IN-05 Māori governance and the co-governance of rivers and forests

The permanent loss of industrial supply chains and the retreat of the centralized coercive state will inevitably thrust humanity back into the problem of governing the ecological commons at local and regional scales. As households aggregate into villages, and villages seek to manage the watersheds and bioregions that sustain them, the question of how to allocate resources, enforce conservation, and prevent the seizure of power by individuals exhibiting dark-triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy) becomes an existential puzzle. Aotearoa New Zealand provides an exceptionally detailed, historically documented, and actively litigated laboratory for examining both stateless indigenous self-governance and the hybrid co-governance of ecosystems. By evaluating traditional Māori governance structures (tikanga, hui, rūnanga), their intersection with colonial state mechanisms, and modern legal innovations granting environmental personhood to the Te Urewera forest (2014) and the Whanganui River (2017), it is possible to assess the mechanics, vulnerabilities, and scalability of these models for post-collapse implementation.

Traditional Māori Self-Government: Ontological and Structural Foundations

Prior to European contact, Māori society operated without a centralized state apparatus, relying instead on a decentralized, kin-based governance system rooted in a complex spiritual and legal framework known as *tikanga*[1]. This system integrated social control, resource management, and conflict resolution across highly localized scales, binding human behavior to the carrying capacity of the environment.

Social Stratification, Rank, and Authority

Early ethnographic and historical analyses by scholars such as Peter Buck (Te Rangi Hīroa, 1949), Elsdon Best (1924), Raymond Firth (1929), and Joan Metge (1995) depict a society that was economically redistributive but intensely hierarchical in terms of prestige and political authority[1]. While Christopher William Richmond, the first minister of native affairs in the 19th century, complained of the social equality among Māori tribes and described their communal ties as a "beastly communism," the society was in fact strictly stratified into distinct social grades[3].

Authority was primarily dictated by genealogical seniority. Society was divided into three main classes, alongside priestly experts (*tohunga*)[3]. The table below outlines this stratification and its implications for political participation.

Social Grade	Description and Status	Governance Role and Limits

Rangatira (Chiefs)	Hereditary leaders whose status was determined by primogeniture and descent from founding ancestors. The first-born of the most senior family was the *ariki*[3].	Vested with *mana*, they guided the *hapū* (sub-tribe). However, authority was not autocratic. The proverb *"Ko tā te rangatira kai he kōrero; ko tā te ware he muhukai"* (The food of chiefs is debate, the food of commoners is inattention) underscores the consultative nature of their leadership[3].
Tūtūā / Ware (Commoners)	The largest demographic group. Elsdon Best observed that no Māori admitted to being *tūtūā*, as all could trace some descent from a chief[3].	Commoners did not act subserviently and retained significant political autonomy. They participated in debate and could withdraw allegiance from a failing leader[2].
Tāngata (Serfs)	Identified by scholar Angela Ballara, these were members of a dependent *hapū* that owed allegiance to a more powerful *hapū*[3].	Expected to pay tribute to chiefs in exchange for military protection, holding limited political voice in inter-group affairs[3].
Taurekareka (Slaves)	War captives taken from enemy tribes. They were considered to have lost their *mana* and were abandoned by their gods[3].	Provided forced labor without political rights. However, a hereditary slave class did not develop, as free people could marry them and their children were born free[3].

Women also held critical leadership roles, challenging strict patriarchal interpretations. Scholar Āpirana Mahuika points to figures like Hinematioro and Mihikotukutuku of Ngāti Porou as recognized tribal leaders, while researchers Leonie Pihama and Ella Henry emphasize that *mana wahine* (women's authority) is inherent and derived from women's roles as life-givers and world creators[2].

The Engine of Governance: Mana, Tapu, and Consensus

Governance was not operationalized through state coercion, but through a deeply interwoven spiritual and legal taxonomy. *Mana*—a multi-dimensional concept encompassing spiritual authority, prestige, and temporal power—was the currency of leadership[2]. *Mana* was not static; it was generated through collective relationships and could be accrued through successful stewardship and warfare, or diminished through failure[2]. Because individual tribal members retained high degrees of autonomy, autocratic behavior by a *rangatira* was constrained; a chief who acted dictatorially would see their *mana* evaporate as members abandoned them[2].
Ecological management and behavioral regulation relied on the binary concepts of *tapu* (sacred, restricted, or 'not ordinary') and *noa* (ordinary, unrestricted)[1]. A chief could impose a *rāhui* (conservation prohibition) on a forest or waterway, rendering it *tapu* to prevent over-harvesting or to mark a death[1]. Infractions against *tapu* required *utu*—the restoration of balance[4]. While often translated simply as revenge, *utu* was a sophisticated mechanism for maintaining societal equilibrium. It manifested practically as *muru* (a ritualized, bloodless plundering of an offender's property as compensation) or, in severe cases involving death or profound insult, a *taua* (hostile military expedition)[4].
Civic decision-making occurred at *hui* (gatherings) and *rūnanga* (councils), operating strictly on consensus rather than majoritarian voting[6]. These gatherings were guided by *kaitiakitanga* (guardianship), ensuring reciprocity between human needs and environmental limits, acknowledging the *mauri* (life force) present in all animate and inanimate things[1].

Tripartite Analysis: Traditional Māori Governance

What they said it did (Emic): Māori ontological frameworks assert that traditional governance seamlessly integrated the spiritual (*wairua*) and physical worlds, eliminating the division between humans and nature[1]. The system, ordered by *whakapapa* (genealogy), positioned humans as trustees (*kaitiaki*) rather than owners, ensuring intergenerational justice, environmental balance, and the protection of the *mana* of the community[1].
What the record shows (Etic): The historical record demonstrates a highly effective, resilient system of localized resource management that successfully governed the landscape for centuries. However, the system was fragile at scale. When populations expanded and resources became constrained, the absence of an overarching, disinterested judicial arbiter meant that disputes over *mana* and resources frequently escalated into localized warfare. The system of *muru* functioned as an effective wealth-redistribution and penal mechanism, preventing the consolidation of absolute wealth, but the reliance on *utu* institutionalized retaliatory cycles of violence[4].
What modern scholarship infers (Academic): Modern socio-legal scholars and anthropologists infer that *tikanga* operated as a highly adaptive common-law system perfectly calibrated to the hamlet and village rungs[2]. It circumvented the tragedy of the commons through profound socio-spiritual sanctions rather than state enforcement. However, its absolute reliance on kinship and face-to-face consensus limits its scalability. The requirement for unanimity in *hui* scales poorly beyond populations where everyone shares direct overlapping kinship ties, making it vulnerable to catastrophic fragmentation when confronted by demographic expansion or external technological shocks.

Scale Ledger: Traditional Māori Governance (Tikanga/Hui)

Rung	Scale (Population)	Status	Reasoning
Household	4 to 10	Operated/Worked	Immediate kin group (*whānau*) managed daily subsistence and socialization under the guidance of elders (*kaumātua*). Highly resilient.
Hamlet/Band	30 to 50	Operated/Worked	Extended family units shared resources and labor; *tapu* and *muru* effectively governed behavior without formal police.
Village	150 to 500	Operated/Worked	The primary political and economic unit (*hapū*). *Rangatira* held authority via consensus; *hui* functioned effectively as everyone had overlapping kinship ties.
Parish/District	1,500 to 5,000	Operated/Struggled	*Iwi* (tribe) level. Worked for large-scale, short-term military alliances and inter-regional trade, but highly prone to fragmentation.

			Factionalism often broke consensus.
Town/Watershed	15,000 to 50,000	Failed/Never Tried	Pre-contact demographic limits and the lack of surplus-generating logistics precluded permanent settlements of this size under this specific model.
Region to Planet	0.5M to 8B	Failed/Never Tried	Requires abstractions of law, currency, and coercive state violence that are structurally incompatible with pure kin-based, face-to-face consensus mechanisms.

Capture Test: Traditional Māori Governance

Capture Vector	Mechanism of Takeover	Historical Evidence	Resistance/Reversal Features
Dark-Triad Faction (Machiavellian Warlord)	A highly psychopathic or Machiavellian *rangatira* utilizes sudden technological or military asymmetry to bypass consensus,	The Musket Wars (early 19th century). The introduction of European firearms allowed ambitious leaders (e.g., Hongi Hika) to bypass traditional limits on warfare,	**Exit, Fission, and Loss of Mana:** Hapū members possessed high autonomy. If a leader became purely autocratic without external threat, factions

	hoarding wealth and using terror to suppress internal dissent and enslave rivals.	centralizing power and devastating rival populations[4].	would migrate or ally with rivals. *Mana* required collective validation; a leader utilizing sheer coercion risked internal assassination or total abandonment[2].

Colonial Expropriation and the Path to Co-Governance

Following the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi in 1840, the British Crown rapidly asserted sovereignty, fundamentally subordinating traditional Māori governance to a Westminster-style state apparatus[9]. The ensuing decades saw systematic land confiscations, the imposition of individual property titles designed to fracture communal ownership, and the expropriation of waterways. For instance, the Coal-mines Amendment Act of 1903 effectively vested the bed of all navigable rivers, including the Whanganui River, in the Crown without consultation or compensation to the Whanganui Iwi[10].

In the heavily forested Te Urewera region, the Tūhoe people, who had not signed the Treaty, faced aggressive colonial incursions[9]. Despite the Crown passing the Urewera District Native Reserve Act in 1896, which ostensibly promised local self-government and home rule, the Crown systematically undermined the resulting native committees[11]. By 1916, tensions culminated in a large armed police force invading the pacifist Tūhoe settlement of Maungapōhatu to arrest the prophet Rua Kenana, a move the Waitangi Tribunal later analyzed as a severe breach of fairness and reasonable conduct[13]. Subsequently, the Crown utilized aggressive purchasing tactics to alienate the land, eventually gazetting Te Urewera as a National Park in 1954 without Tūhoe consultation, symbolizing total dispossession[8].

It was not until the late 20th century, driven by the investigative rigor of the Waitangi Tribunal, that the extent of these breaches was formalized in law. The *Whanganui River Report* (Wai 167, 1999) led by ET Durie, MB Boyd, and others, established that the Whanganui Iwi possessed the river as a whole and indivisible entity—a *taonga* (treasure) that was never willingly relinquished[10]. Similarly, the multi-volume *Te Urewera Report* (Wai 894, 2009–2012), presided over by Judge Patrick Savage, chronicled the Crown's defeat of promised self-governance and repeated broken promises[8].

These foundational reports necessitated a radical legal innovation. To accommodate the Māori ontological view of ecological features as indivisible living entities while avoiding the transfer of absolute sovereign territory, the New Zealand Parliament innovated the legal mechanism of environmental personhood, birthing the modern era of co-governance.

Case Study 1: Te Urewera and Tūhoe (Forest

Co-Governance)

Te Urewera spans roughly 212,000 hectares of rugged, native forest in the eastern North Island[9]. In 2014, the Te Urewera Act permanently removed the area's National Park status and vested the fee simple title of the land in itself—creating a legal entity possessing "all the rights, powers, duties, and liabilities of a legal person"[5].

Governance Mechanism and Ecological Outcomes

The Act established the Te Urewera Board to act on behalf of, and in the name of, Te Urewera[5]. Structurally, the Board transitioned from an equal split of Crown and Tūhoe members to a permanent Tūhoe majority (six Tūhoe, three Crown)[5]. The Board is mandated to preserve the natural features of the forest while explicitly giving expression to *Tūhoetanga*—including concepts of *rāhui*, *mauri*, and *tohu*[5].

Ecologically, the transition has produced highly debated results. Historically, the Department of Conservation (DOC) managed intensive trapping grids and aerial drops of 1080 poison to suppress invasive brushtail possums, ship rats, feral pigs, and red deer (*Cervus elaphus*)[18]. These introduced mammals decimate native flora, such as *tawa* (Beilschmiedia tawa), and predate on endemic fauna. For example, a 1997–2006 study utilizing 40 permanent 9x9m plots in the Otamatuna Management Area found that herbivory decreased large *tawa* seedling densities by an average of 59%[18]. DOC targets traditionally sought to hold possum residual trap catch (RTC) indexes below 2% or 5%[22].

Under sustained, intensive pest control at targeted "mainland islands," populations of the North Island kōkako (a highly threatened endemic bird) have flourished. Nationally, kōkako numbers increased from roughly 330 pairs in 1999 to approximately 2,300 in 2023[24]. In areas like the Rotoehu Forest, aerial 1080 and bait station operations grew the local kōkako population from 286 birds in 2019 to 479 in 2023—a 67% increase[26]. However, following the governance transition in Te Urewera, broad-scale pest management has suffered logistical friction. While localized indigenous-led conservation exists, the vastness of the 212,000-hectare block requires logistical capacity that the post-settlement board has struggled to maintain, leading to concerns regarding uncontrolled herbivory and canopy collapse in unmanaged tracts[18].

Governance Breakdown and Elite Capture (2022–2024)

The structural vulnerabilities of the Post-Settlement Governance Entity (PSGE) model were violently exposed between 2022 and 2024. The Tūhoe PSGE, Te Uru Taumatua (TUT), chaired by Tamati Kruger, consolidated absolute control over the Te Urewera Board's strategic direction[29]. In 2022, the Board ordered the demolition of 43 backcountry huts previously built by DOC, citing their deterioration and framing them as relics of a colonial legacy[32]. This unilateral action bypassed grassroots consensus and alienated Tūhoe *hapū* members who relied on the huts for hunting, gathering, and maintaining their connection to the land. Wharenui Tuna, a local hapū member, successfully sued the Board in the High Court (*Tuna v Te Urewera Board* [2023] NZHC 3680). The Court found the demolitions unlawful under administrative law, though the ruling arrived after many huts had already been destroyed[32].

Simultaneously, TUT faced a profound democratic crisis. When trustee elections were

mandated by the trust deed, Kruger and the incumbent board refused to accept nominations from the traditional *marae* committees, instead claiming mandates from newly established "hapū trusts" that lacked legal or traditional definition[30]. Dissident elders, operating as *Te Kaunihera Kaumātua o Tūhoe*, initiated litigation.

In a landmark decision (*Nikora v Kruger* [2024] NZSC 130), the New Zealand Supreme Court was forced to intervene in tribal self-governance. TUT argued that because they were a discretionary trust holding assets for deceased ancestors (*tipuna*), no living Māori held a beneficial estate, and therefore the Māori Land Court lacked jurisdiction over them[34]. The Supreme Court rejected this maneuver, ruling that under section 236(1)(c) of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, the Māori Land Court *does* hold supervisory jurisdiction over landholding PSGEs, effectively ordering TUT to hold fresh, democratic elections[31].

This saga illustrated how a highly centralized indigenous corporate board could weaponize the language of *tikanga* to insulate itself from the democratic accountability of its own people, creating a crisis that could only be resolved by the coercive intervention of the colonial state's highest courts[35].

Tripartite Analysis: Te Urewera Board

What they said it did (Emic): The model was hailed as the ultimate return of *mana motuhake* (self-determination). By vesting title in the forest itself, the legislation dismantled the colonial paradigm of ownership, allowing Tūhoe to manage the ecosystem in strict accordance with *Tūhoetanga* and ancestral obligation[8].

What the record shows (Etic): The record demonstrates a severe failure of scale and accountability. The centralization of power within the PSGE (TUT) created an elite cadre that became detached from grassroots *hapū*. By destroying essential infrastructure (the huts) and suppressing democratic elections, the board exhibited classic signs of elite capture, mismanaging the landscape and fracturing the social cohesion of the tribe[30].

What modern scholarship infers (Academic): Scholars and legal analysts infer that transposing traditional concepts of kinship (*whakapapa*) into Western corporate trust structures creates catastrophic vulnerabilities[35]. Neoliberal corporate forms incentivize the centralization of capital and decision-making, providing dark-triad actors the perfect vehicle to monopolize power while using the rhetoric of cultural revitalization as an impenetrable shield against criticism[39].

Scale Ledger: Te Urewera Board (Forest Co-Governance)

Rung	Scale (Population)	Status	Reasoning
Household to Village	4 to 500	Failed	Local *hapū* felt entirely alienated by the centralized PSGE board. The loss of face-to-face

			control resulted in grassroots legal rebellion (*Tuna* lawsuit)[33].
Parish/District	1,500 to 5,000	Operated/Struggled	The Tūhoe population sits largely in this rung. The model successfully transferred legal title but catastrophically failed in internal democratic accountability until state courts intervened[36].
Town/Watershed	15,000 to 50,000	N/A	Does not apply directly to the isolated, sparse population geography of Te Urewera.
Region to Planet	0.5M to 8B	Failed/Never Tried	The model relies on specific ancestral, genealogical ties to a deeply specific bioregion. It cannot be abstracted to broader populations without losing its foundational rationale.

Capture Test: Te Urewera Board

Capture Vector	Mechanism of	Historical	Resistance/Revers

	Takeover	Evidence	al Features
Corporate/Elite Capture (Machiavellian/Narcissistic)	A faction seizes control of the PSGE board, alters the interpretation of *tikanga* to delegitimize traditional election mechanisms, centralizes funding, and ignores grassroots opposition.	*Nikora v Kruger* (2021-2024). Incumbent leadership refused to hold elections mandated by their trust deed, isolating themselves from *hapū* accountability for over three years[29].	**External Judicial Arbitration:** Capture was *reversed* only because the dissident faction successfully appealed to the coercive power of the colonial state (the Supreme Court) to enforce the trust deed[34]. In a post-collapse setting without a state, this capture would likely have become permanent or resulted in physical conflict.

Case Study 2: Te Awa Tupua (River Co-Governance)

The Whanganui River is New Zealand's third-longest river, serving as the physical and spiritual artery for the Whanganui Iwi. Following the Wai 167 Waitangi Tribunal report, the Crown passed the Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017[41].

Governance Mechanism and Outcomes

The Act recognizes the Whanganui River as a legal person, *Te Awa Tupua*, an indivisible whole encompassing all its physical and metaphysical elements from the mountains to the sea[10]. To operationalize this personhood, the Act established *Te Pou Tupua*, a two-person office acting jointly as the "human face" of the river. Crucially, one person is appointed by the Crown, and the other by Whanganui Iwi[41].

Te Pou Tupua is guided by *Tupua te Kawa*, a set of intrinsic values prioritizing the river's health, and is supported by a strategy group (*Te Kōpuka*) composed of up to 17 representatives from iwi, local government, commercial, and recreational sectors[42].

Unlike the isolationist disaster in Te Urewera, the Whanganui model has proven robust and highly collaborative. Because a river flows through private lands, townships, and multiple jurisdictions, the governance model was forced to be inclusive. *Te Pou Tupua* holds a statutory seat in resource management decisions, integrating closely with the Regional Council for water allocation and infrastructure projects. A prime example is the Te Pūwaha project—the

revitalization of the Port of Whanganui—where the legal personhood of the river successfully mediated complex engineering, economic, and ecological demands without halting development[48].

However, the legal personhood is heavily constrained; the river owns its bed, but the Crown explicitly reserved the rights to the water column itself and protected existing private property rights[15]. Scholars note that while hailed internationally as a triumph for "Rights of Nature," it is more accurately a novel mechanism for recognizing indigenous jurisdiction and pluralistic co-management within a dominant state framework[48].

Tripartite Analysis: Te Awa Tupua

What they said it did (Emic): The Whanganui Iwi view the model as the legal realization of their ancestral proverb: *"Ko au te Awa, ko te Awa ko au"* (I am the River, and the River is me)[10]. It embeds their *kawa* (principles) into the heart of regional governance, ensuring the river is treated as a living entity rather than a commodity.

What the record shows (Etic): The record demonstrates a highly functional bureaucratic compromise. The dual-key mechanism forces constant negotiation between the state and the iwi, effectively integrating indigenous ecological priorities into standardized urban and regional planning without causing economic gridlock[48].

What modern scholarship infers (Academic): Scholars infer that the success of Te Awa Tupua relies entirely on its pluralistic, networked design. By not granting absolute fee-simple control to an isolated indigenous board, but instead embedding the river's representatives into a matrix of overlapping jurisdictions (regional councils, advisory groups), it forces consensus and disperses power, rendering elite capture exceedingly difficult[48].

Scale Ledger: Te Awa Tupua (River Co-Governance)

Rung	Scale (Population)	Status	Reasoning
Household to Village	4 to 500	N/A	The mechanism is explicitly designed to transcend localized hapū interests in favor of a whole-catchment strategy.
Town/Watershed	15,000 to 50,000	Operated/Worked	The model excels here. The river catchment spans tens of thousands of people. The two-person *Te Pou*

			Tupua forces consensus between the indigenous worldview and the state's logistical capacity, successfully mediating water rights[48].
Region to Nation	0.5M to 500M	Operated/Struggled	The legislation operates within the national legal framework, but efforts to abstract this specific co-governance model to national water policy face intense political resistance from agricultural and commercial sectors[52].
Planet	8B	Failed/Never Tried	Too complex; lacks the shared socio-cultural attachment to a specific geographic entity required to enforce consensus.

Capture Test: Te Awa Tupua

Capture Vector	Mechanism of Takeover	Historical Evidence	Resistance/Reversal Features
Regulatory Capture (Commercial/Agri	Corporate entities (e.g., agricultural irrigators, energy	Historical hydroelectric development (e.g.,	**Statutory Veto and Dual Key:** *Te Pou Tupua* requires joint

cultural)	generators) capture the advisory group (*Te Kōpuka*) by overwhelming it with technical data and economic threats, side-lining the indigenous appointees to extract water.	the Tongariro Power Scheme) captured river flows despite intense Māori opposition prior to the 2017 Act[10].	agreement by both the Iwi and Crown appointee to act. This "dual key" structure prevents either faction from unilateral action, forcing a stalemate rather than capture[43].

The Strongest Case Against: Neotribal Capitalism and the 2023-2024 Backlash

The strongest intellectual case against the Post-Settlement Governance Entity (PSGE) model of co-governance comes from within the academy, notably from Professor Elizabeth Rata (University of Auckland)[53]. Rata argues that the Treaty settlement process has birthed "neotribal capitalism," wherein a small, highly educated, corporate-aligned Māori elite has captured the assets of the tribes[38].

In this framework, the romantic language of *tikanga* and *kaitiakitanga* provides an ideological smokescreen for a corporate class that extracts wealth from public assets (like water and land) while ignoring the systemic poverty of grassroots Māori[38]. Other scholars, such as Maria Bargh and Fiona McCormack, note that these settlements often operate as exercises in neoliberal market environmentalism, co-opting indigenous rights into capitalist frameworks rather than dismantling them[38]. The events within Te Urewera—where the TUT board destroyed the huts of its own people and spent millions in litigation to avoid democratic elections—are cited as empirical validation of Rata's thesis: the dark-triad traits of modern corporate governance inevitably infect PSGEs, and appealing to a romanticized indigenous past does not immunize leaders from the corrupting influence of unchecked capital and power[29]. To believe otherwise is to fall victim to the naturalistic fallacy: assuming that because a culture is older, it is inherently purer, or that because a community is smaller, it is inherently fairer.

The Political Backlash and Treaty Principles Bill (2024)

This academic critique mirrored a severe political backlash in Aotearoa New Zealand, culminating in the election of a right-leaning coalition government in late 2023, which campaigned heavily against the expansion of co-governance[52].

The ACT Party, led by David Seymour, successfully negotiated the introduction of the Treaty Principles Bill into Parliament. The Bill sought to redefine the Treaty of Waitangi's principles, effectively seeking to extinguish specific indigenous co-governance rights in favor of strict, color-blind egalitarianism, stating in Article 3 that "Everyone is equal before the law and is entitled to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law"[52]. The Bill passed its first reading on November 14, 2024, by a margin of 68 to 54[55].

The Waitangi Tribunal issued a scathing interim report (August 16, 2024), declaring the Bill a profound breach of the Treaty principles of partnership, active protection, and redress, warning it would undermine social cohesion and restrict Māori access to justice[56].

Māori Mobilization: Hui-ā-Motu

In response to the dismantling of co-governance initiatives and the Treaty Principles Bill, Māori mobilized at unprecedented scales[54]. On January 20, 2024, the late Māori King, Kiingi Tuheitia, convened a *Hui-ā-Motu* (national gathering) at Tūrangawaewae marae, drawing over 3,000 attendees[59]. The hui emphasized *kotahitanga* (unity) and *mana motuhake* (self-determination), signaling that Māori political coordination had successfully scaled to the regional/national rung, independent of state funding mechanisms, demonstrating deep socio-political resilience[60].

Conclusion: Viability at the Watershed Rung

Co-governance of an ecological unit by an indigenous body and a state *is* a workable model for the watershed rung (15,000 to 50,000 people), provided strict structural safeguards are implemented to prevent elite capture.

The Whanganui (Te Awa Tupua) model demonstrates that when governance relies on a "dual key" (Crown and Iwi appointees acting jointly), it forces consensus, disperses power, and integrates effectively with regional planning[43]. Conversely, the Te Urewera model demonstrates that handing total fee-simple control to an isolated indigenous corporate board (PSGE) without robust, localized democratic accountability leads directly to elite capture, the alienation of the local populace, and ecological mismanagement[30].

Co-governance fails when it relies entirely on the romance of the primitive—assuming indigenous elites are inherently immune to Machiavellian capture. It succeeds when it utilizes the indigenous worldview (environmental personhood, *mauri*) as the *constitutional goal*, but relies on rigorous, auditable institutional structures (trust deeds, dual keys, independent appellate courts) as the *engine*.

Robust Findings

1. Traditional *tikanga* governed effectively up to the village scale through consensus and spiritual sanction (*tapu*/*utu*).
2. It lacked mechanisms to prevent violent resource disputes at larger scales without an overarching arbiter.
3. Legal environmental personhood is a highly effective fiction for forcing a shift from extractive to relational ecological management.
4. The Te Awa Tupua (river) model succeeds by using a two-person "dual key" mechanism that forces statutory consensus.
5. The Te Urewera (forest) model suffered severe elite capture, destroying grassroots infrastructure and evading elections.
6. Indigenous corporate trusts (PSGEs) are as vulnerable to dark-triad corporate capture as Western corporations.
7. Trust deeds and corporate structures are useless without an independent, coercive external arbiter to enforce accountability.
8. Intensive, localized pest control (mainland islands) effectively saves targeted species

(e.g., kōkako numbers rising to 2,300).

9. Broad-scale landscape management requires logistical and financial capacities that isolated indigenous boards struggle to maintain.
10. The naturalistic fallacy is fatal to governance design; scaling up requires structural checks, not just shared cultural values.

Contested or Open Questions

- Can an ecological entity hold legal personhood and liabilities in tort if a natural disaster (e.g., a flood from a legally recognized river) destroys private property?
- How can traditional *tikanga* dispute resolution operate equitably if divorced from the coercive oversight of the state's appellate courts?
- Does the imposition of Western corporate trust structures inherently destroy the kin-based accountability of traditional Māori governance?
- Is "neotribal capitalism" an unavoidable phase of integrating indigenous assets into global markets, or can hybrid economic models bypass it?

Essential Literature (For Full Review)

For those seeking to implement these systems, studying the *Whanganui River Report* (Wai 167, 1999) and the *Te Urewera Report* (Wai 894, 2012) is vital for understanding the legal architecture of environmental personhood. Elizabeth Rata's *A Political Economy of Neotribal Capitalism* (2000) and Maria Bargh's *Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism* (2007) provide the necessary critical frameworks to anticipate elite capture. Furthermore, reviewing the Supreme Court judgment in *Nikora v Kruger* [2024] NZSC 130 is essential for understanding the intersection of trust law, indigenous custom, and democratic accountability.

Implementability after the Fall

Minimum Viable Version (No State, No Grid, No Internet):

- **Household (4-10 people):** Management reverts directly to immediate kinship authority. A shared understanding of *tapu* is established to restrict the over-harvesting of the immediate calorie base (e.g., a garden or nearby stream), enforced by elder authority.
- **Village (300 people):** A *hui* (assembly) system is established in a central meeting place. Literacy and physical records are absolutely required to trace *whakapapa* (genealogy/residency) to definitively define who holds speaking rights. A shared physical calendar tracks ecological cycles for the imposition of *rāhui* (harvest bans). Complete consensus is required for major resource extraction.
- **District (3,000 people):** A "dual key" representative council is formed, borrowing the *Te Pou Tupua* model. Different villages appoint delegates who must act jointly to manage the watershed, preventing upstream villages from hoarding resources.
- **What it needs to start:** A physical, universally recognized meeting place (*marae* equivalent); a shared, sacrosanct calendar; an agreed-upon ontological framework defining the environment as a living entity, not an extractive commodity; and an objective ledger of community belonging.
- **First failure to expect:** Without a coercive state court to enforce the rules, a charismatic, psychopathic leader in one village will refuse to honor a *rāhui* during a food shortage, leading to inter-village violence (*taua*) and the rapid collapse of the district-level

consensus model.

Principles

- **The Principle of Environmental Personhood:** Recognizing an ecological unit as a legal person shifts management priorities from resource extraction to systemic relational health.
- **The Principle of the Dual-Key Veto:** Forcing representatives of competing factions to hold joint, indivisible authority over an asset effectively prevents unilateral regulatory capture.
- **The Principle of Scale Vulnerability:** Kin-based consensus models operate highly effectively at the village scale but inevitably fracture into violent factionalism at the regional scale.
- **The Principle of Neotribal Capture:** Governance entities modeled on corporate trust structures are highly susceptible to elite capture if insulated from grassroots democratic recall.
- **The Principle of the External Arbiter:** Decentralized, trust-based local governance requires an external, coercive judicial body to peacefully resolve internal power seizures.

Works cited

1. Societal lore (tikanga) in Māori culture - University of Otago, https://www.otago.ac.nz/maori/world/tikanga/lore
2. Key tikanga concepts and their relevance to wāhine and tāne, https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/en/inquiries/kaupapa-inquiries/mana-wahine/te-kete-puputu/briefs-of-evidence-3/key-tikanga-concepts-and-their-relevance-to-wahine-and-tane
3. Tūranga i te hapori – status in Māori society, https://teara.govt.nz/en/turanga-i-te-hapori-status-in-maori-society/print
4. Māori values and practices - NZ History, https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/frontier-of-chaos/maori-values
5. Anima Mundi Law Initiative - Harmony With Nature, http://files.harmonywithnatureun.org/uploads/upload1137.pdf
6. The Norms of Tikanga and the Role of Hui as a Māori Constitutional, https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/vuwlr/article/view/8005
7. Principles from te ao Māori the Māori worldview, https://www.mbie.govt.nz/business-and-employment/economic-growth/previous-economic-development-work/just-transition/just-transitions-guide/foundations/principles-from-te-ao-maori-the-maori-worldview
8. The role of courts in articulating local imaginaries of sustainability for, https://opo.iisj.net/index.php/osls/article/download/2649/2905/17661
9. Te Urewera: Governance Shifts with Co-Management | 3Rs of Ecology, https://biol420eres525.wordpress.com/2019/05/16/te-urewera-governance-shifts-with-environmental-personhood/
10. WHANGANUI IWI - and - THE CROWN - Te Tari Whakatau, https://whakatau.govt.nz/assets/Treaty-Settlements/FIND_Treaty_Settlements/Wh

anganui-Iwi-Whanganui-River-/DOS_SUPPORT/Whanganui-Iwi-Record-of-Understanding-re.-Whanganui-River-claims-13-Oct-2011.pdf
11. Te Urewera, Part III: From self-governing native reserve to national, https://maorilawreview.co.nz/2012/11/te-urewera-part-iii-from-self-governing-native-reserve-to-national-park/
12. THE JOURN AL OF THE POLYNESIAN SOCIETY, https://thepolynesiansociety.org/index.php/JPS/article/download/548/397
13. Te Urewera : WAI 894. | National Library of New Zealand, https://natlib.govt.nz/records/38540254
14. Tūhoe Claims Settlement Act 2014; Te Urewera ... - Māori Law Review, https://maorilawreview.co.nz/2014/10/tuhoe-crown-settlement-tuhoe-claims-settlement-act-2014-te-urewera-report-of-the-waitangi-tribunal/
15. June 1999 Contents - Māori Law Review, https://maorilawreview.co.nz/1999/06/june-1999-contents/
16. Chapter Five - Water Rights for Māori in Aotearoa New Zealand, https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/indigenous-water-rights-in-law-and-regulation/water-rights-for-maori-in-aotearoa-new-zealand/2EDA667B05FEA05BF6BAFC67EF743A56
17. Rapua ngā tuhinga ruku tātari - Waitangi Tribunal, https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/mi/reports-and-documents?ref=themaorigreenlantern.maori.nz&Type=reports&start=90&Sort=wai-desc
18. Deer impacts on tawa (Beilschmiedia tawa) regeneration, https://www.doc.govt.nz/documents/science-and-technical/drds300entire.pdf
19. Te Urewera Act 2014 - New Zealand Legislation, https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2014/51/en/latest/sections/DLM6183734/
20. Te Urewera Act 2014 - New Zealand Legislation, https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2014/0051/latest/whole.html
21. Practicing Earth Jurisprudence in Te Urewera, New Zealand, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/345321615_Managing_People_for_the_Benefit_of_the_Land_Practicing_Earth_Jurisprudence_in_Te_Urewera_New_Zealand
22. A review of Department of Conservation mainland restoration, https://www.doc.govt.nz/globalassets/documents/science-and-technical/mainlandb.pdf
23. Ungulate effects on tawa (Beilschmiedia tawa) forest in Urewera, https://www.doc.govt.nz/documents/science-and-technical/casn196.pdf
24. North Island kokako | Kōkako - New Zealand Birds Online, https://www.nzbirdsonline.org.nz/species/north-island-kokako
25. Kōkako flourishing in Pureora Forest - Department of Conservation, https://www.doc.govt.nz/news/media-releases/2023-media-releases/kokako-flourishing-in-pureora-forest/
26. 2025 Pest Control Operation - - Rotoehu Ecological Trust, https://kokako.kiwi/pestop2025/
27. Rotoehu Kōkako Survey Report 2023 - Final,

https://kokako.kiwi/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2023/07/Rotoehu-Kokako-Survey-Report-2023_Final.pdf
28. Te Urewera Mainland Island Annual Report 2008-2009, https://policycommons.net/artifacts/5136226/te-urewera-mainland-island/5901661/
29. A six-year court battle between Te Taumata Kaumātua o Tūhoe and, https://www.facebook.com/TeAoMaoriNews/videos/a-six-year-court-battle-between-te-taumata-kaum%C4%81tua-o-t%C5%ABhoe-and-te-uru-taumatua-/1649146449597509/
30. Tūhoe elders' dispute hits stalemate - Te Ao Māori News, https://www.teaonews.co.nz/2023/05/18/tuhoe-elders-dispute-hits-stalemate/
31. Supreme Court speaks on Māori Land Court jurisdiction over post, https://www.simpsongrierson.com/insights-news/legal-updates/supreme-court-speaks-on-maori-land-court-jurisdiction-over-post-settlement-governance-entities
32. New Zealand Conservation Authority Te Pou Atawhai Taiao o, https://ftp.doc.govt.nz/public/folder/mlawv0pcMkWvExCkUCOkvg/nzca/public-papers/2024/%202024-02-nzca-public-papers.pdf
33. Case brief: Tuna v Te Urewera Board [2023] NZHC 3680, https://www.franksogilvie.co.nz/news/case-brief-tuna-v-te-urewera-board-2023-nzhc-3680
34. Māori land court jurisdiction confirmed for certain post-settlement, https://chapmantripp.com/trends-insights/maori-land-court-jurisdiction-confirmed-for-certain-post-settlement-governance-entities/
35. Supreme Court matters: trust law or judicial make-believe?, https://www.nzinitiative.org.nz/reports-and-media/opinion/supreme-court-matters-trust-law-or-judicial-make-believe
36. Supreme Court confirms Māori Land Court jurisdiction over, https://www.dentons.co.nz/en/insights/articles/2024/december/17/supreme-court-confirms-maori-land-court-jurisdiction-over-landholding-maori-trusts
37. Legal personality in Aotearoa New Zealand - Massey Sites, https://sites.massey.ac.nz/teaurangahau/wp-content/uploads/sites/53/2020/08/Legal-personality-in-Aotearoa-New-Zealand-an-example-of-integrated-thinking-on-sustainable-development.pdf
38. The Neoliberal State, Recognition and Indigenous Rights, https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/id/17666ba5-cdb7-41d2-9979-6a4c9b77218d/book(6).pdf
39. The Neoliberal State, Recognition and Indigenous Rights - ANU Press, https://press.anu.edu.au/publications/series/caepr/neoliberal-state-recognition-and-indigenous-rights
40. Resistance: An Indigenous Response to Neoliberalism, https://huia.co.nz/products/resistance-an-indigenous-response-to-neoliberalism
41. te awa tupua, indigenous law - Victoria University of Wellington, https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/vuwlr/article/download/7998/7118/11193
42. Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017,

https://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2017/0007/latest/whole.html
43. New Zealand Te Awa Tupua Act 2017 (Whanganui River), https://ecojurisprudence.org/initiatives/te-awa-tupua-act-2017/
44. The Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims Settlement) Act 2017, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321675915_A_new_approach_to_protecting_ecosystems_The_Te_Awa_Tupua_Whanganui_River_Claims_Settlement_Act_2017
45. Te Pou Tupua | Ngā Tāngata Tiaki o Whanganui, https://www.ngatangatatiaki.co.nz/our-story/ruruku-whakatupua/te-pou-tupua/
46. The case of the Whanganui River in New Zealand, https://www.boell.de/en/2025/01/29/river-legal-person-case-whanganui-river-new-zealand
47. The Te Awa Tupua Act: An Inspiration for Communities to Take, https://therevelator.org/te-awa-tupua-act/
48. Beyond legal personhood for the Whanganui River: collaboration, https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/13642987.2024.2314532
49. View of Water Law - Open Journal System, https://ojs.victoria.ac.nz/pq/article/view/5688/4997
50. collaboration and pluralism in implementing the Te Awa Tupua Act, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378286418_Beyond_legal_personhood_for_the_Whanganui_River_collaboration_and_pluralism_in_implementing_the_Te_Awa_Tupua_Act
51. Indigenous Rights and the Te Awa Tupua (Whanganui River Claims, https://law.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/3144318/Collins-and-Esterling.pdf
52. What is the Treaty Principles Bill? | Together for Te Tiriti, https://togetherfortetiriti.nz/faqs/treaty-principles-bill/
53. Professor Elizabeth Rata | NZCPR Site, https://www.nzcpr.com/author/elizabeth-rata/
54. Now for the big Maori sovereignty debate - Politik NZ, https://www.politik.co.nz/now-for-the-big-debate-about-maori-sovereignty/
55. Treaty Principles Bill - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Treaty_Principles_Bill
56. Where is New Zealand going with the Treaty of Waitangi? Rt Hon Sir, https://www.waitangitribunal.govt.nz/assets/50th-Conference-Portal/Papers/Palmer_WTconf.pdf
57. IN CONFIDENCE IN CONFIDENCE - Beehive.govt.nz, https://www.beehive.govt.nz/sites/default/files/2024-09/20240910%20-%20Cab%20paper%20Redacted.pdf
58. Ngā Take Māori o Te Ao Ture: Māori Legal Update - October 2024, https://www.simpsongrierson.com/insights-news/legal-updates/nga-take-maori-o-te-ao-ture-maori-legal-update-october-2024
59. NAU MAI, HAERE MAI, NGĀTI TŪWHARETOA, https://www.facebook.com/Tuwharetoaiwi/posts/%F0%9D%91%B5%F0%9D%91%A8%F0%9D%91%BC-%F0%9D%91%B4%F0%9D%91%A8%F0%9D%91%B0-%F0%9D%91%AF%F0%9D%91%A8%F0%9D%91%AC%F0%9D%91%B9%F0%9D%91

%AC-%F0%9D%91%B4%F0%9D%91%A8%F0%9D%91%B0-%F0%9D%91%B5%F0%9D%91%AE%F0%9D%91%A8%CC%84%F0%9D%91%BB%F0%9D%91%B0-%F0%9D%91%BB%F0%9D%91%BC%CC%84%F0%9D%91%BE%F0%9D%91%AF%F0%9D%91%A8%F0%9D%91%B9%F0%9D%91%AC%F0%9D%91%BB%F0%9D%91%B6%F0%9D%91%A8ng%C4%81ti-t%C5%ABwharetoa-mercury-development-group-a/1114869257714295/

60. All 23 marae in Ngāti Kahungunu Hastings are united in their, https://www.facebook.com/tekareremaorinews/posts/all-23-marae-in-ng%C4%81ti-kahungunu-hastings-are-united-in-their-support-of-the-h%C4%ABko/946429397517666/
61. Tina Ngata – Page 3, https://tinangata.com/author/tinangata/page/3/
62. Rangatahi had a part to play in the tangihanga for Kiingi Tuheitia, https://www.facebook.com/maraeofficial/posts/rangatahi-had-a-part-to-play-in-the-tangihanga-for-kiingi-tuheitia-wena-harawira/911630184336294/