacts while it is being lived” and reinforces the significance of the intangible cultural property of taonga through its life force and contextual narrative.

This perspective contrasts with Henare (2007) who uses similar terms such as, ‘post-colonial’, ‘authenticity’, and ‘globalisation’ but undermines current Māori identities, signalling contemporary challenges stemming from imperialism. Henare (2007) uses these terms to imply that colonisation has ended, that Māori are not able to change and authenticate new meanings of their language and identity over time and uses te reo Māori meanings as justifications without understanding the complexities within Māori ways of knowing and current concerns (Smith, 1999). However, Henare (2007) highlights future concerns for museology being focused on tangible taonga and the legalities whānau, hapū, and iwi face when repatriating, particularly intangible taonga as it does not fully align with the definitions of traditional collection institutions or Western law (Rayward, 1998; Waitangi Tribunal, 2011).

DIGITISING TAONGA AND WHĀNAU RESEARCH

Ngata et al. (2012) research how the repatriation of intangible taonga can be achieved. Ngata et al. (2012) created Te Rauata¹⁹, which is a digital research environment. Similarly, Brown and Nicholas (2012) comparatively examined Canadian First Nations²⁰ and Māori cultural heritage methodologies through employing digital tools. Both these studies use the terms, ‘virtual repatriation’ and ‘digital taonga’, which has been argued as contentious, where museums that would prefer not to physically return taonga to its original source communities and only ‘return’ taonga digitally by making these available online (Corbett, 2012). Corbett (2012) critiques the risks to respective whānau by having taonga and knowledge widely accessible internationally and the potentiality for misuse by commercial entities. Corbett (2012) further discusses the Mataatua Declaration of Indigenous Rights introducing soft law²¹ that requires cultural institutions, including museums, to return taonga to its community sources.

The literature exemplifies issues of ethical processes, including obtaining appropriate consent as one of many processes that whānau, hapū, and iwi undertake in order to repatriate both tangible and intangible taonga as well as connect with their respective knowledge and research (Brown & Nicholas, 2012; Corbett, 2012; Ngata et al., 2012).

Both digital and physical museums and archives are created, protected, and preserved to facilitate the return of taonga by either whānau, hapū, and iwi

¹⁹ Te Rauata is a “digital research environment that will bring together images, texts, video recordings, and sound files relating to their taonga and their history into a dynamic and adaptable web-based system”. This system is a partnership between the iwi organisation, Toi Hauiti and the University of Cambridge (Ngata et al., 2012, p. 230).

²⁰ This study examines copyright and intellectual property laws with each respective country as well as discussing the Reciprocal Research Network (RRN). This digital network is in partnership with the Musqueam Indian Band, the Sto:lo Nation and Sto:lo Tribal Council, the U’mista Cultural Society as well as the University of British Columbia’s Museum of Anthropology. RRN works to provide a reciprocal exchange of knowledge among indigenous communities and institutions.

²¹ Soft law refers to guidelines that are non-binding or strict and are often used for policies or declarations (World Property Organization, 2009).

with diverse views on access consent, management, and ethics (Brown & Nicholas, 2012; Hall, 2017; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; Ka'ai, 2017; Ngata et al., 2012; Ngata, 2017). The digitisation of both tangible and intangible taonga encompasses audio recordings,²² scanned images and texts as well as holograms²³ (Ngata et al., 2012; Ngata, 2017; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; 2012).

REVIVAL OF WHĀNAU ARCHIVAL RESEARCH

The digitisation of tangible and intangible taonga opens new and virtual practicalities of reconnecting whānau, hapū, and iwi to their taonga and can be considered as a medium for conducting future whānau research. This process further insists that the development of philosophical, methodological, and ethical approaches to creating, researching, and managing these systems are vital (Ngata 2017; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; Forster, 2006).

This is exemplified through the *Ngāti Kahungunu Māori Battalion Oral History Project* and, although the focus is on iwi, this project uses a particular set of access rights for whānau personally affected by World War II (Forster, 2006).

This project also uses a combination of traditional whānau research methodologies, such as the oral tradition and histories facilitated through semi-structured interviews, as well as digitising taonga that can only be accessed by specific whānau, which is an emerging practice and is similar to that proposed by Smith (n.d.). Forster (2006, p. 100) uses the view of the oral tradition and histories towards recording,

retaining, and transmitting the "collective tribal consciousness narratives of people, places, and events during the World War II campaign, of significance to the community" through video. This premise aligns with previous uses of the oral tradition and histories to conduct whānau research (Forster 2006; Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2012; McRae, 2017; Mikaere, 201; Ngata, 2017; Royal, 2003; Smith, n.d.). Additionally, the project seeks to further its tribal position in terms of "collective interests and rights" (Forster, 2006, p. 102) akin to ideas within the Wai 262 claim (Waitangi Tribunal, 2011). Forster (2006) contextualises this project within colonial history and socio-political events of wider Māori and uses the oral tradition and histories as a measurement of taonga *tuku iho*, cultural well-being, and tribal identity.

Te Atawhai o Te Ao, in association with Ngā Pae o Te Māramatanga, created an oral film archive that was placed in Ngā Taonga Sound & Vision, the New Zealand Archive of Film, Television, and Sound with similar whānau access rights to Forster (2006), collecting the oral testimonies of Māori Vietnam veterans. These testimonies were gathered for future generations of whānau to be able to understand the political and health consequences of toxins that occurred for fathers or grandfathers in the Vietnam war, resulting in intergenerational health consequences for those whānau. Through working with the veterans, it was decided to place the interviews in Ngā Taonga Sound & Vision for long term access by future generations of the whānau. Whānau themselves have their own copies, but these can be lost or damaged or may only be seen by some members of the whānau (Reynolds & Smith, 2014). These illustrate future considerations when utilising digital tools in conjunction with oral media reminiscent of Māori oral tradition and histories for whānau research.

22 These audio recordings can refer to waiata (Ka'ai-Mahuta, 2010; 2012) and kupu (words) within the context of language revitalisation (Ka'ai, 2017).

23 Ngata et al. (2012, p. 242) explore the opportunity to hologram an ancestral house that is scattered in different museums around the globe.



SUMMARY

The literature review provides various definitions of whānau research as well as the methodologies and practices of whānau research. There is limited literature on how whānau research is defined within the context of marae-based archives and taonga preservation; however, whānau research can be contextualised through the physical and digital taonga repatriation efforts of whānau, hapū, and iwi. These processes reveal the underlying philosophical principles reminiscent of paternalism that affect the scholarly, operational, and governance levels of archives and museums currently on all forms of taonga. Furthermore, both tangible and intangible taonga can be representative of whānau research and knowledge within archival and museology contexts.



GLOSSARY

ahi kā	continuous land occupation; burning fires of occupation
Aotearoa	New Zealand
hapū	cluster of extended families, descended from an eponymous ancestor
iwi	tribe; collections of hapū, descended from an eponymous ancestor
kaitiakitanga	custodianship; caretaker; framework used in New Zealand
karakia	ritual chants; invocations
Karanga Aotearoa	New Zealand Government mandated repatriation programme
Kaupapa Māori	Māori methodologies and frameworks
kōrero	discussion; stories
korowai	cloak
kōiwi tāngata	human remains; bones
kupu	word
Māori	indigenous people of Aotearoa
mana	power; status; prestige
marae	traditional Māori place of gathering
matau	fishhook
mātauranga Māori	Māori knowledge
mauri	energy; life force
mokomōkai	preserved head of an ancestor
Ngāti Kahungunu	Hawkes Bay and Wairarapa iwi
Ngāti Koata	top of the South Island iwi
Ngāti Kuri	Northland iwi
Ngāti Porou	East Coast iwi
Ngāti Wai	Northland iwi
noa	unrestricted
pā	village



Pākehā	European settlers of New Zealand
pounamu	precious greenstone found in Te Wai Pounamu
rangatiratanga	self-determination
Rēkohu	Chatham Island
rohe	region
tāngata whenua	People of the land, indigenous people
taonga	Māori treasures; highly prized artefacts, tangible and intangible
taonga tuku iho	Māori treasures handed down from ancestors
tangihanga	funeral
tapu	sacred; restricted
Te Māori	national and international exhibition showcasing taonga Māori
Te Papa Tongarewa	National Museum of New Zealand, located in Wellington
Te Rarawa	Northland iwi
te reo Māori	Māori language
Te Wai Pounamu	South Island of New Zealand
tikanga taonga	correct and accepted practices for Māori taonga
tīpuna	forebears; ancestors
toki	adze
tūpuna	forebears; ancestors
wāhi tapu	sacred places
waka tūpāpaku	receptacle to carry the remains of the deceased; coffin
wānanga	traditional form of learning
whakapapa	genealogy; genealogical table; lineage; descent
whānau	extended family
whakairo	carvings
whakataukī	proverbial saying (author unknown)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bishop, R.** (1999). Kaupapa Maori Research: An indigenous approach to creating Knowledge. In Robertson, N. (Ed.). *Maori and psychology: Research and Practice* (pp. 1-6). The proceedings of a symposium sponsored by the Maori and Psychology Research Unit. Maori & Psychology Research Unit.
- Brown, D., & Nicholas, G.** (2012). Protecting indigenous cultural property in the age of digital democracy: Institutional and communal responses to Canadian First Nations and Māori heritage concerns. *Journal of Material Culture*, 17(3), 307-324. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183512454065>
- Christen, K.** (2009). *Aboriginal Business: Alliances in a Remote Australian Town*. Aboriginal Studies Press.
- Colmer, P. M.** (2011). *Evaluating the Tangible, Acknowledging the Intangible: The Application of Auditing, Kaitiakitanga and Collection Management during the Tairāwhiti Museum Taonga Māori Audit* [Master's thesis, Massey University]. Massey Research Online. <https://mro.massey.ac.nz/handle/10179/2188>
- Corbett, S.** (2012). Māori Cultural Heritage and Copyright Law: A Balancing Exercise. *New Zealand Intellectual Property Journal*, 916-921. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=2152159>
- Cram, F., & Kennedy, V.** (2010). Researching with whānau collectives. *MAI Review*, (3), 1-12. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/49594477_Researching_with_Whanau_Collectives
- Durie, M.** (1998). *Te Mana, Te Kāwanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination*. Oxford University Press.
- Eruera, M.** (2010). Ma Te Whūnau Te Huarahi Motuhake: Whūnau Participatory Action Research groups. *MAI Review*, (3), 1-9. <https://whanauoraresearch.co.nz/wp-content/uploads/formidable/Ma-te-Whanau-te-Huarahi-Motuhake.pdf>
- Fleras, A., & Spoonley, P.** (1999). *Recalling Aotearoa: Indigenous politics and ethnic relations in New Zealand*. Oxford University Press.
- Forster, M.** (2006, June 14-17). *The oral tradition as a measure of cultural well-being*. Mātauranga Taketake: Traditional Knowledge. Indigenous Indicators of Well-being: Perspectives, Practices, Solutions. Wellington. <http://www.maramatanga.co.nz/sites/default/files/TKC-2006.pdf>
- Genovese, T. R.** (2016). Decolonizing archival methodology: Combating hegemony and moving towards a collaborative archival environment. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 12(1), 32-42. <https://doi.org/10.20507/AlterNative.2016.12.1.3>
- Gimblett, B. K.** (1995). Theorizing heritage. *Ethnomusicology*, 39(3), 367-380. 10.2307/924627
- Hafner, D., Rigsby, B., & Allen, L.** (2007). Museums and Memory as Agents of Social Change. *International Journal of the Humanities*, 5(6), 87-94.
- Hakiwai, A. T.** (1996). Māori Society Today: Welcome to Our World. In D. C. Starzecka (Ed.). *Māori Art and Culture*, (pp. 50-68). British Museum Press.

- Hall, C. (2017).** Mukurtu for mātauranga Māori: A case study in Indigenous archiving for reo and tikanga revitalisation. In Whaanga. H., Keegan, T., & Apperley, M (Eds.). *He Whare Hangarau Māori: Language, culture & technology*, (pp. 189-199). https://www.waikato.ac.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/394945/chapter25.pdf
- Harris, A. (2017).** Reconciliation, Representation and Indigeneity: 'Biculturalism' in Aotearoa New Zealand. *The Journal of New Zealand Studies*, 24, 90-92. <https://doi.org/10.26686/jnzs.v0i24.4060>
- Henare, A. (2005).** *Museums, anthropology and imperial exchange*. Cambridge University Press.
- Henare, A. (2007).** Taonga Māori. In A. Henare., M. Holbraad., & S. Warstell (Eds.). *Thinking Through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*, (pp. 47-67). Routledge.
- Henige, D. P. (1982).** *Oral historiography*. Longman Publishing Group.
- Hicks, D. (2010).** The Material Cultural turn: Event and Effect. In D. Hicks., & M. C. Beaudry (Eds.). *The Oxford handbook of Material Culture*, (pp. 25-98). Oxford University Press.
- Holman, J. P. (2007).** *Best of both world: Elsdon Best and the metamorphosis of Maori spirituality. Te painga rawa o nga ao rua: Te Peehi me te putanga ke o te wairua Maori* [Doctoral thesis, University of Canterbury]. UC Research Repository. <http://hdl.handle.net/10092/939>
- Horwood, M. (2015).** *Worlds Apart: Indigenous Re-engagement with Museum-held Heritage: A New Zealand-United Kingdom Case Study*. [Doctoral thesis, Victoria University of Wellington]. ResearchArchive—Te Puna Rangahau. <http://hdl.handle.net/10063/4849>
- Jones, B., Ingham, T., Davies, C., & Cram, F. (2010).** Whānau Tuatahi: Māori community partnership research using a Kaupapa Māori methodology. *MAI Review*, 3(1), 1-14.
- Ka'ai, T. (2017).** Te Whare Matihiko o Te Reo: digital tools for the revitalisation of te reo Māori. In Whaanga. H., Keegan, T. T., & Apperley, M (Eds.). *He Whare Hangarau Māori: Language, culture & technology*, (pp. 29-34). https://www.waikato.ac.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/394918/chapter5.pdf
- Ka'ai-Mahuta, R. T. Ā. (2010).** *He kupu tuku iho mō tēnei reanga: A critical analysis of waiata and haka as commentaries and archives of Māori political history*. [Doctoral thesis, Auckland University of Technology]. Open Repository, Auckland University of Technology. <http://hdl.handle.net/10292/1023>
- Ka'ai-Mahuta, R. (2012).** The use of digital technology in the preservation of Māori song. *Te Kaharoa*, 5(1), 99-108. <https://doi.org/10.24135/tekaharoa.v5i1.98>
- Kawharu, M., & Newman, E. (2018).** Whakapaparanga: Social structure, leadership and whāngai. In M, Reilly., Duncan, S., Leoni, G., Paterson, L., Carter, L., Rātima, M., & Rewi, P (Eds.). *Te Kōparapara: An introduction to the Māori world* (pp. 73-94). Auckland University Press.
- Mahuika, A. T. (1991).** Maori culture and the new museum. *Museum Anthropology*, 15(4), 9-11. <https://doi.org/10.1525/mua.1991.15.4.9>
- Mahuika, R. (2009).** The Value of Oral History in a Kaupapa Māori Framework. In A. Harris., A. T. Somerville., & R. Higgins (Eds.). *Te Pouhere Kōrero 3: Māori History, Māori People*, (pp. 91-104). Victoria University of Wellington and Puhi Princess Press.



- McCarthy, C.** (2011). *Museums and Māori: Heritage Professionals Indigenous Collections Current Practice*. Te Papa Press.
- McRae, J.** (2017). *Maori Oral Tradition: He Kōrero nō te Ao Tawhito*. Auckland University Press.
- Mead, S. M.** (1997). *Landmarks, Bridges and Visions: Aspects of Māori Culture*. Victoria University Press.
- Mead, H. M.** (2003). *Tikanga Māori. Living by Māori values*. Huia Publishers.
- Mikaere, A.** (2003, November 16-17). *Whakapapa and Taonga: Connecting the Memory*. In Proceedings of the Conference on Puna Maumahara: Rōpū Tuku Iho Repositories. Te Wānanga o Raukawa, Ōtaki.
- Mikaere, A.** (2011). *Colonising myths-Maori realities: He rukuruku whakairo*. Huia Publishers.
- Mills, T.** (2006). *Wai 262* [Film]. Tawera Productions.
- Moorfield, J.C.** (2005). Taonga tuku iho. In *Te Aka: Māori-English, English-Māori dictionary and index*. Pearson New Zealand.
- Mutu, M. (2009).** The Role of History and Oral Tradition in regaining Fagin's Illgotten Gain: Settling Ngāti Kahu's Treaty of Waitangi Claims against the Crown. In A. Harris., A. T. Somerville., & R. Higgins (Eds.). *Te Pouhere Kōrero 3: Māori History, Māori People*, (pp. 23-44). Victoria University of Wellington and Puhi Princess Press.
- National Services Te Paerangi (2006).** *Mātauranga Māori and Museum Practice*. Museum of New Zealand Te Papa Tongarewa.
- Ngata, W., Ngata-Gibson, H., & Salmond, A.** (2012). Te Ataakura: Digital taonga and cultural Innovation. *Journal of Material Culture*, 17(3). 229-244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1359183512453807>
- Ngata, W.** (2017). Kanohi ki te kanohi: Face-to-face in digital space. In Whaanga, H., Keegan, T., & Apperley, M (Eds.). *He Whare Hangarau Māori: Language, culture & technology*, (pp. 178-183). https://www.waikato.ac.nz/__data/assets/pdf_file/0009/394920/chapter23.pdf
- O'Sullivan, D.** (2007). *Beyond biculturalism: The politics of an indigenous minority*. Huia Publishers.
- Rayward, W. B.** (1998). Electronic information and the functional integration of libraries, museums, and archives. *History and Electronic Artefacts*. https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/9474/Rayward_electronic.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- Reynolds, P., & Smith, C.** (2014). *Mai te Kahui Maunga: The Whanganui River, Perspectives on Involuntary Chemical Exposures and Environmental Pollution*. Te Atawhai o Te Ao.
- Royal, T. A. C.** (2003). *The woven universe: selected writings of Rev. Māori Marsden*. Māori Marsden.
- Salmond, A.** (1984). Māori Epistemologies. In J. Overing (Ed.). *Reason and Morality*, (pp. 240-263). Tavistock.
- Schubert-McArthur, T.** (2018). *An ethnography of New Zealand's national museum: Grappling with biculturalism at Te Papa*. Routledge.
- Smith, C. (n.d.).** *Whānau research: Listening to the stories of our Whānau*. Unpublished. Kauangaroa Marae.

- Smith, L. T.** (1999) *Decolonising methodologies: Research and Indigenous peoples*. Zed Books Ltd.
- Tamarapa, A.** (1996, May 16-18). Museum Kaitiaki: Māori Perspectives on the Presentation and Management of Māori Treasures and Relationships with Museums. In *Curatorship: Indigenous Perspectives in Post-Colonial Societies*, (pp. 160-177). The Canadian Museum of Civilisation. Canada: The Commonwealth Association of Museums and the University of Victoria.
- Tapsell, P.** (1997). The Flight of Parerātutu: An Investigation of Taonga from a Tribal Perspective. *Journal of the Polynesian Society*, 106(4), 323-373. http://www.jps.auckland.ac.nz/document/Volume_106_1997/Volume_106%2C_No._4/The_flight_of_Pareraututu%3A_An_investigation_of_Taonga_from_a_tribal_perspective%2C_by_Paul_Tapsell%2C_p_323-374/p1
- Reynolds, P., & Smith, C.** (2008). *Māori Vietnam Veterans*. Te Atawhai o Te Ao
- Te Awēkotuku, N.** (1996). Māori: People and Culture. In D. C. Starzecka (Ed.). *Māori Art and Culture*, (pp. 26-49). British Museum Press.
- The Waitangi Tribunal.** (2011). *Ko Aotearoa Tēnei: Report on the Wai 262 Claim Released*. https://forms.justice.govt.nz/search/Documents/WT/wt_DOC_68356416/KoAotearoaTeneiTT2Vol1W.pdf
- Tinirau, R.** (2008). He Ara Whanaungatanga: A Pathway Towards Sustainable, Inter-generational, Research. Relationships: The Experience of Ngāti Ruaka/Ngāti Hine. In Te Rito, J. S., & Healy, S. M. (Eds.). *Te tatau pounamu: The greenstone door*, (pp. 295-305). Ngā Pae o te Māramatanga.
- Tinirau, R., Gillies, A., & Tinirau, R.** (2009). Ahikā: An ancient custom re-ignited to guide decision-making in Māori research. *He Pukenga Kōrero*, 9(1), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/117718011100700208>
- Tinirau, R., Gillies, A., & Tinirau, R.** (2011). Hōmai tō Hono. *AlterNative: An International Journal of Indigenous Peoples*, 7(2), 163-176. <https://doi.org/10.1177/117718011100700208>
- Walker, R.** (1990). *Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou: Struggle without end*. Penguin.
- Williams, R.** (1960). *Culture and Society: 1790-1950*. Anchor Books.
- World Property Organisation.** (2009, April 29). *Summary of options for the International Dimension of the Committee's work*. World Intellectual Property Organisation, Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore: Fourteenth Session. WIPO/GRTKF/IC/14/6, 4-5.



TAMAKEHU A TE AOTORUITI

RUAKA

RUAKA

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN

Although this literature review addresses western colonial practises of archiving and museology, and its negative effects, the Whakamanu Research Project applies a Māori lens and asks how whānau, hapū, and iwi can create their own Kaupapa Māori preservation and protection practices. As such, the conceptual design of this publication is an expression and juxtaposition of both western and Māori approaches. The basic elements of the literature review, including the font, headings, page numbers, and layout exemplify western archives and museums. The off-white background, and minimalistic formatting reminisce western museum placards, while the page numbers as tabs are redolent of western catalogue and index practices. In contrast, the creative elements, specifically the photography, remove the taonga from the artificial and curated environment of archives and exhibitions, and restores them to their natural environs. Furthermore, through the modelling by Te Morehu Whenua tamariki and rangatahi in front of their marae, and the tāniko pattern carried throughout the publication, the taonga are displayed as more than the limited western perception of taonga as tangible and inanimate.

The use of Māori visual elements is also calculated and deliberate. The tāniko motif is a design from the wharepuni, Te Morehu, at Rānana Marae, where the first archive of the Whakamanu Research Project is located. The tamariki and rangatahi models are uri of Ngāti Ruaka (and other hapū of Rānana), and affiliate to Rānana Marae and Pūtiki Pā, where the photographs are taken. Pūtiki Pā has a pātaka, which traditionally stored food but now holds many hapū taonga. The tamariki and rangatahi are also members of Te Morehu Whenua, an environmental group endorsed by Ngāti Ruaka and Ngāti Hine hapū of Rānana. The group regularly hold wānanga, as part of the Whakarauora Research Project, and both Whakamanu and Whakarauora Research Projects fall under the *He Kokonga Ngākau Research Programme*, conceptualised and hosted by Te Atawhai o Te Ao. Finally, the taonga worn in the photographs (belonging to the Tinirau whānau), the tamariki and rangatahi of Te Morehu Whenua, the tāniko pattern, and Rānana Marae and Pūtiki Pā, are all examples of taonga that have pertinence to Ngāti Ruaka and other hapū of Rānana.

