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ABSTRACT: This article presents an account of collaborative, cross-cultural academic research related to indigenous peace traditions in Aotearoa New Zealand. It describes the decolonising research methodology developed by Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith, kaupapa Māori and introduces kaupapa Moriori (that is being developed by Moriori researchers). We then assess how these kaupapa approaches relate to the concept of friendship articulated by Professor Preston King. We find that the collaborative model that we have developed incorporates friendship principles that are generally in accord with kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori principles for conducting ethical, respectful cross-cultural research. Research based on both friendship and a decolonising methodology allows for sensitive material to be revealed in a way that avoids some of the harm research can cause to communities that have already experienced a painful history.
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Introduction

In this article we describe how four colleagues came together to conduct cross-cultural research related to some of the indigenous peace traditions of Aotearoa New Zealand and Rēkohu (Chatham Islands). Our collaborative research was based on a decolonising methodology and this seemed to be in accord with the friendship that developed and enhanced the research process. We were curious to explore the link between the recommended principles for conducting research with indigenous peoples, and the concept of friendship. We consider firstly, the tensions between Western research and friendship and the dilemma of conducting cross-cultural research that relies on good relationships being developed. Then we look briefly at some of the issues that research raises for indigenous peoples. These are addressed by Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith who advocates applying kaupapa Māori research principles as part of a decolonising methodology. This is particularly applicable in the bicultural context of Aotearoa New Zealand (Smith, 1999). We also build on Smith’s principles of kaupapa Māori to introduce Moriori principles to add this analytical framework that acknowledges the indigenous people of Rēkohu (the Chatham Islands), which is under New Zealand jurisdiction.
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Having analysed our own cross-cultural, collaborative research to demonstrate where it accords with kaupapa Māori/Moriori methodology, we then assess whether it also reflects the aspects of friendship as a political concept as outlined by Professor Preston King (2007). We conclude by arguing that research based on friendship, and research that adheres to the principles of Kaupapa Maori and Kaupapa Moriori, provides a useful challenge to the Western paradigm. And while we are not recommending a binary approach that sets indigenous research at odds with academic research, we believe that the relationships approach in the cross-cultural research we have been conducting produces rich knowledge and at the same time helps to ensure that harm is not caused in the process.

A note about the use of Māori and Moriori language

While we understand that there will be challenges for those unfamiliar with the indigenous languages of Aotearoa New Zealand, we are following the decolonising practice advocated for the use of Māori terms (te reo) in English language documentation not to italicise Māori because it an official language of New Zealand (along with New Zealand sign language). We will provide approximate translations of the concepts in brackets and in the glossary included as an appendix. Moriori language (re) is yet to be officially recognised as a distinct language. However, our research team has chosen to treat rē Moriori as if it were official and equivalent to te reo Māori, and we will also use brackets for Moriori terms.

Introducing the researchers

In Māori and Moriori culture, it is important to introduce oneself to the gathering or the audience. Traditionally this is done through a recitation of one’s genealogy in the indigenous language. In this article, we introduce ourselves to be transparent about how we came to work together as researchers and the knowledge shared.

Heather Devere

As a Pākehā or Tauiwi (non-Māori) Director of Practice at the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Otago (NCPACS), Dunedin I have been teaching for many year about some of the peace traditions of Aotearoa New Zealand. My learning about the peace traditions occurred along with relationships developed with indigenous scholars and practitioners who were connected to NCPACS. I had come across, by chance, information about Parihaka’s peace tradition, their non-violent resistance to occupation, which I had incorporated into my teaching. I had been largely unaware of the peace tradition of Moriori, with their commitment to non-killing, until Maui Solomon agreed to serve on the Trust that established NCPACS. I knew nothing about the centuries-old commitment to peace of Waitaha until hearing Kelli Te Maiharoa’s presentation to our
students before she became a PhD student. With Maata Wharehoka's arrival in Dunedin from Parihaka on a fellowship to advise us about Māori tikanga or customs, we all agreed to share our knowledge and begin to raise awareness of Aotearoa indigenous peace traditions, especially within academia.

Kelli Te Maihāroa

My tribal affiliations are Waitaha, Ngati Rarua, Atiawa and I am a descendent of Te Maihāroa the peace prophet. Waitaha are the First Nations people of Te Waipounamu, the South Island of Aotearoa New Zealand. As a peaceful people, our history contains no stories of war. There are no artifacts associated with fighting that have been discovered. I work at Otago Polytechnic as Director of Māori research and have just completed a PhD thesis using a kaupapa Māori framework with Dr. Heather Devere as my supervisor. I was encouraged to do this study after an invitation from Maui Solomon Chairperson of the Hokotehi Moriori Trust and member of the Trust that established NCPACS to join with him in a presentation for the students of the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies on the peace traditions of Moriori and Waitaha at Puketeraki Marae in Otago. Living in Taranaki, I am close to the village of Parihaka, and Maata Wharehoka has become one of my mentors.

Maui Solomon

I am Moriori, Māori (Kai Tāhu) and Pākehā, and co-Chair the board of the Trust that set up the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Otago. I am also a barrister with 30 years experience on claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and civil courts related to land and fisheries, cultural and intellectual property rights. Currently my focus is on rebuilding and reviving Moriori culture and traditions. I have returned home to Rēkohu to live and manage our tribal trust board. Over the last 20 or so years my people have built a modern marae (cultural meeting house) and have had our identity recognised by the New Zealand Government and organisations such as the Treaty of Waitangi Fisheries Commission. We are reconstructing and using our language and traditional songs, rituals and ways of being. We have many different ways of engaging with others that are possibly more akin to life in Eastern Polynesia than in New Zealand itself. Our core values of sharing, unity and peacemaking, for instance, have shaped very different rituals of encounter and welcome. They are also the guiding principles for our engagement in collaborative research projects.
Maata Wharehoka

My home is the Māori village of Parihaka, located on the west coast of the North Island (Te Ika-a-Maui) of Aotearoa New Zealand. My tribal affiliations are Ngati Koata, Ngati Kuia, Ngati Toa, Ngati Tahinga, Ngati Apakura, Ngāi Te Rangi. I have been part of negotiations with government that have resulted in a Deed of Settlement and an apology to the people of Parihaka, for the violent invasion against peaceful non-violent protests in the 1800s. Part of the rebuilding of the community is the establishment of an indigenous peace centre at Parihaka. I held an advisory position as Māori Practice Fellow at NCPACS to assist in the development of Māori tikanga (knowledge and customs) and deliver lectures and training sessions throughout Aotearoa and internationally. I engaged with Heather, Kelli and Maui in sharing knowledge about the peaceful kaupapa that has maintained Parihaka despite violent attacks and the destruction of the village in the 1800s.

Western academic research and friendship

Academic research in the Western Eurocentric tradition has been seen to function within a tension between friendly relations and competitive, ‘even hostile’ relations. Researchers are ‘expected to communicate openly about the findings and improve work by collaboration as well as constructive criticism’ (Emmeche, 2015: 41). Competitive research grants often insist on collaboration between different institutions, researchers and/or disciplines. However, when academics are ranked and rewarded according to their research outputs, individual research outputs are more highly valued in the competitive academic market place (see for example Farhan, 2016; Horta, 2009).

The role of friendship and research has been covered relatively little in the academic literature but there are some dilemmas related to the competitive nature of research in the Western academic sphere. Emmeche (2015) has pointed to concerns about the borderline between friendship and collegiality in academia. The dangers of nepotism and cronyism are contrasted with ideals of collegiality and collaboration that might produce intellectual synergies. Friendly collegial relations are considered to be important ‘for the smoothness of interactions’ (Emmeche, 2015: 52) but ‘adversarial collaboration’ is advocated for exploring ideas, and rivalry is seen as healthy competition designed to make progress.

The ‘old boys’ network’ sometimes called ‘the invisible college’ has been criticised for some time by feminist scholars for limiting this collaboration to elite men, and excluding women and members of non-Western groups, (see for example, Sädl, 2009). The counteracting ‘sisterhood’ has in turn been criticised for its political correctness, and excessive focus on women and their concerns (see for example Sommers, 1994).

Tillman-Healy (2003) promotes ‘friendship as method’ but is also concerned about the ‘ethics of using friendship in ethnographic fieldwork’. She acknowledges that researchers rely on friendship and reflects on ‘whether relationships forged in the field are inherently instrumental in nature’ and might compromise friendships that predate...
fieldwork, particularly when the research is with one’s own community. On the other hand, Ramírez-i-Ollé (2019: 299) claims that the ‘instrumentalisation of friendship’ is ‘a normal aspect of knowledge formation, and should not be seen as unethical.’ He believes that if anything ‘befriending subjects promotes better research ethics as it generates a form of mutuality based on partial relatedness, constructive dissent and playfulness, rather than hybridity, totalizing consensus and domination.’

Owton and Allen-Collinson (2013: 26) found that it is challenging for the researcher who adopts a friendship methods approach to maintain that relationship over time. They relate that ‘despite best efforts to sustain the research relationship and beset by feelings of loss and rejection, it was eventually deemed appropriate to let go of an informant and move on’.

Maintaining objectivity is also considered to be difficult yet desirable in research, and is regarded as of particular concern where one is both researcher and friend. Writing about insider research with gay communities, Taylor (2011: 12) claims that the ‘shift from friend to researcher and back again can be challenging’ with issues raised by research participants related to trust, vulnerability and the power dynamics ‘of the friend-informant relationship’.

**Cross-cultural research and building relationships**

Maintaining this balance between researcher and participants has been a particular dilemma in cross-cultural research. Cross-cultural research is the term generally used in the UK, more commonly referred to as intercultural research in the USA, and generally compares behaviour, customs, ideas, and ideologies of people living in different countries, people from different ethnic groups, or from different communities. Researching across cultures requires building relationships in order to understand the differences and similarities between different nations and diverse ethnic groups. Some of the matters that are recommended as needing to be addressed when undertaking cross-cultural research include cultural sensitivity, cultural knowledge (Liamputtong, 2008), empowerment and data ownership (Marshall and Batten, 2004). To establish good relationships involves maintaining regular contact, building rapport and gaining trust.

However, as most cross-cultural research is conducted by Western researchers, often wanting to find out about ‘an other’ cultural group, the comparisons have usually been about how the ‘other’ matches up to the Western norm. For indigenous groups worldwide, this has contributed to suspicion and distrust of academic researchers. Ethnographers, who needed to establish intimacy or develop a degree of closeness to the culture they wished to examine, had many claiming to have established friendships or become ‘part of the family’. However, while there were benefits for the researchers in gaining insight and access to valuable information, getting ‘street credentials’ and ‘subcultural capital’ (Thornton, 1995), often those from the culture being researched felt
abandoned by their ‘friend’ or ‘family member’ when the research project was completed (Visweswaran, 1997; de Regt, 2015).

Leeuw et al (2012: 190) observe that if the long term relationships established by researchers are strategically and methodologically essential, then this alters the nature of the relationship. The ‘non-Indigenous researchers who claim friendship with their research subjects often fail to recognize the ways in which such friendships are pre-conditions for research itself’. In their research they claim that ‘when the friendship pre-exists the research, and when research is not the principal reason for the engagement, critical analysis and reflection can more fully occur. They suggest that only ‘certain friendships, established and situated outside research relationships, may be productive spaces within and through which research methods may be decolonized’ (see Leeuw et al., 2012).

The development of indigenous research methodologies

The Alaskan Native saying that ‘researchers are like mosquitoes, they suck your blood and leave’ (quoted in Cochran et al., 2008: 1) is indicative of the disquiet among research participants related to the disempowering nature of much research. Anthropological researchers, in particular, have been criticised for doing research on or about not with non-Western peoples to the extent that for indigenous peoples ‘research’ has become ‘probably one of the dirtiest words in the indigenous world’s vocabulary’ (Smith, 1999: 1; Hall, 2014).

The leading resource for any research related to indigenous communities and peoples is the seminal 1999 book, followed by a second edition published in 2012, by Māori academic and scholar, Professor Linda Tuhiwai Smith, Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples. Smith (1999: 1) takes a position in her books, privileging herself as one of ‘the colonized’ and views the term ‘research’ as ‘inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism’. She sees scientific research as ‘implicated in the worst excesses of colonialism [that] remains a powerful remembered history for many of the world’s colonized peoples’. Using Edward Said’s discussion about ‘the Other’, Smith identifies research as ‘a significant site of struggle between the interests and ways of knowing of the West and the interests and ways of resisting the Other’, in this case ‘the Other’ being indigenous peoples.

While Linda Smith’s ideas have been used to frame indigenous research globally, for example, with First Nations Peoples in Canada (Baskin, 2005; Datta 2018; Leeuw et al., 2012; Shahjahan, 2005; Smith H.A., 2017); Native Americans in the USA (Butler et al., 2005; Cochran et al., 2008); Southern African indigenous peoples (Keane et al., 2014); Aboriginal peoples in Australia (Braun et al., 2014; Brown, 1999), Pasifika Peoples (Thaman, 2003; Whimp, 2008), and the Peoples of Oceania (Tacon, 2000), as well as Māori of Aotearoa New Zealand (Eketone, 2008; Royal, 2012; Te Maihāroa, 2019), she develops a specific methodology that draws from Māori knowledge and practices. She emphasises that this
is for research by and with Māori. This methodology has an emphasis on prior consultation with communities, building trust and the telling of their own stories by Māori. The Kaupapa Māori research method has been characterised as culturally safe, involving the mentorship of elders, being culturally relevant and appropriate, while at the same time satisfying the rigour of research (Smith, 2012; Walker, Eketone and Gibbs, 2006). Kaupapa Māori has been incorporated into academic research whereby new generations of indigenous researchers are now ‘speaking back to the Academy about emerging indigenous research partnerships’ (Hall, 2014: 376).

Kaupapa is a complex term that incorporates principles, values and plans of action. Kaupapa Māori emphasises ‘making space’ for Māori people, culture, knowledge and values throughout academia and includes the ‘political notion of challenging the privileging of Western knowledge’. It is about transformation, ‘achieving cultural, education and social liberation very much in the mode envisaged by the Brazilian education theorist Paulo Friere’ (Royal, 2012: 31). There is debate about whether the researcher needs to be Māori or whether a non-indigenous non-Māori person can be involved in kaupapa Māori research (see Smith, 2012; Barnes, 2013). Bishop (1996) argues that non-indigenous people have an obligation to support Māori research as partners to the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi and can be useful allies and colleagues with a goal of empowerment meaning ‘that Māori people should regain control of investigations into Māori people’s lives’. Much like different sorts of feminist methodologies, Kaupapa Māori does not advocate a particular method of research, and uses different types of quantitative and qualitative research methods.

**Biculturalism in Aotearoa New Zealand**

Cross-cultural research sits within a national political debate about culture in Aotearoa New Zealand that has focused on multiculturalism and biculturalism. Multiculturalism is the recognition that New Zealanders have their origins in a wide number of different cultures and countries. Biculturalism considers the primary relationship to be between the first nations people, Māori and Moriori, and the newer arrivals. Māori culture is based on a tribal arrangement of different whānau, hapū and iwi. The whānau is the extended family. Hapū has been translated as clan or descent group, and iwi is the main tribal affiliation, a collection of hapū, and the largest political grouping in pre-European Māori society. These iwi (tribal units) are not used in Moriori culture where complex kinship relationships define societal structure. Under the bicultural model, non-Māori New Zealanders are referred to either as Pākehā or Tauiwi (Munford and Walsh-Tapiata, 2006; Hotere-Barnes, 2015: 40).

The concepts of biculturalism and partnership between Māori, Moriori and the New Zealand Government are grounded in the Treaty of Waitangi (Te Tiriti o Waitangi) that was signed in 1840 between the British Crown and some Māori chiefs (Kāwharu,
The principles of Te Tiriti have been incorporated into the New Zealand legal system and the Treaty is considered to be a ‘contract that is a commitment on the part of the government to uphold certain rights due to Māori [and Moriori] as the peoples who occupied the land that the settlers and other newcomers to New Zealand wanted to share’ (Nakhid and Devere, 2015: 64; Ruru, 2005). The Waitangi Tribunal set up in 1975 to assess the legality of land confiscation by the Crown since 1840 and the signing of Te Tiriti o Waitangi makes recommendations about the restoration of land rights, cultural interests, financial and commercial redress.

While there are a number of critiques that this is part of a re-colonisation process (see for example Mutu, 2017; Sadler, 2015; Seuffert, 2005; Williams, 2013), many institutions in New Zealand have made a commitment to operate according to the principles of the Treaty. Most New Zealand government departments now have a Māori name. Traditional Māori ceremonies such as mihimihi (greetings), pōwhiri (welcomes) and poroporoāki (farewells) are often performed at official functions, tangi (bereavement) leave is provided, and central Government research funds have kaupapa Māori ethical requirements. Māori words, symbols and concepts are commonplace inside and outside of the government and public sector (see Te Ara, Biculturalism). Moriori language is still to be officially recognised and incorporated into legislation and daily usage.

When the National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies (NCPACS) was established at the University of Otago in Dunedin (located in the south of the South Island – Te Wai Pounamu) in 2009, it was given the Māori name Te Ao o Rongomaraeroa (the space of peace). The Memorandum of Understanding signed between the Trustees and the University included an explicit commitment to biculturalism.

Cross-cultural research and friendship

However, it was the failure of the newly established NCPACS to exhibit an understanding of biculturalism and the principles of Te Tiriti that brought the four of us into this research collaboration through different pathways. Each of us was connected differently to NCPACS. We did not initially envisage collaborative research to be published in academic journals as our purpose. However, through our conversations we realised that we each had something of value that we could contribute to a joint research project.

The research collaboration developed both face-to-face and via email. Not all four of us had met prior to agreeing to start writing collaboratively in an effort to share peace-based messages. As a collective, through email communication, we ensured that all four authors were involved in this research project. From the conceptualisation, to the process of writing and editing, through the dissemination of the final pieces of work, all parties were regarded as equal participants and benefactors. Each of us has made a contribution to the combined text, choosing how and when to engage in this joint process. We finally met together (about three years after our work had begun) on Rēkohu the home of the Moriori people.
Each of the indigenous researchers, in consultation with their own communities, and with reference to academic work, and indigenous knowledge passed on through oral accounts, took responsibility for writing the sections on their own indigenous peace tradition. These were placed in context, used comparatively, and edited, in an iterative process where everyone was able to comment on all aspects of the paper through email discussions. The various articles and chapters that have been jointly produced concerned different aspects of the research. These include a chapter on the origins of the peace traditions, the historical account of the invasions of each of the communities in the 19th century, and the resurrection and regeneration of the peace traditions and the communities in the 20th and 21st centuries (Devere et al. 2017); an article that sets the three peace traditions in the context of Māori history related to endurance and resilience (Devere et al., 2019); a paper that describes the collaborative project (Te Maihāroa et al.); several jointly authored conference papers delivered in Nepal, New Zealand, Portugal, Trinidad and Tobago, Turkey and USA.

This cross-cultural research flourished due to the way in which we had collaborated that helped to build trust and to develop, not just a team of collegial researchers, but what we can identify as a firm friendship. In this article we are looking at the relationship between the principles that govern ethical kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori research and how these relate to the concept of friendship. There are synergies as well as disjunctions found in analysing our work through these different lenses.

Kaupapa Māori and Kaupapa Moriori research

The kaupapa Māori research approach initiated by Linda Tuhiwai Smith, a notion that emerged from the 1980s Māori self-determination movement, was initially a way of describing ethical research practice by, for and about Māori and so is particularly applicable for research with the indigenous people of Aotearoa - Māori (see Pihama, Cram and Walker, 2002) and Moriori. While there are debates about the theoretical underpinnings of Kaupapa Māori practice (Eketone, 2008; Smith G., 1997; Kiro 2000; Rata, 2008) there is widespread agreement that Māori have been hugely affected by the impact of colonisation, including the delegitimisation of the Māori worldview and indigenous knowledge (Mead, 2003; Durie, 1992).

As a research methodology, importance is placed on Māori values including whanaungatanga (relationships), manākitanga (hospitality and sharing), māhaki (humility), aroha (love and respect), mana (power and dignity), titiro, whakarongo, korero (look, listen, then speak), kia tūpato (cautiousness), and he konohi kitea (being a familiar face).

Aotearoa New Zealand also comprises Rēkohu (Chatham Islands) which is the home of an indigenous people who are not Māori, although they share similarities in their Pacific heritage. The Moriori people have a unique culture and language (King, M., 2000).
We have used the term kaupapa Māori to describe indigenous-led research that benefits Māori and Moriori, but we are also introducing some Moriori concepts and terminology to acknowledge that research principles and methodologies will vary for different communities. We express this as ‘kaupapa Moriori’ to point out the uniqueness of the Moriori community. Awareness of Moriori culture and traditions has only emerged in the last 20-30 years and these are still not commonly understood, even in New Zealand (Solomon and Thorpe, 2012; King, M., 2000). However, there is work currently under way to further develop research with a kaupapa Moriori approach.

Kaupapa Moriori is a research methodology that is evolving in response to pressure from external researchers on Moriori and the Chatham Islands. Moriori developed their own research ethical protocols, which our research team has incorporated into our research methodology. Examples of Moriori research partnerships that support this are seen in the international research project which emerged out of the Simon Fraser University project on intellectual property issues in cultural heritage (Hokotehi Moriori Trust), and the 2011 Me Rongo Declaration (Hokotehi Moriori Trust, 2011). The principles of the Me Rongo Declaration are: Hokomenetai (unity), sharing, active participation for non-violence, pluralism, peace education, protection and valuing natural resources, freedom of identity, protection of and respect for sacred spaces, protection of and respect for indigenous rights, values and teachings, the nurturing of artists, poets, musicians, spiritual leaders and visionaries, and the promotion of research and dialogue on conflict resolution. More details of kaupapa Moriori research methodology will be the subject of subsequent writings.

In this article we focus for our exploration of the three peace traditions of the people of Parihaka, Moriori and Waitaha on incorporating Moriori concepts into the kaupapa Māori framework. We identify the corresponding Moriori principles for each of the eight principles highlighted for research and evaluation in a kaupapa Māori context (Smith and Cram). The Moriori concept will be given in brackets after the Māori principle and the quote that follows will be taken from Smith and Cram’s (n.d.) description of the kaupapa Māori principles. Differences will be identified in the explanatory text for each principle, and we will provide examples of how each of these principles was applied in our work together.

1. Whanaungātanga (Hūnaungātanga)

Whanaungātanga refers to the building and maintenance of relationships. It’s the process of establishing meaningful, reciprocal and whānau (hūnau) or family-like relationships through cultural respect, connectedness and engagement.
The word whānau (hūnau) ‘is the basic building block of the whole social system’ (Mead, 2003: 212). The concept of whānau (hūnau) is often equated to ‘family’ and can range from the immediate family to include those who are directly related as extended family, as well as whangai (foster children) and those who have passed on. In addition to descent-based whānau (hūnau), there is also the concept of whānau as a collective that comes together for a common purpose. The term includes those with whom one develops a close familial, friendship or reciprocal relationship. Whānau (hūnau) support, help and value each other.

We have been welcomed onto the marae (ancestral meeting houses) at Parihaka, the village in the North Island of Aotearoa New Zealand where the people in 1881 offered peaceful resistance to the British militia that came to evict them. We have become part of the whānau (extended family) and in turn we are part of the welcoming committee for new arrivals. We share in the cooking, serving and clearing up of meals. We play our part in the community activities. We have also been welcomed onto Kōpinga Marae on Rēkohu where the regenerated Moriori tradition is very open to people from all traditions and cultures.

2. Manākitanga (Manawa Rekatanga)

Manākitanga describes sharing, hosting and being generous. It supports collaborative research and evaluation and helps knowledge flow both ways between researcher/evaluator and participant.

Hosting people on a marae (ancestral meeting house) and providing hospitality is part of a generous offering and a privilege afforded to many visitors to Aotearoa New Zealand and on Rēkohu. There is always a formal greeting when first one visits a marae that includes taking part in a hongi or physical face-to-face greeting and always there is food shared with visitors. Part of this manākitanga (manawa rekatanga) (hospitality) involves the giving of a koha (tāpae) by the visitors (a gift of an undisclosed amount of money, food or other relevant gift exchanges), a tradition that acknowledges this hosting, and helps sustain the gathering. The Moriori concept of manawa rekatanga emphasises the value of compassion rather than the raising of one’s own mana (position or status) through hospitality.

The manāki (manawa reka) that we have shared has included being hosted at several marae that are connected to the three peace communities with whom we are doing the research. The principle of ‘sharing’ was very much part of an important meeting on Rēkohu. The first time we were able to all meet together as a group was at Kōpinga Marae. In order to fund the travel, we shared the research money obtained for two of us
with the third person, to ensure that we were able to have our first meeting face to face. We were generously hosted and our workshops and research discussions were interspersed with feasts of seafood, fishing trips, and viewing of the sacred groves of kōpi trees where only 56 engraved living trees of the thousands that once existed on Rēkohu, remain in situ. We were able to gain an understanding of the commitment to peace of a remote community whose island was invaded and whose people maintained their ancient covenant of peace in face of the greatest provocation they were to ever face. In so doing, they were almost wiped out, but have, over the past 30 or so years been regenerating traditions focusing on the values of peace and sharing as handed down by Moriori karāpuna (ancestors).

In terms of the research collaboration there has also been generosity in sharing knowledge from the different indigenous communities involved, and the passing on of this special and sometimes sacred knowledge was enabled through the academic conference and publication process.

3. Māhaki (Tau Muai)

Māhaki (tau muai) is about showing humility when sharing knowledge. Māhaki (tau muai) reminds us to share knowledge and experiences to understand each other better and foster trust in the research or evaluator relationships.

He tangata māhaki is a person who is self-possessed, calm, quiet, mild-mannered and humble (Mead 2003: 363). Māhaki is also used in reference to ‘others’ paying homage to one’s talents and achievements. This is never done by oneself. To give praise to oneself is seen as arrogant, or whakahihi, used to describe rudeness, impoliteness and conceit.

The idea of humility when sharing knowledge is somewhat in opposition to the current culture in academia that encourages self-promotion, in particular about one’s research achievements. In Māori and Moriori cultures, one does not praise oneself or take credit. While we have been working together as a group, this humility of interaction has promoted trust and confidence in the integrity of the others. In line with the goal of the Māori and Moriori people to convey their messages about these peace traditions to a wider world, academic conferences and publications have been used as a conduit, but the work is not presented as one individual’s work, rather as the work of a collective and behalf of the others.
4. Aroha (iaroha)

Aroha means love but it also means respect and compassion. Treating people with respect means allowing them to control: where to meet and on their own terms, and when to meet. Aroha (iaroha) also relates to the information collected. You should let the participant decide what information will become public and what will stay confidential. They can also choose whether to participate anonymously.

Aroha (iaroha) is the expression of love, respect and concern for the wellbeing of each other, societal relationships and humanity. Aroha (iaroha) is a word that dispels anger, hurt and injury as a result of abusive behaviour, and is synonymous with healing and giving. In each of the three peace traditions, aroha (iaroha) features strongly and is also extended to those from outside of their communities. Despite the harms suffered, each community is responding not with anger and violence, but with respect and concern for others.

At Parihaka, the descendants of the militia that invaded their village are invited to visit Parihaka with a photo of their ancestor and be welcomed through a ceremony of reconciliation. The Waitaha iwi invite people to join their Peace Walk (heke) that retraces the steps through the Waitaki river valley of their ancestors led by, Te Maihāroa, to find refuge from eviction. Moriori regularly host visitors from all over the world on Rēkohu, including the inaugural Me Rongo Congress, where everyone was invited to debate, discuss and reaffirm the peace covenant of Moriori.

Allowing each of our co-researchers to decide which elements of the narrative to include is part of this aroha (iaroha) and respect. In Māori and Moriori societies this means that not just the researcher, but the researcher’s own community also determines what information or knowledge can become public and what should stay confidential. On a personal level, aroha (iaroha) has also been shown within our group by supporting each other at times of personal loss and trauma and putting aside the academic work when it will be too much of a burden for one of the others.

5. Mana (Manawa = kindness in rē Moriori)

Mana relates to power, dignity and respect. Kaua e takahia te mana o te tangata “Do not trample on the mana or dignity of a person”. People are the experts of their own lives, including their problems, needs and aspirations. Look for ways to work together.
For Māori, ‘personal and group relationships are always mediated and guided by the high value placed on mana’ (Mead, 203: 29). Mana like aroha (iaroha) incorporates respect, but it also represents the prestige with which a person is regarded. Mana is earned over a long period of time. It is not about material success or status within the New Zealand community generally, but it is associated with a person of deep integrity who shows dignity and is held in high esteem by the community. Even so, everyone has their own mana, and needs to be shown respect. Mana is an attribute or quality that is recognised by others about a person and is not something that is self-ascribed. To do so would be regarded as arrogance. For Moriori, though, mana is not a recognised concept. Instead, Moriori use the word manawa (heart or kindness) to describe relationships with place and each other, it is associated more closely with iarohu, with an emphasis on love and compassion.

The mana and the manawa of the people of Rēkohu and Waitaha and their leaders have been recognised by other Māori tribes and by peace groups around the world. Steadfastness in the face of oppression and their commitment to non-violent responses are held up as examples of extreme courage and integrity. The leaders of Parihaka, are now acknowledged in legislation currently going through the New Zealand parliament as providing a model of peace by the use of passive and non-violent resistance rather than aggression in facing the loss of their land, and have received an apology from the Crown for its historical breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi (see Te Kawanata ō Rongo, 2017). The recognition of Moriori for their steadfast compassion to strangers is being upheld as a value to be respected and admired. Moriori are also being recognised as the tangata whenua tuturu ake (true tangata whenua or first peoples) of Rēkohu (see the Waitangi Tribunal in its ‘Rēkohu Report’ 2001) and the present day mana of Moriori was acknowledged in the presence of the Prime Minister of New Zealand, Helen Clark, and the Maori Queen, the late Dame Te Ataairangikaahu, at the opening of Köpinga Marae in 2005. Waitaha is also beginning to receive recognition for the integrity of their commitment to non-violence and the recognition of Waitaha as the original iwi in Te Wai Pounamu has begun through the restorative justice processes of the Waitangi Tribunal.

Our project incorporated the concept of mana and manawa by empowering the voices of both insider and outsider researchers in our commitment to kaupapa Māori and Moriori research methods. Each of us was treated as the expert with our own knowledge that we wanted to share respectfully. This extended to the concept of tikanga me reo-ā-iwi (rē a imi), which is giving voice to each author to relate the narrative of each peace tradition using words from her/his own unique tribal languages, dialect, tikaka, tikane (customary protocols), history and political landscape. There are different dialects for the Māori of the Taranaki region where Parihaka is located, and for the Māori of the South Island where Waitaha is located. As noted earlier, Moriori is a language that has similarities to Māori, but is a unique language of its own.
6. Titiro, whakarongo, kōrero (E tiro, hokorongo, korero)

Titiro, whakarongo, kōrero (E tiro, hokorongo, korero) means look, listen and then speak. When researching and evaluating, it is important to look and listen to develop understanding and find a place to speak from. You need to take time to understand people’s day-to-day realities, priorities and aspirations. This will make your questions relevant to the participant.

Launching into research projects with no understanding of these values can lead to a breach of these principles of kaupapa Māori and Moriori. The importance of taking time to understand, by listening and watching, and learning when to speak or ask questions is stressed. Moyle (2014: 32) refers to these as the ‘art of patience, humility and keen observation. The researcher is a learner in a privileged situation; looking until one sees and listening until one hears, so that nothing is missing’.

Each of the values of titiro (e tiro) (observation), whakarongo (hokorongo) (listening) and kōrero (speaking) are represented in the environment in the form of Ātua (etchu), gods or ancestors who are kaitiaki (tchieki) or guardians of the environs. The Māori moko kauae (markings or tattoos) on Maata Wharehoka’s lower jaw represent the importance of these aspects in communication. Titiro (e tiro) involves the eyes, and the first step – silently watching and observing. Whakarongo (hokorongo) is associated with the ears. It means to listen or hear. In Moriori and Māori languages rongo also means peace. So important for peace is the ability to listen.

The joint communication of our group was enhanced through the transparent and collaborative research process that we followed. The kōrero or telling of the stories for each of the three peace traditions has historically been very inaccurate in the Western press, the schooling system, and in academic publications. Until the recent Deed of Reconciliation signed in June 2017 between the Crown and Parihaka, in which the people of Parihaka recounted their ‘legacy’ in both Māori and English, the knowledge of the rape of the women by the men in the militia was unknown (Te Kawenata ō Rongo, 2017). The history of Moriori taught in schools told that they were driven out of New Zealand by Māori, and that the last of the Moriori had died, whereas the historical evidence is that Moriori were not on the New Zealand mainland, but were the first people on Rēkohu (King M., 2000). There are an estimated 3,500 Moriori descendants identified as still living. Moriori did not die out. Waitaha has been portrayed as a ‘fairy people’ no longer a separate iwi or tribe, rather than the first arrivals in the South Island of New Zealand, and an iwi distinctive from the larger iwi of Kai Tahu (Te Maihāroa, 2019).
7. Kia Tūpato (‘toho’ or ‘kia toho’)

Kia tūpato (kia toho) is being cautious (and careful). You need to be politically savvy, culturally safe, and reflective about your insider or outsider status. Staying safe might mean working with elders and others in the community who can guide your research and evaluation.

Kia tūpato (kia toho) is taking caution, being careful and wary, particularly about your position and status among those with whom you are living and working. It is ensuring that te ao Māori (the Māori world) and te ao Moriori are visible and recognised in Pākehā institutions. The Māori concept of rangatiratanga that refers to the ancestral wisdom acknowledges the need for guidance from the ancestors and the Kaumātua (Rangata mātua), the elders and leaders of Māori and Moriori communities. For Moriori culture, however, which is more egalitarian, there is not the same concept of rangatiratanga or chieftainship.

Each representative of the three peace traditions did not assume to speak on behalf of the others. While all three traditions have been open to welcoming outsiders into their communities, respect, caution and the commitment to peaceful interaction are expected to be shown in each place. Where outsiders are culturally insensitive, they are reminded clearly about inappropriate actions or behaviours. Each tradition incorporates not only Māori or Moriori tikanga/tikane or customs, but in addition an emphasis on upholding the peaceful messages of their ancestors. Each community has elders who are consulted about what is deemed to be appropriate, especially when outsiders are involved.

We were guided by elders from the Waitaha community, learning from their kōrero the lessons of peaceful protests, resilience and endurance. At Parihaka we have been hosted at Te Niho o Te Atiawa meeting house and guided through the consultation process where research projects need to be presented to each of the three marae in the village. On Rēkohu we have the example and teachings of the ancestors that guide the regeneration of the Moriori peace tradition. We have also had guidance from Ngāi Tahu, the major iwi in the South Island, and the people of the land where the University of Otago is located.

8. He kanohi kītea (konehi)

He kanohi kītea (konehi) means being a familiar face. You should seek to be involved with communities and familiar to them to build trust and communication.
In order to keep the bonds of whanaungātanga/hūnaungātanga (relationships) strong, the principle of being a familiar face, he kanohi kitea (konehi), is valued, in recognition of the fragility of relationships. The importance of face-to-face communication is emphasised. Once a researcher has been involved in a community, this involvement should be respected and maintained. The end of a research project is not the end of one’s association with the community.

One of the goals of our joint research is to ensure that there are spaces where people supportive of these and other indigenous peace traditions can meet face to face. Visiting marae and hearing from the people of each community the histories and teachings of the ancestors, and learning about the projects that are in train to regenerate these models of peaceful living are important aspects of being a familiar face. Our hope is that the universities will acknowledge and support the establishment of teaching spaces in the communities as indigenous peace centres where students from Aotearoa and around the world can participate in knowledge sharing.

The peace centres to be developed at Parihaka and on Rēkohu will also serve as spaces for he konohi kitea. Our collaboration through this research project has achieved kotahitanga/hokotehitanga, a unity of the four of us who have worked on behalf of the collective group of researchers, and on behalf of the valued communities that they represent. Our research will be ongoing, and inclusive as long as it is needed.

The process of this collaborative work and engaging in kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori has also created a lasting commitment to each other that has evolved into a friendship. We now consider how concepts of friendship accord with our research project.

**Research as friendship**

In the Western academic literature, there is an increasing interest in the relationship between friendship and politics and the importance of the concept of friendship for modernity and developing understanding of ethical principles of friendship (Devere and Smith, 2010).

In his article on ‘Friendship in Politics’, Preston King (2007) argues that dyadic friendships, friendship networks and universal friendship can help with the checks and balances on state power. He identifies ten aspects of friendship for modernity that provide a basic outline construct of friendship for connecting friendship to the political (2007: 130). King argues that these aspects of friendship could be used to curb immoral political power. He suggests that friendships, friendship networks and the concept of universal friendship have practical and philosophical potential to encourage a more moral politics.

*AMITY: The Journal of Friendship Studies (2020) 6:1, 53-87*
The concept of friendship as political is useful as a second lens to apply to our analysis that acknowledges the political implications for decolonising research and that addresses morality and issues of power that are fundamental to Western practices of cross-cultural research.

The eight principles of kaupapa Māori and Moriori research are compared to the ten aspects of friendship proposed by Professor Preston King, now of Morehouse College in Atlanta, Georgia, who has been instrumental in advancing the study of the relationship between friendship and politics. We are applying these ten aspects of friendship to our research collaboration to consider the role of friendship as an ethical relationship in cross-cultural kaupapa Māori and Moriori research.

1. Relationship

...fairly obviously, friendship is never to do with an agent or subject taken singly. It concerns some type of relationship whether (a) interactive, as between subject and subject, or (b) unilateral, as from one subject to another – though (a) is the more common construct.

As King says, friendship is a relationship. In terms of research that involves human participants, relationships need to be developed. However, friendship in academia is not always encouraged as it is seen as bordering on nepotism, or producing work that is not objective. Research is valued more for the ‘outputs’ that are produced rather than for the collegiality developed between researchers or between researchers and research participants. The type of friendship that is most compatible with the current values of academia would be instrumental friendship, where friendships are valued for what each party can achieve through the relationship. These relationships are considered valuable for the research that is produced, rather than for the relationship that is developed. There is academic benefit for researchers to be involved in research with indigenous communities but instrumentalism is not compatible with Māori and Moriori values of whanaungatanga (hūnaungātanga) and prioritising instrumental friendship is likely to lead to distrust.

Building relationships is important to facilitate collaborative research, connecting subject to subject or offered from one person to another. If these relationships are meaningful and reciprocal, involving genuine connectedness and engagement then these could be considered to be related to the concept of whānaungātanga (hūnaungātanga). Whānaungātanga is not regarded as an instrumental relationship. It is based on respect, trust and engagement and is valued for its own sake. Our own collaborative experience incorporates both instrumental and non-instrumental elements. We worked together to produce research papers, so in that sense our relationship was instrumental. However,
the motivation for our work was not to achieve publications to advance our careers, but to share knowledge that the peace communities wanted to be shared. The good relationships that we had also enhanced the work that we were able to do. As the research progressed, so our relationship was affirmed as trustworthy, respectful and affectionate, a non-instrumental friendship.

2. Affection

... a basic sentiment of affection – one aspect of which is care or caritas – of one for another, or others.

Affection corresponds most closely to aroha (iaroha). Affection and respect are related but different concepts. Affection includes sentiments and feelings of love. One can respect someone, and admire them, without this necessarily involving emotions of affection. However, respect can come from knowing a person whom one loves, and affection can evolve from seeing the good in the other person.

While our relationship began with a common purpose, to tell the stories of Aotearoa’s indigenous peace traditions in a way that respects the people and the ancestors, affection for each other developed as we learnt to appreciate each other both professionally and personally. It is the care and concern shown for each other, as well as the respect for each other’s work, that are part of this affectionate relationship.

Aroha (iaroha) and affection are emotions and values of partiality, which can be perceived as a danger for academic social science research that emphasises objectivity and replicability. However, there is also a growing body of literature that acknowledges that impartial research that ignores the role of the emotions is likely to be unrealistic, incomplete and sometimes inaccurate (Holland, 2007; Davidson, Bondi and Smith, 2005; McLaughlin, 2006).

3. Reciprocal or Unilateral

In reciprocal relationships, some type of affection is both given and returned... [and] remains a circulate engagement, though the thickness of the circle varies, taking account either of the number of people entering it or of the quantity/quality of the affection they reciprocate.
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Unilateral affection ... can be described as instancing the generalized trait of ‘friendliness’ [that] ... may take the form of help to strangers, anonymous assistance to the distressed, or the unrequited love of known benefactors.

Unilateral friendliness might establish good relationships, but reciprocal friendship builds the relationship as trust and generosity shared. To some extent, manakitanga/manawareka most closely accords with unilateral friendship. Manakitanga is a form of hospitality that is given to all visitors who are prepared to come into the meeting house in peace. While manakitanga (manawareka) is given whether it is reciprocated or not, the koha (tāpae) (gift) does represent a reciprocal gesture in return for the hospitality. But manakitanga (manawareka) is not limited just to hospitality. It also concerns a generosity of spirit in sharing with others. This sharing though is done with caution, kia tūpato/ kia toho, to keep one’s friends and whānau (hūnau) safe.

The concept of ‘circulate engagement’ of reciprocal friendship has some resonance with our small circle of friends engaged in this work. We also engage cautiously with those outside of this small circle. We extend the ‘thickness’ of the circle to include for example, other whānau/hūnau, other collaborative colleagues, and students who become inspired through the stories of the peace traditions. For example, we helped to co-edit a collection on indigenous rights and peacebuilding in which we also shared a chapter (Devere, Te Maihāroa and Synott, 2017).

4. Bounded

... friendship, as a circle of reciprocal affection is ... bounded. For it is intimate and has obvious numerical limits.... Friendships with several may revive or reinvigorate the one; and it may be much the same across cultures.

This is the principle that puts a limit on friendship as a relationship. Friendship is exclusive. Boundedness acknowledges that not everyone can be friends with everyone else. Even unilateral friendship is limited by the number of people with whom one can interact. However, this principle also recognises that friendship can be ever increasing and overlapping circles that can ‘revive and reinvigorate’ those connected.

Our friendship is bounded in several ways. We all live or have lived in different parts of New Zealand, on different islands. We are not in daily contact. We have only met once as a group. We have different types of contact with each other. The kaupapa Māori and Moriori principles that recognise this boundedness include the concept of he kanohi kitea (kohehi kitea), the need to be familiar, to be able to see each other face to face, to look into each other’s eyes. Another aspect of boundedness is reflected in the concept of kia tūpato (kia toho), being cautious, not taking too much for granted, not
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pushing the relationship too much, remembering to acknowledge each other, being constant.

We each have our own friendship circles that can interconnect us all to wider circles, and particularly where these circles cross multiple cultures. Each of us has connections not just to Māori, Moriori and Pākehā cultures, but also to a vast array of international cultures, through whakapapa (hokopapa), through friendship networks, through our work and through political and academic connections. It is the sharing of the values of friendship and tikanga Māori and tikane Moriori that can establish moral interactions that are needed for a moral society and ethical politics.

5. Equal

*It is equal in the sense that there is some minimum of affection shown by one’s friends and returned in some form by the other.... Friendships, however, are only equal in some respects. They are always unequal in others.... Large inequalities ... tend not to accommodate friendship, properly speaking, but lose ground to a type of patron-client relationship, which remains reciprocal, but is far from equal.*

For King, the concept of equality includes minimum equality of affection for each other, but he also acknowledges that friendships are generally not equal in all respects. If the inequalities become too great, then the friendship evolves into a different sort of relationship based on unequal status, one that involves patronage where one party becomes obligated to the other.

Our group’s friendship is based on equality of respect, respect for mana and manawa. We are not concerned with measuring equalities, but rather with valuing difference. We have different knowledge/s, we have different status within our communities, we are from different traditions and ethnicities, we are of different ages and genders. The kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori concept of māhaki (tau muai) or humility is a useful concept for ensuring feelings of equality and worthiness within relationships. With pride and self-promotion there is an emphasis on one’s own achievements that can produce feelings of inadequacy in others. When there is condescension there is the feeling of being patronised, representing a type of patron-client relationship, not a close friendship. The concepts of māhaki (tau muai) and of not trampling on the mana of other people shows sensitivity and respect that take account of the impact on others and builds people up rather than cutting them down to size.
6. Asymmetrical sharing

One is not identical with one’s friend... Any relationship from casual meeting to enduring alliance, implies separateness, or separability.... What is shared in friendship always involves some degree of divergence and non-identity.

Identity involves both connectedness and separateness. Diversity and sharing about one’s own differences in life’s journey both requires trust and builds trust in relationships. Differences also imply different capacities to share and contribute. The learning from kaupapa Māori research and kaupapa Moriori methodologies involves appreciation of the knowledge/s deeply known, but not shared more widely. One of the issues raised about kaupapa Māori research is whether or how non-Māori or non-Moriori can be involved.

As with friendship, non-identity does not preclude collaboration and partnership. It is the way in which the relationship is developed and whether or not respect, care, acknowledgement, humility, aroha (iaroha), mana and manawa are in evidence. This also relates to being cautious (kia tūpato), looking and listening (titiro, whakarongo) before one speaks (kōrero) or acts.

As the Pākehā partner in this collaboration, Heather was guided by Māori and Moriori researchers, and it is their patience, understanding, support and kindness that has ensured that she feels part of a friendship circle, as well as being welcomed as part of a team with indigenous researchers. There is asymmetry of knowledge. The indigenous knowledge lies within the indigenous communities, and non-Māori only have access to that knowledge through generosity and inclusion.

7. Moral

The friendship relationship... is not just abstractly psychological, but it is ... somehow moral.... In many of these relationships that are marked by affection, even if there is some significant power gap, we commonly remark some sense of reciprocal duty owed by one to the other, even if duty is not the defining aspect of the relationship.

The concept of friendship carries with it the sense of responsibility and care for those for whom we feel affection. The morality of duty and responsibility in the Western sense is often associated with a legal or moral obligation that is some kind of requirement. Duty is also part of the individualist world of taking responsibility for oneself, for society and for those to whom we are connected in some way.

For Māori and Moriori the obligation is very much to one’s community, defined in different ways, but including whānau (hūnau), iwi (imi), and hapū. In Moriori culture the
obligations are enmeshed in more complex kinship relationships rather than strata of family and sub-tribal units. The concept of duty for Māori and Moriori is much more of a collective concept than the Western idea of duty. Both Western and indigenous philosophies consider duty as a moral concept, and in New Zealand the morality of legal duties, obligations and responsibility is part of the debate about recognition and reparations for past wrongs imposed on the indigenous people.

In terms of Pākahā researchers working on Māori and Moriori matters, the sense of duty and obligation to help to ‘right past wrongs’ and build meaningful partnerships together is part of the motivation for working with indigenous peoples. However, a sense (or certainly declaration) of ‘duty’ can sometimes damage relationships, as it can also seem to be condescending and not genuine. Also, the sense of ‘duty’ does not recognise the benefits (in terms of knowledge and indeed friendships) to be gained in the interaction. In the context of this research collaboration there is a more complex web of obligations given the history of Moriori and the impacts of invasion and enslavement by two Māori tribes in the 1800s.

The principles of kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori do have a strong moral component of obligation, responsibility and care. As we have already noted, offering hospitality, acknowledging the mana of others, being humble, showing love, care and compassion, and paying respect are all associated with strong moral values, as well as with values that are compatible with friendship.

8. Voluntary and Contractual

The obligation to the friend, like any other, is based on some notion of free will. But the obligation to the friend is voluntary in a specifically contractual sense....In as far as friendship is an affective relationship, of a reciprocal, intimate and voluntary (or contractual) type, borne along by a strong moral updraft, the question arising concerns the direction and nature of that morality.

Friendships are voluntary relationships that also carry obligations. While you may not be able to choose your relatives, you are able to choose your friends. However, once a friendship is embarked upon, there is then a (usually unspoken) agreement/contract that you now have a special bond where your obligations to your friend/s will take precedence over people less close to you. The tension between helping one’s friends over helping strangers is also grounded in morality.
There are strong moral obligations of commitment associated with kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori. The maintenance and longevity of relationships are part of upholding whānaungātanga (hūnaungātanga), the physical care provided by manakitanga (manawareka), the obligation to treat each other with respect involving both aroha (iaroha) and mana. Ties between whānau (hūnau), hapū and iwi (imi) carry with them obligations, but the role of tauiwi also has obligations in relationships with Māori and Moriori, and as partners under the Treaty of Waitangi.

As a group of researchers, we have obligations to each other, and to the project with which we are involved. So, whilst we entered into this collaboration voluntarily, we are committed to support each other when and where we can. This obligation, though, is tempered by compassion, concern and aroha (iaroha) towards each other as friends. On occasions when one or more of us is unable to participate fully the project is put on hold or advanced by the others in correspondence with our contractual commitment to hold fast to the principles of peace and as long as our joint mahi (work) is corresponding with the principles of kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori as being valuable for Māori and Moriori.

9. Tolerance

The element of first importance in the content of friendship as a moral matter is the specific morality of tolerance of divergent judgment... The key component of friendship, in the face of divergent understandings, does not then turn round simple agreement or disagreement. It turns round shared affection and amicable pursuit of resolution.

There is an element of patience within the concept of tolerance. Tolerance means that even when one does not agree with or even understand the view of others, this will not break the relationship, or disunite friends. It is the recognition that affection can still be shared, that projects can be pursued, that everyone does not have to think in the same way. Here again respect is a vital component of tolerance, and corresponds to those aspects of mana that allow people to be ‘the experts of their own lives’. But in order to fully appreciate the other/s, understanding can be developed by looking and listening (titiro, whakarongo). In order to speak, there also needs to be trust about the way in which one’s words are then used.

In gaining knowledge about the different peace traditions, in Aotearoa, the stories demonstrate the degree of patience that has been shown towards Pākehā newcomers and the time taken to address the concerns of Māori and Moriori. There have been years of tolerance shown towards Pākehā while they slowly learn about the indigenous peoples and the injustices Māori and Moriori have been forced to tolerate. Meetings or hui are
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held at Parihaka and Rēkohu that give everyone the opportunity to voice their opinions and to bring about consensus rather than absolute agreement and Pākehā and other tauiwi are invited to participate, just to look and listen, or to present their ideas to the gathering.

10. Can have a beneficial impact on society

... reciprocal friendship may indirectly impact society as a whole. The moral example extracted from reciprocal friendship may be replicated by other dyads. The moral example of selflessness, commitment, tolerance and rationality internal to the dyad often transcends it. Reciprocal friendships may spiral off into interlocking chains of friendly networks... reciprocal friendships contain the germ ... of a generalized friendliness.

The argument that friendship can serve as a moral example with benefit for society has been taken up by several commentators (Digeser, 2011; Schwarzenbach, 2009; Smith G.M., 2011; von Heyking and Avramento, 2008). King's argument is that reciprocal interpersonal friendships of affection, tolerance, commitment and care, can be extended out to friendly relationships that could create a politics where interaction between people in society is based on these values. The example of kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori research can also serve as models for all researchers, not only those investigating indigenous issues. Respect, humility, affection, concern, understanding, trust and reliability are values and principles upon which to base research that adheres to the ethical norms of research integrity.

The moral examples of the ancestors who originated the three indigenous peace traditions that we have been sharing, advocated peaceful interaction, non-violent protest, tolerance, perseverance and commitment that are integral for a humanitarian and good society. The ethics of the research process, the moral examples of the traditions researched, and the friendship of the researchers coalesce to demonstrate an intention to work together with integrity.

Discussion

This article offers an example of researchers from different cultures endeavoring to follow a practice that is in harmony with the material being explored, with the values being examined, and with the people who are sharing the information. Kaupapa Māori and kaupapa Moriori research include the philosophy that Māori and Moriori protocols and values must be reflected in the research process. It is designed to give full recognition to
Māori and Moriori cultural values and systems and challenge dominant Pākehā (non-Māori) constructions of research. As Walker, Eketone and Gibbs (2006: 331) indicate, ‘kaupapa Māori research has been used as both a form of resistance and a methodological strategy’ that has an end outcome of benefiting Māori. However, the methodology also has relevance to other groups who have experience of exploitation and a desire to reclaim control over their research experiences and over the knowledge that is theirs to share or retain.

Including the concept of friendship into research has also been advocated for a more moral politics. The principles that guide friendship also challenge Western academic research constructs that are often competitive. Basing research on committed relationships that engage people with each other in the research process, involving positive emotions and affection not just objectivity and partiality, is a more humane and less exploitative model for research than aggressive, selfish competition. Reciprocity and asymmetrical sharing can help to establish equality of benefits rather than being exploitative.

Kaupapa Māori, kaupapa Moriori and friendship principles emphasise the complexity of the material revealed and the necessity of considering people’s mana and interests, rather than just interests of the research. This results in nuanced, real, complicated and insightful findings, not easily replicable or verifiable in different contexts.

**Conclusion**

Western academic research is generally suspicious about combining friendship with research. However, in this analysis of an on-going research project on indigenous peace traditions of Aotearoa New Zealand, we find that friendship is compatible with kaupapa Māori kaupapa Moriori methodologies. Māori and Moriori values for doing respectful research have significant synergies with the values of friendship, that include forming genuine relationships based on affection, generosity, paying careful attention to the dignity and needs of the other, caring both physically and emotionally, being a real and consistent presence. The differences are slight and mostly in emphasis. For example, instrumental friendship where the benefits are not reciprocal is likely to create lack of trust for indigenous communities. Humility is a value that is very important for Māori and Moriori cultures, but is not been identified as a priority in Western friendship models.

We do not advocate that our collaborative research method is the only way to undertake cross-cultural research. We offer this as an example of a collaborative process that highlights the importance of genuine relationships for undertaking ethical cross-cultural research. We continue to build on the friendship we have established, the trust we have developed and the knowledge we have shared to undertake further research, as long as it is of value to the communities whose stories we are relating, whose values we are voicing and whose peace traditions stand as examples to the world. We hope that our research project can provide some understandings that have potential use for other
groups seeking complex knowledge through ethical research that avoids harm and provides moral benefits to the societies concerned, and makes a small contribution to decolonization.

Endnotes

1 Aotearoa is the Māori name for New Zealand usually translated as the land of the long white cloud.

2 Rēkohu is the Moriori name for the Chatham Islands: an archipelago situated 800km east of New Zealand, first settled by Moriori directly from Eastern Polynesia some 1,000 years ago. The islands officially became part of the New Zealand colony in 1842 but retain their own distinct island identity (see also Devere et al., 2019).

3 Kaupapa Māori does not refer explicitly to other terms for friendship in Māori language. For a discussion of some of these see Brandt (2013), Brandt and Hauser (2011) and Te Maihāroa (2016).

4 For the first time during COVID-19 lockdown in Aotearoa New Zealand, this tikanga and hospitality was unavailable at marae throughout the country.

5 For information on Māori spirituality and decolonisation see Simmonds (2011).

6 We use Pākehā here as an adjective to describe both state and private institutions that are not specifically Māori.
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Kaputaka | Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Māori</th>
<th>Moriori</th>
<th>Pākehā (English) term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aroha</td>
<td>iaroha</td>
<td>love, compassion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa</td>
<td>Aote</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ātua</td>
<td>etchu</td>
<td>god(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapū</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>sub tribe, clan or descent group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he kanohi kitea</td>
<td>konehi kitea</td>
<td>the seen face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heke</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hongi</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>greeting of pressing foreheads and noses together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>iwi</th>
<th>imi</th>
<th>tribe (originally ‘bones’) tribal affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kaitiaki</td>
<td>tchieki</td>
<td>guardian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaua e</td>
<td>kāhi</td>
<td>do not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaumātua</td>
<td>rangata mātua</td>
<td>elders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaupapa</td>
<td></td>
<td>principles, policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kia tūpato</td>
<td>kia toho</td>
<td>be cautious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koha</td>
<td>tāpae</td>
<td>gift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Köpinga Marae</td>
<td>Köpinga Marae</td>
<td>name for the Moriori meeting house on Rēkohu, which means many kōpi trees (sacred trees with Moriori engravings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>korero</td>
<td></td>
<td>talking, speaking, sharing stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotahitanga</td>
<td>hokotehitanga</td>
<td>Unity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>māhaki</td>
<td>tau muai</td>
<td>humble, calm, inoffensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mana</td>
<td>manawa</td>
<td>prestige, authority (heart and compassion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manākitanga</td>
<td>manawareka rekatanga</td>
<td>hospitality, kindness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Māori</td>
<td>Māori (indigenous people of New Zealand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Māoritanga</td>
<td></td>
<td>Māori values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marae</td>
<td>marae</td>
<td>ancestral meeting house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me rongo</td>
<td></td>
<td>me rongo greeting of ritual for Moriori, meaning ‘in peace’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Me Rongo Congress</td>
<td>Me Rongo Congress</td>
<td>Peace congress held on Rēkohu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mihimihī</td>
<td></td>
<td>Greetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moriori did not traditionally use markings on the body</td>
<td>traditional marking of skin on a chin, usually worn by women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moko kauae</td>
<td>Moriori</td>
<td>Moriori (indigenous peoples of Rēkohu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngāi Tahu/ Kāi Tahu</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ngāi Tahu/Kāi Tahu (Southern tribe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Pākehā</td>
<td>Pākehā (descendent of Europeans/white New Zealanders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parihaka</td>
<td>Parihaka</td>
<td>Parihaka (ancestral Taranaki village)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poroporoāki</td>
<td>Poporoki</td>
<td>Farewell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pōwhiri</td>
<td>hokomaurahiri (the making warm of the visitors)</td>
<td>formal welcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puke</td>
<td>maung'</td>
<td>hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puketeraki Marae</td>
<td></td>
<td>Puketeraki Marae (meeting house at Karitane, Otago)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rakatira, rangatira</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not a relevant term for Moriori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangatiratanga</td>
<td></td>
<td>chiefly authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rēkohu (Wharekauri)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rēkohu means misty sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reo</td>
<td>rē</td>
<td>language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rongo</td>
<td>rongo</td>
<td>peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata</td>
<td>tchakat</td>
<td>people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangata whenua</td>
<td>tchakat henu</td>
<td>people of the land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangi</td>
<td>tangi</td>
<td>funeral, cry, weep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>takahia</strong></td>
<td><strong>takahi</strong></td>
<td><strong>trample</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tau iwi</strong></td>
<td>No term for stranger in Moriori language</td>
<td>stranger, outsider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>te</strong></td>
<td><strong>ta</strong></td>
<td>The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>te ao Māori</strong></td>
<td><strong>ta ao Moriori</strong></td>
<td>Māori/Moriori worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Ao o Rongomaraeroa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The space of peace (National Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>te ao Pākehā</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>European worldview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Ika-a-Maui</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>North Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Kwenata ō Rongo:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Deed of Reconciliation: Parihaka and the Parihaka Papakāinga Trust and the Crown, 9 June 2017 Te Tuaiwa o Pipiri.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Niho o Te Ātiawa marae</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>name of one of the three marae at Parihaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>te reo Māori</strong></td>
<td><strong>te rē Moriori</strong></td>
<td>Māori and Moriori languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Tiriti o Waitangi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Treaty of Waitangi 1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Waipounamu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Te Whare Wānanga o Otāgo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Otago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tikaka / tikanga</strong></td>
<td><strong>tikane</strong></td>
<td>customary protocols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tipuna</strong></td>
<td><strong>karapuna</strong></td>
<td>ancestor/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>titiro</strong></td>
<td><strong>tiro</strong></td>
<td>look, observe, inspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waitaha</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waitaha (name of first South Island iwi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waitaha ki Te Waipounamu</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>South Island Waitaha iwi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>whakahihi</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>arrogance, conceit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakapapa</td>
<td>hokopapa</td>
<td>genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whakaroko</td>
<td>hokorongo</td>
<td>listen, hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānangatanga</td>
<td>hūnaungatanga</td>
<td>building relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whānau</td>
<td>hūnau</td>
<td>family, extended family, support network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whangai</td>
<td></td>
<td>foster children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharekauri</td>
<td>Rēkohu</td>
<td>Māori and Moriori names for Chatham Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>whenua</td>
<td>henu</td>
<td>land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>