

Beyond the Binary – Shifting New Zealand’s mindset

First Sir Paul Reeves Memorial Lecture

Anne Salmond
August 2012

In this first Sir Paul Reeves Memorial Lecture, I wish to honour a great New Zealander. Thoughtful, robust and astute, Sir Paul lived a passionate life, inspired by a quest for the shared good and the common ground, and a deep and abiding sense of justice.

Called ‘Darky’ in primary school, Sir Paul made sure that when Te Atiawa signed their Treaty settlement with the Crown, his people answered the Crown’s apology by formally offering their forgiveness for the harms and insults that they had suffered.

The son of a Wellington tram driver, he never forgot what it was like to be poor. During his term as Governor-General in the mid to late 1980s, Sir Paul became fearful about the market-driven reforms that were transforming New Zealand society.

After a year in office, he remarked to a *NZ Herald* reporter, "I happen not to believe in the trickle-down theory. I fear we are in the process of creating a stratified society" – earning himself a rebuke from the then Prime Minister, David Lange. He was unrepentant, however, adding two years later, "...the spirit of the market steals life from the vulnerable."

Sir Paul was deeply concerned about the impact of market-led philosophies on *iwi* leaders. Noting that the transfer of wealth in Treaty settlements was not being reflected in improved social and economic statistics for Maori, he said in an interview with Chris Laidlaw, ‘We don’t want to go down in history as capitalists who built wealth for a few, but as those who distributed wealth and improved life for our people’.

By the same token, Sir Paul believed that taxation and community-owned assets should be used to enrich the lives of ordinary New Zealanders. ‘We’re cancelling many community initiatives,’ he said, and ‘putting money into things that just benefit a few’.

Born of a Pakeha father and a Maori mother, Sir Paul talked often about honouring tikanga Maori and tikanga Pakeha, Maori and European ways of being, and finding common ground between them. In learning about his Pakeha side, he studied at the University of Oxford as well as in New Zealand, and served as an Anglican priest in English parishes.

When questioned about his faith, he spoke above all about other people: ‘I want to steer my hopes and aspirations to something bigger, outside myself: to absorb, transform and possibly perfect human relationships, that’s what I want to do with my life’.

Sir Paul cared about climate change, and education, and constitutional arrangements. It is a great honour to be asked to deliver a lecture in the memory of this marvellous man. In what follows, I will address some of the same topics that inspired him, if from my own perspective. Quite clearly, I am not an Anglican bishop but a scholar, from the

world of knowledge rather than of faith - although the historical links between these two worlds run deep.

After all, the first Universities were monastic institutions, with the slight disadvantage that scholars were not permitted to marry. Until recent times, too, women were excluded from taking University degrees. As Virginia Woolf wryly noted in *A Room of One's Own*, it was thought that for women such as herself, advanced study would overtax their frail faculties:

To write, or read, or think, or enquire,
Would cloud our beauty, and exhaust our time,
And interrupt the conquests of our prime.

Fortunately, women such as myself are now permitted to marry **and** have children **and** think - although when I spent a year as a Visiting Fellow at King's College in Cambridge in the early 1980s, shortly after they had admitted the first female fellows, people invariably thought that I was a wife who had got lost!

So let me now exhaust myself (but hopefully not you) by inquiring into aspects of our collective life as New Zealanders. It is possible that at present, we are trapped in habits of mind that limit our potential as a small, intimate society, inhabiting some of the most beautiful and productive landscapes and seascapes in the world.

Like Sir Paul, I am concerned about the current quality of our relations with each other, and fear that these have gone awry. As he remarked, 'I happen not to believe in the trickle-down theory. I fear we are in the process of creating a stratified society.'

Here, he was prescient. Over the past four years, according to a recent report, the median weekly income for European families increased to \$580, while that for Maori families fell to \$459, and for Pacific families to \$390. Not just a stratified society, but one tiered by ethnic background.

As I have argued recently, in Europe this kind of hierarchy goes back at least as far as the mediaeval idea of the **Great Chain of Being**. Here, the cosmos was ranked, with God at the top followed by archangels and angels, a Divine monarch and the ranks of the aristocracy and commoners. Men were placed over women and children, and civilised people over barbarians and savages.

In this timeless, tiered world, it seemed only right and proper that ruling elites should profit from ordinary people, and that 'civilised people' should rule over 'barbarians' and 'savages.' Since people were placed over plants and animals, and the earth itself, it seemed natural that people should exploit these other forms of life, even to the point of destruction. Somehow, it was supposed such exploitation was for the common good – a 'trickle down' theory on a cosmic scale.

During the seventeenth century, this idea took a new twist when the French philosopher Renee Descartes had a new vision of the nature of things, at once powerful and intoxicating. In his dream, the Cogito – the thinking self' or Subject – became the eye of the world, which in turn was transformed into an Object for human inspection.

In this '**Order of Things**,' as Michel Foucault has called it, mind was split from matter, subject from object, self from other, culture from nature, people from 'the environment,' and eventually, the disciplines from each other.

The characteristic motif of the Order of Things was the grid, based on oppositions that divided the world into bounded objects of various kinds – nation states, blocks of land, units of time and space measured by instrumental calculation; Linnaean genera and species of plants and animals, with their binomial descriptions.

Even people were defined as bounded objects, with the idea of the autonomous, cost-benefit calculating individual. It is not difficult to see how this kind of model might lead to ideas of technocratic control, as Foucault has eloquently argued.

During the Enlightenment, however, this was not the only philosophy available. Many thinkers, including Tom Paine in *The Rights of Man* and William Blake in his visionary poems ('Jerusalem,' for example) assailed these hierarchical models as self-serving myths, propagated by uncaring elites who presided over the destruction of the natural world, and the poverty, incarceration and suffering of the vast majority of their fellows.

Instead of a static, tiered universe, thinkers including Erasmus Darwin, Joseph Priestley and many of those involved in the Scottish Enlightenment; Benjamin Franklin in America; the Humboldt brothers in Germany; and Buffon, Diderot and Rousseau in France described the cosmos in terms of dynamic networks of relations, generated by complementary dualisms (rather than binary oppositions) between different elements and forces, each necessary for survival.

In this '**Order of Relations**,' as we might call it, the characteristic motif is the web or the net, and indeed, the World Wide Web is an iconic example of this kind of order. Here, exchanges in the middle ground between complementary pairs are the stuff of life, driving an ever-changing cosmos, working towards equilibrium or balance.

These 'vitalist' thinkers were the precursors to evolutionary biology, the earth sciences, medicine, much cosmology and ecology, and indeed, the science of self-organising systems. In social theory, their ideas led to the emancipation of slaves and women, the American Revolution, the Declaration of Independence and the US constitution, followed by the French Revolution and the fall of the Bastille – historical events that coincided with the early European exploration and settlement of New Zealand.

Thus when the first Europeans arrived in this country, they brought with them a cargo of colliding cosmological ideas. On the one hand, the Order of Things was powerful. As settlers spread across the land, surveyors divided it into gridded settlements and bounded blocks, cutting across the complex, overlapping networks of relations between Maori kin groups and local resources. As 'civilised' people, the settlers took for granted their right to control the land, and their superiority over Maori as 'barbarians' or 'savages.'

At the same time, however, that other Enlightenment tradition, the Order of Relations, was also present, helping to shape our history. In Britain, for instance, the Society for the Protection of Aborigines in Britain fought for the fair treatment of Maori, which led to the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, and protests when its agreements were dishonoured. Many early missionaries and officials – for instance the first Chief Justice, Sir William Martin - were inspired by these ideas, if in a paternalistic mode.

For themselves, most of the early settlers were on a quest for freedom, eager to strike off the fetters of social hierarchy. I think, for instance, of the Scots who fled the Highland clearances, or the young settler in New Plymouth who wrote jubilantly to his brother, 'I never will be an English slave more!' How ironic, then, that over the past thirty years we have been busily recreating a stratified society in this land.

In their dislike of the aristocratic monopoly of land and waterways at home, the settlers fought for the establishment of the Queen's Chain, and made successive attempts to break up large estates. Part of their legacy is the idea of the 'fair go,' a powerful motif in our society, along with a marked dislike of arrogance and pretension.

At the same time, though, this idea of the 'fair go' was also shaped by Maori ideas, where conduct described as *whakahihi* – ie. raising oneself above others – is equally disfavoured. In fact, Maori ideas of the cosmos resonate closely with the vitalist tradition from Europe. Here, too, the world is understood as dynamic networks of complementary relations between different life forms - in this case, as described by *whakapapa*.

In the old Maori cosmological chants, the world begins with a burst of energy, which generates thought, memory and desire. Next comes the Kore, Nothing, the seedbed of the cosmos, and then the Po, long aeons of darkness, and the celestial phenomena – sun, stars, moon, and planets, and the earth and sky.

From the union of Ranginui and Papatuanuku, earth and sky, the ancestors of the winds, the sea and waterways, and plants and animals are generated. All the world is linked by *whakapapa*, with people, plants, animals, winds, sea and earth joined together in multi-dimensional webs of relations. These are animated by the *hau ora*, the energy that drives the cosmos.

In this Order of Relations, there are no Cartesian splits between nature and culture, or subject and object. There is no idea of the autonomous, cost-benefit calculating individual. Rather, the mark of a *rangatira* is generosity, the ability to provide food and hospitality, and successful leadership in oratory and battle. Ordinary people insist on their *mana*, and early European visitors often remarked upon the 'democratic spirit' of Maori people.

Here, life is about negotiating relations, seeking those points of balance where all is *ora* - prosperous and well – a process that applies to plants and animals and other life forms, as well as people. This is very like the vision of reality espoused during the Enlightenment by Joseph Priestley and Erasmus Darwin in Britain, Buffon in France, and the Humboldt brothers in Germany, for example.

Perhaps not surprisingly, given these competing, entangling ideas of reality, the colonial history of our country is philosophically far from simple. Just when one thinks that the Order of Relations is dominant - at the time of the signing of the Declaration of Independence and the Treaty of Waitangi, for instance - the Order of Things comes into play – denying Maori the right to participate in the new governance arrangements, for example, or attempting to sell the so-called 'wastelands,' or instigating the Land Wars.

At the same time, however, some Europeans – like William Martin, the first Chief Justice of New Zealand – reassert relational thinking, arguing that the Land Wars are

fundamentally unjust and a breach of the Treaty of Waitangi; while some Maori kin groups assert it by fighting for the Crown.

And in the wake of the Land Wars, when Maori lands are confiscated and the Native Land Court is established, there was that curious phase of our national history when New Zealand called itself 'Maoriland,' and many early settlers, including men like Elsdon Best, Percy Smith and my own great grandfather James McDonald made a serious study of Maori language, art and ancestral practices, working with men like Sir Apirana Ngata and Sir Peter Buck on their projects of cultural revival.

The era of 'Maoriland' was followed by two World Wars, when Maori soldiers fought for 'the price of citizenship,' as Apirana Ngata put it, winning the respect of their comrades in battles such as Gallipoli and the Somme, Tunisia and Monte Cassino. This was followed by an era when assimilation was all the rage, and Maori children were required to learn English, and more Maori land was seized.

It was at that time, no doubt, that Sir Paul was called a 'darky' at primary school, and his father, who had married his Maori mother and fought in WW2, worked on the Wellington trams. Having survived his youth, Sir Paul went on to study at Oxford and became a priest in English parishes.

During the 1970s, after Sir Paul had been appointed as the Bishop of Aotearoa, a ferment of debate and protest swirled around the Western world as rising generations sought to free themselves from old hierarchies. Feminism, anti-racism, anti-war sentiment fuelled anger among the young, and much social experimentation.

In New Zealand at that time, the Maori Renaissance got under way, along with the feminist movement. This was still a relatively prosperous, egalitarian society, with a strong welfare state delivering health and education to a high standard across the social spectrum. At the time, most of us took these things for granted.

Looked at in this way, the history of our country looks far from black and white. Rather, it has many complex, contradictory strands. As a way of understanding our past as New Zealanders, the Order of Things - with its sharp-edged oppositions between nature and culture, 'civilized men' and 'savages,' Maori and Pakeha – is not helpful.

Instead, it confounds our understanding. Think, for example, of the current fad for separating our past into Maori history and the rest, as though somehow Maori and the settlers inhabited different lands.

Equally, this kind of 'black and white' logic does not assist in thinking about the present, and the future of our country. In its binary oppositions, A is defined as not equal to B, with a sharp dividing line between them – what you might call 'bi-polar' thinking.

As A and B are split apart, they are abstracted, purified of any qualities that they might have in common, and set in opposition to each other. This is an inherently divisive way of grasping the world. Take the terms Maori and Pakeha, men and women, Left and Right, developers and environmentalists, and you will soon see what I mean. Take these labels, add the term 'bloody' and you will have accounted for quite a lot of talk-back and in-group chatter in New Zealand.

In addition, the binary oppositions between such terms are almost invariably weighted, with in-built power imbalances. Because these are presupposed, they are often difficult to detect, let alone to challenge. Taken-for-granted inequalities between Maori and Pakeha, rich and poor, men and women drive fissures into our small, otherwise intimate society, threatening its *ora* – its well-being, health and prosperity.

Genuine differences do exist between Maori and Pakeha, men and women, Left and Right – but so do networks of interlocking relations, shared values and mutual dependencies. Rather than excluding the middle ground, the challenge is to get these operating in ways that are mutually positive and creative, not hostile and destructive. This, I think, is the task that Sir Paul set himself, and why his life mattered so much to us all.

Who knows how philosophical shifts occur? When Rogernomics was launched in the mid 1980s, it is likely that this apparent lurch to the right was just another reflex of the Order of Things, with its Cartesian habits of mind. The baby boomers had already begun to shape the world in terms of sharp-edged binary oppositions – women vs. men in feminism; Maori vs. pakeha in bi-culturalism; Self vs. Other in the pursuit of personal freedom, for example.

As selves were split from others and nature from culture, the idea of the autonomous individual pursuing his own rights and interests without constraint, was reframed as a virtue. Because New Zealand has few checks and balances, it was possible for a relatively small number of people to drive this idea beyond its reasonable limits, as Sir Paul argued at the time.

As a result, over the past thirty years much of our collective life has been re-shaped in the image of the market, with citizens defined as autonomous, cost-benefit calculating customers, required to buy and sell even the most basic of their needs – education, health, personal safety and security in old age, for example.

As a template for running for a small, intimate society, this logic is remarkably ruthless. It is also non-adaptive, cutting across our key advantages as a species. As *Homo sapiens*, we are social animals, able to think and communicate through language, forge strategies and combine our efforts to achieve them. Our offspring have a long, vulnerable period while they acquire these capacities, during which they have to be protected.

Any society that ignores these basic facts puts itself in danger. In New Zealand, this is obvious from the indicators of social distress that have rocketed since the 1980s – child abuse, youth suicide, increasing gaps between rich and poor, sharp educational and health disparities. Very high rates of incarceration, especially of young Maori, provide a satirical counterpoint to the rhetoric of personal freedom.

Coupled with the illusion, born from the Cartesian split between nature and culture, that people can exploit other life forms and the earth without risk to their own survival, and you have a recipe that seems very unlikely to create a prosperous, happy society in our beautiful land.

Beyond the Binary

Over the past few decades, if many New Zealanders have adopted key ideas that drive towards social fragmentation rather than prosperity and cohesion, what alternatives are available?

I have already suggested that with Maori and Polynesian (and Asian) philosophies and the vitalist legacy from the Enlightenment, we are fortunate, well placed to experiment with relational habits of mind.

Why should we do this? With rising indicators of disparity and distress, many people fear the widening chasms in our society, and yearn for greater amity and cohesion.

During the Rugby World Cup, for instance, when the divisions that haunt us were set aside, New Zealanders were seized by a collective euphoria. Fuelled by a love of the sport and a sense that we were on show to the world, there were moments when our country indeed felt like a 'Stadium of 4 million people.'

Black flags with silver ferns fluttered off car aerials, people's houses in the cities, and across rural landscapes. When the Cup was won, almost everyone celebrated. It felt fantastic.

I know that most New Zealanders would love to feel this way more often. It is likely to involve new styles of leadership and decision-making, however, which I for one, would find refreshing. At present the world is changing in ways that challenge the old sharp-edged silos – nation states, government departments, the disciplines, ethnic groups - even the genders.

While the grid remains a powerful form of order, networks of relations are literally going viral. People, ideas, goods, influence and investment are whizzing around the globe with ever-increasing frequency and speed. Work is changing, with crowd-sourcing, out-sourcing and other new forms of production. IT and the World Wide Web are transforming our ideas of the cosmos, also in relational directions.

Here, there are brilliant opportunities. In our small, intimate society, the tyranny of distance may at last be cancelled. If we are smart and agile, the legacies of our ancestors may help us to make the most of new global exchanges, and thrive and prosper. While other, older societies remain trapped in non-adaptive rigidities, we can organize ourselves flexibly and quickly, and in ways that give us joy, as well as contributing to greater equality and prosperity.

In order to achieve this, it is possible to draw on Maori and Pacific (and Asian) philosophies as well as the best of contemporary science. Although some see these as mutually incompatible, I disagree, profoundly. Here, I take inspiration from the recent science of complex networks, and self-organising systems, for example.

Although I am no expert in these fields, those who have proposed a resonance between the complementary dualisms of Asian (and also by implication, Maori and Pacific) ideas about the world, and the patterns they generate, the complementary, generative pairs involved in many aspects of contemporary science.

In a recent work, *The Complementary Nature*, for example, the authors (both neuroscientists) cite an array of such patterns - the wave / particle duality of light, Einstein's reconciliation of space-time and energy-matter, the base pairings in DNA and the bi-stability of neurons, for example.

At the same time, they insist that science must show '*both* how the parts of a system operate in context *and* how they co-ordinate to produce collective emergent effects.' Even at this basic theoretical level, they argue for an approach based on complementarity – ***both/and***, rather than binary opposition - ***either/or***.

Let me now take these ideas, which no doubt seem rather heady, and see how they might help us to move **beyond the binary** in our collective lives.

In **civic affairs**, for example, it is not difficult to see how the binary logic of the Order of Things, with its tiered models, drives towards authoritarian styles of leadership. The idea of a bifurcated political order – Left-Right, Labour-National, for example - is so common in the West that we forget that this is a cultural artefact, and not the way that democracy has to be.

Here, the job of running the country is seen as a form of gladiatorial combat. Every three or five years, one side or the other wins an election, claims a mandate and imposes its policies on the electorate, whether or not these enjoy majority support. Parliament is similarly polarized, with styles of debate in which the best interests of the majority of citizens is often set aside.

In New Zealand, however, many citizens are fed up with this style of governance. The shift to proportional representation was intended to move away from successive lurches between left and right, and towards negotiation across the middle ground. When politicians subvert this by sticking with the old binary arrangements, using these to impose extreme ideologies, they lose the respect of ordinary citizens, who become cynical and/or disengage from the political process.

Some politicians understand this better than others. In places, inclusive, relational styles of governance are emerging that work across the ramparts. The Land and Water Forum, for example, is an exciting experiment with collaborative styles of decision-making, used to tackle vexed questions of water use in New Zealand.

Instead of fighting each other in the courts, key players including the dairy industry, Federated Farmers, forestry, environmental NGOs, iwi groups and regional government have decided to negotiate face to face. Rather than resorting to 'end runs' to the law or Government, they engage with the facts of the matter, and from the best evidence at hand, work towards optimal regimes for water use based on shared values as well as divergent interests. This includes baselines for water flows, quantitative indicators of water health and collaborative ways of working these through at more local levels.

As a model of smart, flexible, evidence-based decision-making for a small country, this is superb. One can see how in this process, different values and ways of understanding the environment might converge. It would be great to see such an approach applied to other contentious areas in our national life – superannuation, maybe, and land use regimes, for example. The outcomes are likely to be infinitely superior to those achieved by the old, bi-polar arm wrestling. Such a flexible, nimble approach, based

on fostering collaboration across various networks of relations, would be a major step towards a new kind of democracy in New Zealand.

In **education**, too, one can still see the old hierarchical rigidities at play. The decile system, for instance, although a useful way of allocating funding, arranges schools into tiered arrays that serve as a proxy for educational quality. Here too, the job of running the education system is often understood as a form of gladiatorial combat, with politicians pitted against teachers and schools against each other. In the sort of policy-making that emerges, the interests of students are often set aside.

As a result, over recent years, achievement gaps between students from Maori, Pacific and low income backgrounds and others have widened. For these children and their families, and for the wider society, this is a disaster. Since these young people represent an increasing proportion of the future work-force, the failure of the school system to adequately prepare them for new kinds of knowledge-rich work places New Zealand at high risk of economic and social failure.

In order to change this, rather than an endless trail of short term, 'big bang' experiments, systemic remedies are required. The Starpath project, for example, has been working on ways of tracking students along their educational journeys, so that the 'chokepoints' where significant groups of young people falter in their learning can be identified, and initiatives to change these tested against outcomes.

As a result, some pioneering schools have developed academic counseling based on such long-term tracking, aimed at ensuring that every child can achieve their potential. In the Te Kotahitanga programme, too, similar insights are at work - that students learn best when teachers understand and appreciate their backgrounds, and build creatively on their existing knowledge and learning styles.

To her credit, the current Minister of Education, Hekia Parata, understands the dangers of current educational disparities, and is determined to change them. In order to achieve systemic change, however, collaborative decision-making among parents, teachers, students and those with an evidence-based understanding of the challenges is required.

In this context, old, arrogant, unilateral habits of decision-making are bound to backfire – whether over class sizes or charter schools. Collaborative processes for forging strategies and policies, like those used by the Land and Water Forum, for example, are much more likely to succeed. With so many lives and the future of the country at stake, surely such an experiment would be worthwhile.

To give another example, one dear to Sir Paul's heart, **inter-ethnic relations** on the old hierarchical, bi-polar model are also changing. Rather than seeing Maori and Pakeha, or Maori and Pasifika, or for that matter, Kiwi and Asian as bi-polar opposites with some kind of Berlin Wall between them, these are increasingly regarded as complementary pairs, joined by a fertile middle ground.

In a philosophy based on *whakapapa*, for example, there is no need to regard oneself as purely Maori, or Pakeha, or Pasifika, or Asian. Rather, an individual is made up of all the relationships in which they participate, with their different *taha* or 'sides' able to turn from one network to another, exploring the creative possibilities. One can see how readily such a person can adapt to the diverse, rapidly changing world in which

we dwell. A Pakeha child, for instance, who learns Maori will find themselves equipped with a new way of thinking, and one moreover that resonates with Pacific and Asian ways of being, and many ideas in contemporary science.

I could go on, almost ad infinitum. In **architecture** and **town planning**, for example, the Order of Things divides up communities and buildings into sequestered silos. Instead of zones (or dwellings) that operate like boxes, with work in one place, domestic life in another, recreation somewhere else, and old people isolated from young couples and children, relational thinking suggests that it would be better to join them together. As Sir Ian Athfield has demonstrated in his own buildings, this makes life more vital, varied and interesting for us all.

With respect to the **environment**, too, the old idea from the Great Chain of Being that the world is there for people to exploit without limit has put the planet at risk, with few sensible remedies emerging. Here again, unilateral, hierarchical decision-making and bi-polar thinking are non-adaptive. In relational thinking, on the other hand, humans are understood as part of the ecosystems in which they dwell, and like other life forms, entitled to prosper. At the same time, the mutual dependency between them and other living systems is recognised, and as in the Land and Water Forum, used to inform decision-making.

For one short lecture, I have said quite enough, or more! As a quote that my husband Jeremy recently unearthed remarks, 'A closed mouth gathers no feet.' Over the past three-quarters of an hour, no doubt I've become a centipede of sorts.

In my wish to do honour to Sir Paul, however, I wanted to share my sense of excitement about the creative possibilities that lie before us, arising from these new / old ways of thinking. The great thing about such ideas is that we don't have to wait for the Government to try them out, or anyone else. All we need is a creative project, and a few good people to work with, and a new thought may spread like wildfire. As Sir Paul showed in his own life, and especially in a small country, it is possible for any of us to change the world.

Na reira e aku rangatira, kua mutu enei korero inaianei. In closing, I'd like to give the last word to my teacher and mentor Eruera Stirling, whose favorite chant sums up the kind of philosophy that I've been advancing, and by which Sir Paul Reeves lived and died:

*Whakarongo! Whakarongo! Whakarongo!
Ki te tangi a te manu e karanga nei
Tui, tui, tuituiaa!
Tuia i runga, tuia i raro,
Tuia i roto, tuia i waho,
Tuia i te here tangata
Ka rongo te po, ka rongo te po
Tuia i te kawai tangata i heke mai
I Hawaiki nui, I Hawaiki roa,
I Hawaiki pamamao
I hono ki te wairua, ki te whai ao
Ki te Ao Marama!*

*Listen! Listen! Listen!
To the cry of the bird calling
Bind, join, be one!
Bind above, bind below
Bind within, bind without
Tie the knot of humankind
The night hears, the night hears
Bind the lines of people coming down
From great Hawaiki, from long Hawaiki
From Hawaiki far away
Bind to the spirit, to the day light
To the World of Light!*