WHĀNAU, TIKANGA AND TINO RANGATIRATANGA

What is at stake in the debate over the Ministry for Children?

*Luke Fitzmaurice**

Abstract

The removal of a Māori child in May 2019 led to widespread protest and the launch of four inquiries into the Ministry for Children, plus an urgent inquiry through the Waitangi Tribunal. Tamariki Māori are over-represented in the child welfare system, but the issues are not just about the system itself. The legacy of colonisation continues to have an impact, not just on individual whānau, but also on the loss of tikanga in relation to whānau. It is the tikanga of whānau that many protesters seek to protect. Furthermore, advocates for reform disagree on the extent to which partnership and biculturalism should be prioritised, or whether self-determination should be a minimum prerequisite for change. Understanding this difference of opinion is important because it affects our view of the child welfare system itself. This article explores these issues within the current context, where child welfare issues are a matter of considerable public debate.

Keywords

tamariki, whānau, tikanga, child welfare, child protection

Introduction

The failings of Aotearoa New Zealand's child welfare system have been well publicised in recent times. The removal of a Māori baby in Hawkes Bay in May 2019 led to widespread protest, as well as the launch of several high-profile reviews and an urgent inquiry through the Waitangi Tribunal. Some were shocked by the story, but for many others it was, sadly, unsurprising. For many years, tamariki Māori have been over-represented within Aotearoa's child welfare system (Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel, 2015). Whānau Māori have repeatedly said that they find the system traumatic, difficult to navigate and culturally alienating (Boulton et al., 2018; Williams et al., 2019).

The outcomes of those inquiries have now begun to be released. An internal inquiry launched by the Ministry for Children found that there were significant practice failings in the case itself. It stated that there was an over-reliance on historical information regarding the whānau, insufficient exploration of the range of options available and insufficient attention to the values of whānau Māori (Oranga Tamariki—Ministry for Children, 2019). An initial report by the Office of the Children's Commissioner has also been released, which shows that there is a "deep, persistent and increasing inequity in the removal of pēpi Māori into State custody" (Office of the Children's Commissioner, 2020). Most recently, the report led by the Whānau Ora Commissioning Agency

* Te Aupōuri. PhD Candidate, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand. Email: lukefitzmaurice@gmail.com

(2020) recommended a full system overhaul based on three key principles—a system based on tino rangatiratanga, practices designed to connect tamariki and whānau back to their hapū and iwi, and the provision of wrap-around support. At the time of writing, reviews that are still pending include a report from the Ombudsman, a follow-up report from the Office of the Children's Commissioner and the findings of the Waitangi Tribunal. The release of those subsequent reviews may mean that the calls for change grow even louder.

However, the reasons for the over-representation of Māori within the child welfare system are only partially explained by looking at the system itself. Understanding the underlying reasons for these issues requires examining the long-term impacts of colonisation. Colonisation led to a breakdown of practices that continues to affect Māori today, with family violence among whānau Māori just one of many effects (Cooper & Wharewara-Mika, 2011; Taonui, 2013). Colonisation has affected whānau in two distinct senses: it affects individual whānau, but it also affects the tikanga of whānau. This article argues that efforts to address the over-representation of Māori in the child welfare system must seek to "restore whānau" in both of these two senses. It also examines some of the differences in opinion about how this might be achieved.

Whakapapa, whanaungatanga and whānau

Prior to the arrival of Europeans, Māori society was organised by a system of principles and customs known as tikanga (Jones, 2016; Matike Mai Aotearoa, 2016; Mead, 2016; Mikaere, 2011; Ruru, 2018; Superu NZ, 2017). As stated in the Matike Mai Aotearoa (2016) report, "[T]ikanga may be defined as both a law and a discrete set of values" (p. 42). Tikanga provided a framework through which harmonious relations could be promoted, disputes could be addressed and issues of both personal and political power could be resolved (Matike Mai Aotearoa, 2016). Tikanga Māori "served the needs of tangata whenua for a thousand years before the arrival of tauiwi" (Mikaere, 2011, p. 248). Williams has described how two concepts, whakapapa and whanaungatanga, were among the most important aspects of tikanga (Superu NZ, 2017). Whakapapa and whanaungatanga governed both human relationships and relationships with the environment (E. Durie, 2012). They were not just legal principles; they were ontological ones, explaining and rationalising the entire world (Superu NZ, 2017). Whanaungatanga and whakapapa defined not only how people related to each other but how they made sense of the world itself.

From the principles of whakapapa and whanaungatanga came the importance of whānau, described as "the basic social unit in Māori society" (Walker, 2004, p. 63), and as the concept "which underpins the whole social system" (Mead, 2016, p. 225). The whānau was broader than what we have come to think of as the nuclear family. Children belonged not to their parents but to their whānau, with the whānau as a whole carrying responsibility for them (Metge, 1995; Ruru, 2013). The responsibility for keeping children safe was upheld by multiple people (Jenkins & Mountain-Harte, 2011; Metge, 1995). Whānau were also crucial in establishing and securing a person's sense of identity and belonging (Metge, 1995).

A number of authors have used the metaphor of the harakeke to describe the importance of whānau within tikanga Māori (King et al., 2018; Pīhama et al., 2015; Whānau Ora Commissioning Agency, 2020). The harakeke metaphor emphasises the deep connection between child wellbeing and whānau wellbeing, and the importance of the relationships between children, whānau, whakapapa and tikanga (Pīhama et al., 2015). For many whānau, practices have changed since the arrival of Europeans to Aotearoa, but these traditional conceptions of whānau remain relevant and useful today.

The impact of colonisation on whānau

When Europeans arrived, the principles of whakapapa, whanaungatanga and whānau no longer governed how society was organised. Relationships became defined by contracts, rather than kinship, which was completely foreign to Māori (Superu NZ, 2017). The British family structure was instituted as the norm, a process supported by policymakers (Metge, 1995). This changed not just who people lived with but how they saw the world. Mikaere (2011) argues that "colonisation has always been about much more than simply the theft of land, the decimation of indigenous populations and the seizure of political power. It has always been about recreating the colonised in the image of the coloniser" (p. 206). The loss of the tikanga of whānau, in favour of a Western view of the nuclear family, is an example of that process.

The seizure of Māori land played a major role. By the early 20th century, the percentage of land owned by Māori in the North Island had dropped to around 9%, and land in the South Island was almost entirely owned by the Crown (Orange,

2004). The period from 1860 to 1900 has been highlighted as a particularly severe period for Māori health due to the devastating impact of land confiscations following the New Zealand Wars (Cram et al., 2019). The loss of Māori land had a destructive impact on whānau, undercutting the economic base of Māori society and leading to a range of other social issues (Metge, 1995; Wirihana & Smith, 2019).

Walker (2004) describes the arrival of European missionaries as "the cutting edge of colonisation" (p. 87). Te reo Māori usage declined throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, largely as a result of the Native Schools system (Simon et al., 2001). In the 20th century, Māori experienced a "second wave" of land loss with the push towards urbanisation and assimilation of Māori within towns and cities, which further distanced Māori from their whakapapa (Cooper & Wharewara-Mika, 2011). This was part of a raft of policies "aimed at making Māori abandon their distinctive tikanga and conform to the economic and social norms of the non-Māori majority" (Ruru, 2013, p. 66).

Two things are important to note here. Firstly, explanations for the over-representation of Māori children in the child welfare system that highlight the impacts of colonisation are not intended to minimise the harm suffered by those children. The over-representation of Māori children within child welfare data cannot be explained by a single factor; instead, it is likely to be caused by a complex mix of factors that are related to colonisation and systemic bias but are also related to the real risk of harm (Cram et al., 2015). Secondly, the history of colonisation is not simply a history of passive acceptance by Māori. Within the history of Native Schools, for example, are accounts of whānau engagement and resistance to the colonising intentions of those who established the system (Simon et al., 2001). The 2019 protests against the Ministry for Children demonstrate the ongoing resistance by Māori to harmful actions by the Crown. However, despite that resistance, the process of colonisation has had a significant impact on the role of whānau within Māori society, and Aotearoa society generally.

Tino rangatiratanga

The loss of the tikanga of whānau as a foundational societal principle occurred despite the assurances offered to Māori by Te Tiriti o Waitangi ("Te Tiriti"). Article 2 of Te Tiriti promised tino rangatiratanga, or "absolute chieftainship" over the lands, homes and treasured possessions of Māori people (Walker, 2004, p. 93). That included not only physical possessions but also cultural traditions and other non-tangible treasures (Kawharu, 2005). The Crown guarantee of tino rangatiratanga was never upheld, and for many years the Crown was never held to account for those breaches. However, in the 1970s a process began that Walker (2004) described as "the cultural revival of the twentieth century" (p. 173). Māori demands for redress grew louder, and the Waitangi Tribunal began to examine, and attempt to rectify, breaches of Te Tiriti by the Crown. Eventually, laws began to be passed that began to re-establish tikanga in the law (Superu NZ, 2017).

At around the same time, a number of Māori health models were developed that drew on Māori concepts of wellbeing. These models challenged the dominant Western view of what it means to be healthy. Māori models of health tend to be more holistic in their approach than Eurocentric health models, which are generally more individualistic (Williams et al., 2019). Williams et al. (2019) have identified a focus on whānau, whakapapa and whanaungatanga as one of the key things that Māori health models have in common. M. Durie (2001) argues that "whānau have the potential to make major contributions to the revitalisation of language, culture and wellbeing in its broadest sense" (p. 213). He also states that in order for Māori to be well, they must be supported "to live as Māori" (M. Durie, 2001, 2011). This is tino rangatiratanga in its most personal sense.

The year 1988 saw the publication of the landmark *Pūao-Te-Ata-Tū* report (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988; Ruru, 2013; Walker, 2004). The report described the impact of institutional racism within the department and within society more generally. It led to significant changes within the child welfare system, with a greater emphasis on the role of family and whānau, and recognition of the importance of hapū and iwi in providing for the wellbeing of tamariki Māori. The period immediately following the publication of *Pūao-Te-Ata-Tū* was a time of great promise for those working within the child welfare system. For many Māori social workers it was the first time that Māori social work methods and tikanga Māori were validated within statutory systems (Hollis-English, 2012).

However, the promise of that time never entirely eventuated, as the practices envisaged by *Pūao-Te-Ata-Tū* were never fully implemented. Just three years into the operation of new legislation, a review found that the government needed to give "a clear, unequivocal commitment to resource

and fund the implementation of development of the Act" (Mason, 1992, p. 107). This recommendation was rejected, with the government stating that "there can be no open-ended commitment to resources" (Department of Social Welfare, 1992, p. 35). A further review of the system eight years later criticised the government's failure to devolve services, commenting on "the great enthusiasm to devolve responsibility but not control" (Brown, 2000, p. 82). These developments show that despite some significant milestones, claims of tino rangatiratanga have regularly been contested.

Partnership or self-determination?

The developments of the 1980s and beyond have culminated in growing recognition that supporting Māori children requires doing things in a Māori way. The legislation governing child welfare in Aotearoa now requires the Ministry for Children to set measurable outcomes for tamariki Māori and reduce disparities between Māori and non-Māori (Oranga Tamariki Act 1989, s 7AA). This creates an opportunity to improve things for tamariki and whānau Māori, but "Māori must be part of the solution if we are ever to reduce the number of Māori children in care" (Boulton et al., 2018, p. 26). A collective focus and a focus on whānau wellbeing is essential if improvements are to be made. As mentioned above, whānau wellbeing models based on the harakeke metaphor have been suggested as one way to achieve this (Pīhama et al., 2015).

Opinions differ on the balance to be struck between Māori-led responses and Crown–Māori partnerships. Some advocate for partnerships between the Crown and Māori organisations on the basis that only the Crown has the financial resources to provide the level of support required, while only Māori organisations can provide the cultural support required (Superu NZ, 2017). Within child welfare, those who advocate for such partnerships argue that bicultural practice approaches, or "culturally appropriate practice" can be an effective way to support tamariki and whānau Māori (Atwool, 2019; Ruwhiu et al., 2016, p. 83). This position does not necessarily downplay the importance of rangatiratanga, but it does suggest that positive outcomes for tamariki Māori can be achieved within the mainstream child welfare system, provided that the system is culturally responsive. This approach might also have practical value in that it could enable iwi with varying levels of willingness or capacity to decide whether they want to take on a formal role within the child welfare system.

Others are more sceptical of claims of partnership. Mikaere (2011) argues that "by supporting legislation that incorporates aspects of tikanga, we actually do more to undermine Māori law than we do by simply continuing to operate within the overtly monocultural models of the present" (p. 271). Others have pointed out that while the inclusion of Māori words and concepts within child protection has the potential to benefit Māori, this also "risks kupu and tikanga Māori being misinterpreted and diluted from their true meanings" (Williams et al., 2019, p. 8). According to proponents of this approach, tino rangatiratanga will never be achieved within a system that was originally created by the Crown. This approach favours self-determination over partnership, arguing that if the objective is to support tamariki and whānau Māori to "live as Māori" (M. Durie, 2001, 2011) then a partnership with the Crown in which the Crown retains ultimate control is unlikely to be effective.

It is possible for advocates of partnership and biculturalism to still advocate for tino rangatiratanga, just as it is possible for those who advocate for self-determination to acknowledge that partnership with the Crown may sometimes have value. There is evidence that partnership may be possible: the emergence of the Whānau Ora approach is perhaps the most prominent example of a Māori-led initiative supported by the Crown that contributes to tino rangatiratanga (Taskforce on Whānau-Centred Initiatives, 2010). On the other hand, the scale of the change required to shift the child welfare system to one based on Māori values should not be underestimated. Child welfare systems across the world are increasingly shifting towards a more "child-centred" orientation (Gilbert et al., 2011) and this has been a key feature of the reforms of the last five years in Aotearoa (Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel, 2015). Furthermore, these are not just surface-level policy issues: *Pūao-Te-Ata-Tū* revealed that the lack of responsiveness to Māori within the Department of Social Welfare was less about specific practices than it was about deeply rooted problems of institutional racism (Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare, 1988). Those who are sceptical of partnership-based approaches may justifiably point to the magnitude of the changes that would be required to the current child welfare system to make it truly responsive to Māori.

The distinction between the two positions, one favouring partnership and the other prioritising

tino rangatiratanga, may be less of a black-and-white categorisation and more of a continuum. However, the two positions differ in their starting points, and in the extent to which they suggest that self-determination is an essential prerequisite for Māori wellbeing. My intention here is not to resolve this complex issue but simply to highlight that approaches based on the notion of partnership are not as simple as they sometimes appear. Crown–Māori partnerships are not a panacea to child welfare issues, and when they are established they are fraught with complexity. Understanding this context is essential to understanding why the issue of tamariki Māori within the child welfare system will continue to cause controversy.

How best to support tamariki Māori?

This brings us back to the current issues surrounding the Ministry for Children. Protesters marching against the ministry following the Hawkes Bay case echoed the words of Ngāti Maniapoto rangatira Rewi Maniapoto: "'ka whawhai tonu ahau ki a koe, ake, ake, ake' (I shall fight you forever, and ever, and ever)" (Walker, 2004, p. 126). This is the spirit in which Māori oppose attempts by the Crown in modern times to encroach on tikanga Māori.

The main reason for this is that colonisation continues to have an impact on Māori today. Colonisation was not caused solely by land loss; there was always an underlying loss of tikanga. The Native Land Court, for example, did not just strip Māori of our land; it also stripped us off our tikanga. Once that foundation was removed, the loss of the land almost inevitably followed. The establishment of Native Schools removed the right of Māori to decide for ourselves how to educate our children according to our own customs. The loss of te reo Māori came later, but the erosion of tikanga Māori relating to education was the essential precondition.

The same may now be said of whānau. It is the loss of Māori ways of decision-making in relation to whānau—the loss of tikanga Māori in relation to whānau—that may cause the most harm in the long term, not just the breakdown of individual whānau. Protesters do not just march in support of individual whānau; they also march in support of the tikanga of whānau. The tikanga is what many believe to be at risk. Their belief is well founded if history is anything to go by.

Improving outcomes for Māori children and whānau requires doing things in a Māori way, but there is disagreement as to exactly what this should look like. Within child welfare, some Māori advocate for biculturalism and partnership with the Crown, while others insist that Māori self-determination is the essential starting point if the legacy of colonisation is to be overcome. Perhaps, for some, it is a question of whether or not wholesale system reform is realistic, rather than whether it is ideal. The reality is that the state-run child welfare system is unlikely to be able to be radically changed overnight. On the other hand, perhaps it is a case of what Jackson refers to as being brave enough to imagine a different future (Tauri, 2017). Those who advocate for self-determination as a non-negotiable starting point may acknowledge the difficulty in pursuing that goal, but choose to pursue it nonetheless.

Recognising this difference of opinion has implications for how we view child welfare in general. If the role of the child welfare system is to ensure the safety of individual children, then it may be acceptable for this to sometimes come at the expense of collective rights, such as the right of children to participate in their culture (*United Nations Declaration on the Rights of the Child*, art 30) or the collective right of Indigenous peoples to self-determination (*United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*, art 3). However, if reversing the impacts of colonisation is the key to improving outcomes for Māori children, then the restoration of the tikanga of whānau is an essential first step, and it may be permissible for this to occasionally come at the expense of the rights of individual children. Understanding this tension from a Māori perspective is essential. Without that understanding, the struggle without end is likely to continue, ake ake ake, forever and ever and ever.

Glossary

Aotearoa	New Zealand
hapū	subtribe(s) that share a common ancestor
harakeke	flax plant
iwi	tribal kin group
kupu	word, anything said
pēpi	babies
rangatira	chief
tamariki	children
tangata whenua	Indigenous people of the land, first people of the land
tauiwi	foreigner, European, non-Māori, colonist
te reo Māori	the Māori language
Te Tiriti o Waitangi	the Māori language text of the Treaty of Waitangi
tikanga	customs and practices

tino rangatiratanga	self-governing; having absolute independence and autonomy
whakapapa	genealogy, ancestry, familial relationships
whānau	family; nuclear/extended family
whanaungatanga	the interrelationship of Māori with their ancestors, their whānau, hapū, iwi as well as the natural resources within their tribal boundaries such as mountains, rivers, streams and forests

References

Atwool, N. (2019). Child-centred practice in a bi- and multi-cultural context: Challenges and dilemmas. *Child Care in Practice*, 26(3), 300–317. http://doi.org/d29j

Boulton, A., Potaka-Osborne, G., Cvitanovic, L., & Williams-Blyth, T. (2018). E tipu E rea: The care and protection of indigenous (Māori) children. *New Zealand Law Journal*, 3, 3–7.

Brown, M. (2000). *Care and protection is about adult behaviour: The ministerial review of the Department of Child, Youth and Family Services. Report to the Minister of Social Services and Employment Hon Steve Maharey.* https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/archive/2000-care-and-protection-is-about-adult-behaviour.pdf

Cooper, E., & Wharewara-Mika, J. (2011). Healing: Towards an understanding of Māori child maltreatment. In T. McIntosh & M. Mulholland (Eds.), *Māori and social issues* (pp. 169–186). Huia Publishers.

Cram, F., Gulliver, P., Ota, R., & Wilson, M. (2015). Understanding overrepresentation of indigenous children in child welfare data: An application of the Drake risk and bias models, 20(3), 170–182.

Cram, F., Te Huia, B., Te Huia, T., Williams, M. M., & Williams, N. (2019). *Oranga and Māori health Inequities, 1769–1992.* Katoa Ltd.

Department of Social Welfare. (1992). *The Government's response to the report of the Ministerial Review Team.*

Durie, E. (2012). Ancestral laws of Māori. In D. Keenan (Ed.), *Huia histories of Māori: Ngā tāhuhu kōrero* (pp. 1–12). Huia Publishers.

Durie, M. (1998). *Te mana, te kāwanatanga: The politics of Māori self-determination.* Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2001). *Mauri ora: The dynamics of Māori health.* Oxford University Press.

Durie, M. (2011). *Ngā tini whetū: Navigating Māori futures.* Huia Publishers.

Gilbert, N., Parton, N., & Skivenes, M. (2011). *Child protection systems: International trends and orientations.* Oxford University Press.

Hollis-English, A. (2012). Pūao-te-Āta-tū: Informing Māori social work since 1986. *Aotearoa New Zealand Social Work*, 24(3–4), 41–48.

Jenkins, K., & Mountain-Harte, H. (2011). *Traditional Māori parenting: An historical review of literature of traditional Maori child rearing practices in pre-European times.* Te Kahui Mana Ririki. https://www.occ.org.nz/assets/Uploads/Reports/Parenting/Traditional-Maori-parenting.pdf

Jones, C. (2016). *New treaty, new tradition: Reconciling New Zealand and Māori law.* Victoria University Press.

Kawharu, M. (2005). Rangatiratanga and social policy. In M. Belgrave, M. Kawharu, & D. Williams (Eds.), *Waitangi revisited: Perspectives on the Treaty of Waitangi* (2nd ed., pp. 105–122). Oxford University Press.

King, P., Cormack, D., & Kōpua, M. (2018). Oranga mokopuna: A tāngata whenua rights-based approach to health and wellbeing. *MAI Journal: A New Zealand Journal of Indigenous Scholarship*, 7(2), 187–202. http://doi.org/d29k

Mason, K. H. (1992). *Review of the Children, Young Persons and their Families Act 1989.* Department of Social Welfare.

Matike Mai Aotearoa. (2016). *He Whakaaro Here Whakaumu mō Aotearoa: The Report of Matike Mai Aotearoa—The Independent Working Group on Constitutional Transformation.* https://nwo.org.nz/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/MatikeMai Aotearoa25Jan16.pdf

Mead, H. (2016). *Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori values* (2nd ed.). Huia Publishers.

Metge, J. (1995). *New growth from old: The whānau in the modern world.* Victoria University Press.

Mikaere, A. (2011). *Colonising myths—Māori realities: He rukuruku whakaaro.* Huia Publishers; Te Wānanga o Raukawa.

Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. (1988). *Puao-te-ata-tu (day break): The report of the Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Maori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare.* https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/archive/1988-puaoteatatu.pdf

Modernising Child, Youth and Family Expert Panel. (2015). *Expert Panel final report: Investing in New Zealand's children and their families.* Ministry of Social Development. https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/corporate/expert-panel-cyf/investing-in-children-report.pdf

Office of the Children's Commissioner. (2020). *Statistical snapshot: Pēpi Māori 0–3 months and the care and protection System.* https://www.occ.org.nz/assets/Uploads/20200116-OCC-StatisticalSnapshot2.pdf

Oranga Tamariki Act 1989.

Oranga Tamariki—Ministry for Children. (2019). *Practice review: Professional Practice Group practice review into the Hastings case.* https://www.orangatamariki.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/News/2019/Practice-Review/Practice-Review.pdf

Orange, C. (2004). *An illustrated history of the Treaty of Waitangi* (2nd ed.). Allen & Unwin. http://doi.org/7gt

Pīhama, L., Lee, J., Te Nana, R., Campbell, D., Greensill, H., & Tauroa, T. (2015). Te Pā Harakeke: Whānau as a site of wellbeing. In R. E. Rinehart, A. Emerald, & R. Matamua (Eds.), *Ethnographies in pan Pacific research: Tensions and positionings* (pp. 251–264). Routledge.

Ruru, J. (2013). Kua tutu te puehu, kia mau: Māori aspirations and family law policy. In M. Henaghan & B. Atkin (Eds.), *Family law policy in New Zealand* (4th ed.), pp. 57–97. LexisNexis.

Ruru, J. (2018). First laws: Tikanga Māori in/and the law. *Victoria University of Wellington Law Review*, *49*, 211–228. http://doi.org/d29m

Ruwhiu, L., Te Hira, L., Eruera, M., & Elkington, J. (2016). Borderland engagements in Aotearoa New Zealand: Te Tiriti and social policy. In J. Maidment & L. Beddoe (Eds.), *Social policy for social work and human services in Aotearoa New Zealand: Diverse perspectives* (pp. 79–93). Canterbury University Press.

Simon, J. A., Smith, L. T., & Cram, F. (2001). *A civilising mission? Perceptions and representations of the Native Schools system*. Auckland University Press.

Superu NZ. (2017). *Justice Joe Williams, Te Ritorito 2017: Towards whānau, hapū and iwi wellbeing* [Video]. YouTube. https://youtu.be/LnlMa5jJu_k

Taonui, R. (2013). Trends in Māori child abuse and homicide. In S. Katene & M. Mulholland (Eds.), *Future challenges for Māori: He kōrero anamata* (pp. 155–168). Huia Publishers.

Taskforce on Whānau-Centred Initiatives. (2010). *Whānau Ora: Report of the Taskforce on Whānau-Centred Initiatives*. Ministry of Social Development. https://www.msd.govt.nz/documents/about-msd-and-our-work/publications-resources/planning-strategy/whanau-ora/whanau-ora-taskforce-report.pdf

Tauri, J. (2017, December 9). *Moana Jackson: FIRE presentation 2016* [Video]. YouTube https://youtu.be/mPnf0cbFIuo

United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child GA Res 44/25 (1989).

United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples GA Res 61/295 (2007).

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu mātou—Struggle without end* (Rev. ed.). Penguin.

Whānau Ora Commissioning Agency. (2020). *Ko te wā whakawhiti: It's time for change—A Māori inquiry into Oranga Tamariki*. https://apo.org.au/sites/default/files/resource-files/2020-02/apo-nid274231_1.pdf

Williams, T., Ruru, J., Irwin-Easthope, H., Quince, K., & Gifford, H. (2019). Care and protection of tamariki Māori in the family court system. *Te Arotahi Paper Series Paper*, (1). http://www.maramatanga.ac.nz/sites/default/files/teArotahi_19-0501%20Ruru.pdf

Wirihana, R., & Smith, C. (2019). Historical trauma, healing and well-being in Māori communities. In C. Smith & R. Tinirau (Eds.), *He Rau Murimuri Aroha: Wāhine Māori insights into historical trauma and healing* (pp. 3–16). Te Atawhai o Te Ao. http://www.teatawhai.maori.nz/images/downloads/He_Rau_Murimuri-Aroha_web.pdf