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Introduction

The history of transitional justice has been marked by a variety of efforts to promote peace, reconciliation and achieve justice in the aftermath of mass violations of human rights. It appears that the majority of mechanisms used since the Second World War primarily seek redress through retribution and punishment via the use of tribunals and courts. The Nuremberg Tribunal and the Tokyo tribunal, as well as the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia (ICTY), the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR), and the International Criminal Court (ICC) are examples of this approach to justice. More recently, attempts to bring about justice have been complemented by less retributive mechanisms, such as truth commissions, and revamped customary mechanisms of justice. These mechanisms of justice are often described as promoting a combination of retributive, reparative, and restorative justice. This paper contends that the current scholarship is ill-suited to account for the type of justice that is embodied in customary mechanisms of justice. Here, I explore how indigenous approaches to doing and thinking about justice often differ from the existing framework used in transitional justice. Using evidence gathered through three months of ethnographic research in New Zealand, I contend and explain how the māori approach to justice, like many other indigenous approaches, adopts a relational lens. I conclude that the type of “justice” embodied in customary mechanisms, has often been taken out of context, and rendered universal and ahistorical in the transitional justice literature through their representation as restorative justice mechanisms.

I Justice in Transitional Justice

Of particular interest in this paper is the way “justice” is conceptualized in the field of transitional justice. The literature on transitional justice tends to think about how to do “justice” in different terms, by using the retributive, reparative, and the restorative approaches. Each approach, in essence, seeks the same thing, which is to make things right after violations of rights, but tries to do so using different means. The retributive approach, for instance, favors the use of tribunals and courts, while the reparative
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approach encourages the enactment of material and symbolic reparations. Restorative justice sees truth-telling as an essential element in its pursuit of “justice.” So, while the end goal of “justice” remains the same, views of how to do “justice,” in the field of transitional justice, vary.³

Each of these approaches conceives of the individual as a holder of rights, regardless of any other factor.⁴ Cultural differences and backgrounds are irrelevant considerations. Conceptions of justice can be “justified independently of particular conceptions” of what is good or bad.⁵ This understanding of how justice ought to be carried out, and also of individuals, has clear roots in the Western, Judeo-Christian tradition, which views human beings as imperfect reflections of God.⁶ The approach to justice embodied in the restorative, reparative and retributive modes of justice is “the creation of a specific legal tradition,”⁷ that of the West, and can be considered “a cultural artefact… masquerading as universal, immutable values.”⁸

Such approaches to carrying out justice traditionally had much credence in the minds of liberal thinkers, including Kant and Nozick.⁹ According to the liberal approach, individuals are conceived as morally autonomous, and fully rational beings. As such, individuals are the bearers of rights,¹⁰ and function under the same framework and conception of justice. Justice is seen as a “foundational priority” that precedes any other considerations, preferences, and cultural particularities.¹¹ The majority of the literature in transitional justice is embedded within these deontological approaches.¹² Regardless of whether justice is to be categorized as retributive, reparative or restorative each approach sees the individual as the primary source of concern, and justifies the need for justice either in the restoration, reparation, or retribution for individuals, whose rights have been violated. They are fundamentally grounded in a Western liberal framework, which “rests on an overly individualistic conception of the self.”¹³ For this reason, I argue that they are ill-suited to discuss the type of justice that is embodied in customary mechanisms of justice.

I Tikanga Māori
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When asked, a majority of Māori individuals I interviewed agreed that tikanga is important in thinking about justice in a Māori way. I was told that tikanga was “absolutely essential in thinking about Māori justice.” Judge Durie adds that Tikanga māori can be defined a body of “Māori principles for determining justice.” Not abiding by tikanga would have severe consequences in communal life and would result in oneself, and one’s community “being hurt.”

In fact, tikanga māori is a normative system, which prescribes correct ways of behaving and processes to use for correcting problematic behavior. It can be seen as a set of principles determining right from wrong and prescribing actions on how to deal with it. Tikanga also includes “measures to deal firmly with actions causing a serious disequilibrium within the community.” Burrows explains that indigenous people, around the world, have developed various sets of spiritual, economic, political and social principles in order to foster their relationships with one another and the environment. These principles and conventions, he adds “became the foundation for many complex systems of governance and laws.” Tikanga māori can be seen as a set of principles to determine justice and is, therefore, generally referred to as Māori customary law.

It appears that, “the traditional system of tikanga for resolving dispute still exists” and used in some areas of the country. Māori generally prefer to deal with offenses and crimes amongst themselves, without any external state intervention. Only a few decades ago, the police rarely got involved or intervened in Māori communities. Nowadays, while the police are sometimes called, they still do not always come to the help of Māori living in rural communities. As noted by Stafford, “historical legacies of indigenous peoples and police interaction have resulted in…feelings of mutual suspicions held by both parties.” Māori often feel disempowered and disadvantaged by the judicial system.
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They are also often distrustful of the police forces, which they see as “amplifiers of crimes.”

That is the police is often perceived as being more severe towards the indigenous population than against the white population. Moreover, there exists a shared belief, amongst the Māori, that New Zealand laws and judicial procedures are foreign and imposed legal norms. These imposed pakeha laws and mechanisms are considered “part of the mechanism of colonization,” that has “shaped and helped create the circumstances which lead to much contemporary Māori offending.” And so, as a result of a combination of factors, including the police’s attitude towards Māori communities, the remoteness of some communities, as well as their ‘know how,’ non-urban Māori communities will generally deal with disputes and offenses themselves.

II Relational Justice

Customary law and customary mechanisms, and more particularly, the type of justice they embody, are difficult to appreciate and make sense of within a Western, individualistic and legally based framework. This may be due to the fact, that justice, in a number of cases, “represent[s] a grammar for living and an intricate set of religious principles that make the world intelligible.” It is not just legal institutions that differ, but entire social structures and beliefs, which, in turn, get lost and sanitized in the restorative justice texts.

Central to these Māori norms and ideals is the primacy of kinship. Relationships are of paramount importance to Māori. No discussion of the principles that underpin tikanga māori can bypass the primacy of relationships, which in turn influence and affect the Māori practice and approach to justice. In fact, tikanga māori is fundamentally relational, and, just like other indigenous traditions, is centered on the primacy of kinships.

The importance of relationships is visible through a number of principles that Māori abide by, including whakapapa (genealogical connection) and whanaungatanga (human connection). Both point to the strength and importance of connections between
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people and their communities. While whakapapa is concerned with the spiritual, whanaungatanga deals with present relationships and is not restricted to the genealogical order. In other words, both whanaungatanga and whakapapa remind each person of the centrality of relationships, both past and present, and his or her responsibility towards these. These values, which resonate in a number of other traditions found throughout the South Pacific, remind individuals of “the importance of group unity and of maintaining relationships.” They provide the understanding that all Māori are related to one another and their environment. As a result, it is in the interest of all to act in ways that strengthen and sustain relationships, whether they be with other human beings or with the natural world. The whanau, to Māori, is “a pivotal social and cultural force,” that gives its members a sense of identity and safety. To many, the whanau is everything. It is “what we are made of” and “makes us the way we are.” To Māori “you are nobody unless you belong to a community, to some land and some people.”

According to Huffer and So”o, “Pacific values must be seen in the context of a network of social relationships.” Indeed, to Māori and other Pacific Islanders, society is seen as a “collective unit meaning everyone within that unit has the responsibility of working together.” As a result, “connections…must be respected and fostered.” Mane notes that the creation and maintenance of relationships, for Māori, “is a matter of considerable significance highlighting the required sense of reciprocity, accountability and mutual respect.” This has important consequences on the Māori practice and approach to justice and requires re-thinking our approach to criminal behavior. Crime must be seen, no longer as breach of contract and law, but rather as a “breakdown in
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relationships.” It must, therefore, be treated as such. Implicit in the centrality of the whanau and relationships to Māori is the sense of collective social responsibility. In turn, this sense of a) interconnectedness and collective responsibility, begets b) active involvement and participation of all community members for the c) well-being of the collective.

a) Interconnectedness and collective responsibility

Māori approach to justice is built around “fundamental values such as collectivism and interconnectedness.” Māori “collective identity lends itself to collective responsibility.” This has important consequences on justice and how it is viewed and carried out in Māori communities. Relationships being the most valued element of Māori social life and worldview, they are the focus of justice. Justice becomes a way to nurture and sustain relationships. This is strongly reminiscent of Ross’ “relational lens” which was discussed in chapter 3 when dealing with Ubuntu and Aboriginal healing Justice. This emphasis on relationships, interdependence and collective responsibility encourages us to think of wrongdoing as a “relational event.” A crime becomes the symptom of “disharmonies within the offender's relational life.” It is therefore the relational life of the offender that must explored and restored.

Accordingly, one of the first steps in dealing with offences, for Māori, is to uncover the relational ties, each of the parties to the dispute, sustains with other community members. Many indigenous traditions, such as that of the Navajo, view a person who harms another as a person who “has no relatives.” Accordingly, justice is very much about reinstating these relationships. It is concerned with “retaining, teaching and maintaining relationships.” Only once the relationships between the parties to the dispute have been explored, can discussions about why a dispute took place and how it
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can be solved, begin. Exposing the relational ties between the whanau, the offender and the victim lifts the veil of anonymity and contributes to accountability. “You know your victims and they know you. That puts more of an onus on you for your actions.”

By the same token, highlighting the connections and kinship between all community members serves to demonstrate how the wrong and the pain caused “reverberates through the individual and the community.”

This, in turn, directly influences how justice is carried out, and who is involved in the process. “Offenders and victims must be seen in the context of extended family.” After a crime or dispute, people come together, whether in the marae or a home, depending on the severity of the crime, to discuss what has been done and what needs to be done. According to the Māori way, “it is all about the collective, rather than the individual.” Individuals and their communities share a co-dependent and almost symbiotic relationship. This means that when a crime takes place, everyone in the community is affected to some degree, because the harmony of the community is threatened. The focus of the process of justice is more than just the offender and the individual wronged. Both are “inextricably linked to family, clan and culture,” thereby giving a kind of derivative responsibility to the individuals’ whanau and the wider community. Traditionally, the system of tikanga simply attributed “responsibility for wrongdoing on the family of the offender.” Because Māori society is largely based on collective responsibility, if an individual member is wronged or hurt, the entire whanau is equally liable to redress the harm caused. “When you hurt one member, you hurt the rest of the whanau.” Each member of a community will “either feel some sense of having being wronged or some sense of responsibility for the wrong.” It is, therefore, in the interest of all to contribute to the process of justice.

This sense of collective responsibility “does not resonate quite so strongly in non-Māori communities.” It requires providing support to those who have been wronged as well as to those who have wronged. One is never alone in the Māori world and that
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means everyone has to look after one another to sustain the community.76 This principle of collective responsibility also influences everyday life in contemporary New Zealand. “As children, we grow to learn the importance of the community and involvement and responsibility.”77 A significant number of my respondents appeared to be socially aware and responsible, in that many actively contributed, and in some ways, supported community life.78 Some individuals admitted to having taken into their homes and raised another family’s child,79 periodically chairing or attending marae meetings,80 or working on the construction of a marae for their iwi.81 A schoolteacher explained “these are our kids. They’re not that family’s or that family’s; they’re all our kids. And all, whoever they are, belong to our whanau and we have a social responsibility as a community to help them.”82

This sense of collective identity and responsibility urges community members to take part in communal matters and decision-making. As a result, the participation by and consultation of community members becomes a central element in doing justice within Māori communities, and according to tikanga. This stems from the “very real sense that a conflict belongs to the community itself,”83 and constitutes a violation of the community’s interwoven relationships and harmony.84

B) Active community participation

Māori processes to carry out justice are not “formal court sitting that a lawyer would recognize.”85 When a hui is organized, it is open to all who wish to contribute.86 “Whoever may feel that they have an interest” is included.87 There is no audience, per se, since everyone is encouraged to participate and share their views.88 Hearings usually take
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place in the *marae*, because it is inclusive of all and represent a neutral “place to reconcile difference.”

During a *hui*, community members talk through things in an attempt explain what happened, why it happened, and solve the issues at hand. Indigenous mechanisms of justice use a “talking-out process among relatives (by blood and clan)” to reach a practical solution to the problem. Justice is the result of “what the society…considers to be fair and just.” Both parties to the dispute must be present to exchange their views and opinions. Their participation and the expression of their interests are central to a process that relies on voluntariness.

The active participation and contribution of community members to the process is an inherent element of a worldview based on the centrality of relationships. “Justice has to be done with the families.” The inclusion of community members in the process, however, also serves to reinforce the community’s values, and “generates a more compelling sense of justice.” Holding offenders verbally accountable for their wrongdoing is “essential to expressing remorse to the victims,” and facilitate the communication of suffering, and possibly apologies. By participating, the community shows its commitment to social stability and harmony. It emphasizes the “solidarity of the collective” towards upholding communal well-being and empowers community members to make decisions. Justice, then, becomes a “communal asset” to be safeguarded by all. On top of regenerating communal values of respect and care, the presence of community members in the process contributes to what Braithwaite calls “reintegrative shaming.”
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discourage further misbehaving. Shaming helps produce compliance to the values upheld by the community and limits potential deviance.

The process engendered by tikanga, a form of relational justice, creates a venue where “offenders, the victims and their support system get to see how the crime has affected each of them.” Offenders get to experience justice, as it is not handed down to them but requires their participation, their commitment and agreement. Participation is also entirely voluntary. The strength of relational justice lies in the fact that community participation lends authority to the process and the decision reached. In horizontal and acephalous societies, communities tend to take a very active role in the process. “Consensus development for the resolution of disputes or grievances between or within communities” is an important element of these processes. And because all are held accountable by their whanau, which engages in the process, parties to the dispute “have to own up to the decision and carry out what has been decided collectively.”

Moreover, relational justice is about showing aroha, support and care to both offenders and victims, regardless of their actions. Indeed, the “methods of justice reflect the virtues of justice: respect, love, engaging family and community, land, elders and the Creator.” These values “bind the individual to the group and the group to supporting the individual.” The exploration of the crime, truth-telling and confrontation between offenders and victims can be emotionally trying, but also contributes to the acknowledgment of their experiences. The support and presence of the community also serves to alleviate the pain and contributes to the collective healing. The sense of interconnectedness and collective responsibility discussed previously requires all to engage in the restoration and rehabilitation of those affecting by injustice.

101 Braithwaite, Crime, Shame and Reintegration.
103 Interview with a representative from the Ngati Whatua Trust, 27th June 2010, Auckland.
104 Penal Reform International, 16.
107 The New Zealand Law Commission, Converging Currents, 54.
108 Agnes Naera, Programme Director Equity, Kaiwhakahaere Kaupapa Maori, Auckland University of Technology (AUT), interview with author, 30th June 2010, Auckland; Arena Williams, Auckland youth and Law student at the University of Auckland, interview with author, 10th May 2010, Auckland; Interview with schoolteacher, 17th June 2010, Otara.
109 Maori word meaning love and care.
110 Sawatsky, The Ethic of Traditional Communities, 70.
113 Patricia Lundy and McGovern Mark. "Community Based Approaches to Post-Conflict Truth Telling: Strength and Limitations." Shared Space: A research journal on peace, conflict and community relations in Northern Ireland 1 (2005), 42.
C) Well-being and rehabilitation

To Māori, justice is a way of life, not just a response to crime. It is *houhou rongo*, literally sewing the seeds for peace. Justice is “a conversation around living.” It is an “everyday thing, so you don’t have a special courtroom, special lawyers or special language.” The way justice is carried out, as a public space for all to participate, very much reflects that. In fact, it is argued that justice in indigenous communities is “inseparable from issues of social well-being.” The occurrence of a crime causes a serious imbalance in the community and reflects the community’s failure to set favorable living conditions for all. Implicit in the sense of collective responsibility that underpins relational justice is the belief that all community members are responsible for sustaining community wellbeing. Justice, therefore, serves as a means of maintaining or redressing that harmony and balance within the community.

The Māori approach to justice is essentially holistic and oriented towards the maintenance of mutually supportive relationships. It is based on the belief that justice is about healing the person who has wronged, the person who has been wronged and the entire network of relationships affected by the harm caused. As such, it seeks to deal with harm in its entirety, recognizing the centrality of emotions. The emphasis on healing is the “necessary manifestation of a [indigenous] world-view.” Zion notes that indigenous justice “attempts to reach into the mind.” It cannot succeed and heal without dealing with the person in its entirety, meaning spiritually, emotionally, physically and mentally. Justice is about healing the spiritual, emotional, physical or mental imbalance in the person, and goes beyond the legal sphere. It allows one to “fix one’s spirit.” This means that justice is not simply about redressing a wrong and restoring a balance, but it is also about healing those involved. It can only be successfully achieved if it restores the “spiritual, emotional and physical balance within the social, environmental, and cosmic sphere.”
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Relational justice requires working “collectively in a manner to help rebuild the person that has done wrong. It is a daily process of doing things together, and surrounding that person with normality, to show them caring and aroha.”\(^{127}\) In turn, healing those directly affected by wrongdoing contributes to the well-being of the entire community.\(^{128}\) Healing the harm provides the opportunity to “transform suffering and root causes of harm […] to cultivate conditions of respectful living within the interrelated aspects of the self, other, communities, social structures, environment and spirit.”\(^{129}\) Viewing justice through a Māori lens leads us to focus on relationships as the source of restoration and rehabilitation for individuals affected by a dispute or crime. Māori justice is not about retribution, but about restoration and rehabilitation.\(^{130}\) This “derives from long held indigenous customs in which kin…seek to meet the need if all involved in a harm situation.”\(^{131}\)

At a hui, “the basic question asked is what happened and how can we fix it?”\(^{132}\) It seeks to identify the reasons that led a community member to wrong another member,\(^{133}\) provides a space for exploring and “understanding what made offenders do what they did, who they are, where they come from.”\(^{134}\) Justice, therefore, is sought when the community tries “to restore that balance within them and between the individuals involved in what happened.”\(^{135}\) This is done in accordance with the principle of utu, which emphasizes reciprocity and the maintenance of harmonious relationships between members of society.\(^{136}\) Whatever harm has been caused by an item being stolen or damaged, for instance, must be returned or repaired.\(^{137}\) The kind of reparations must fit the circumstances and needs of all parties, keeping in mind the collective concern for harmony and balance.\(^{138}\)

Because all community members are considered integral and essential parts of a collective, “it is not as simple as just removing [offenders.]”\(^{139}\) The emphasis remains on restorative penalties, such as community service.\(^{140}\) This approach is based on the
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understanding that removing someone from the community, such as sending him through the penitentiary system, does not mend relationships or contribute to healing the harm. It is, on the contrary, more likely to cause further suffering and victimization, for all involved.141 Removing someone from the community would also signal a break in communal relationships and result in additional imbalance. It would absolve the Māori notion of collective responsibility, which bestows responsibility on all community members, for the wrong committed by one.

### III Implications for Transitional Justice

The Māori approach to justice is clearly embedded within a kinship-based tradition that highly values principles of collective responsibility, social harmony and well-being. Dyhrberg argues that “central to Māoridom is the right and the responsibility of a community to care for its own, and to seek… solutions to its social problem.”142 Over the years, Māori have remained critical towards New Zealand’s legal apparatus, which many viewed as a “system imposed upon them by an aggressive colonizer,”143 and which incessantly worked against indigenous communities and their rights.144 The existing legal system never fully empowered Māori communities to take care of their own, according to their own traditions and beliefs.145 Despite the increasing number of Māori going through the criminal justice system, the latter continued to uphold the values and to adjust to the needs of the settler society.146 Following mounting criticism from Māori communities that the existing legal system “was wholly foreign to its traditional values and destructive of the kinship networks essential to Māori society,” Family Group Conferencing (FGCs) were set up.147 The FGC model put in place by the New Zealand government is often said to epitomize the restorative justice approach.148 It is also frequently presented as a Māori process.149

In fact, part of the debate surrounding restorative practices and traditions concerns “claims that restorative justice draws on traditional processes for resolving disputes among indigenous peoples.”150 Daly has coined this the “myth of origin,” according to
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which restorative justice “uses indigenous justice practices and was the dominant form of pre-modern justice.”151 Restorative justice practices and indigenous approaches to justice are often seen as one and the same. As mentioned earlier, a common assumption, in the case of the New Zealand restorative conferencing model, is that the practice is rooted in Māori culture.152 This belief is particularly striking in that it reveals a lack of understanding of the cultural, social and spiritual principles that underpin Māori society and its approach to justice. Hakiaha expresses concerns at the New Zealand government’s use of Māori principles, which may result, in his view, in “the dilution, bastardization and disenfranchisement of these revered and sacred principles.”153

This amalgamation between restorative justice practices and indigenous approaches illustrates the worrisome propensity to romanticize and homogenize indigenous philosophies and practices.154 It is also symptomatic of the transitional justice literature. More often than not, customary mechanisms of justice are described using our own conceptual tools, without any critical evaluation of the implications this has for the quality and relevance of the transitional justice research. Indeed, customary mechanisms of justice are generally described as embodying a mix of restorative and retributive values.155 Seldom, are they ever considered and examined outside of the existing conceptual framework used to think about justice mechanisms in transitional justice, namely using the retributive, reparative and restorative approaches.

Indeed, the Māori along with a number of other indigenous communities adopt a relational understanding of the self. The strength of Māori communities and approach to justice comes from a deep-seated sense of collective identity, which informs every aspect of living and knowing.156 Such an understanding fundamentally differs from that of a society, which views the self as a fully independent and autonomous entity.157 Clark explains that the Western legal tradition is anchored in an “understanding of events as interactions between independent objects.” With deep roots in individualism, the Western, Eurocentric justice tradition, embodied in the retributive, reparative restorative approaches, is unable to detach itself from the idea of justice used as a means of social control and punishment of individuals who violate the rule of law. It also generally

156 Tuhiai Smith, The Native and Neoliberal Down Under, 343.
“assumes that the voice of the community is the same as the voice and values of the state.”

Moreover, this liberal principle of individuation, although culturally and historically specific, serves to shape much of existing conceptions of how to carry out justice in transitional societies. Nagy, who is highly critical of what she refers to as the “global project,” accuses transitional justice of seeking to “produce subjects and truths that align with market democracy and are blind to gender and social justice.” Lundy and McGovern, who denounce international efforts for promoting “a pattern of development determined by the dominant ideology of neo-liberalism,” echo Nagy’s concern. Transitional justice, just like peacebuilding, with which it is often associated, is informed by a given “epistemic knowledge base and ontological view of the world” which influences the strategies employed and promoted in order to carry out justice.

Assuming that the restorative justice approach to justice is identical to indigenous (and in this case, Māori) approaches to justice is hugely problematic. Failing to look at justice from an indigenous perspective runs the risk of misrepresenting and re-appropriating indigenous mechanisms to fit the western individualistic brief. The Māori conception and processes of justice are “based on a different cultural orientation than the Western model.” Part of the difficulty lies in the fact that the underlying philosophy of Māori practices and approach to justice are not well understood.

Customary mechanisms and philosophies of justice have long been overlooked and under-researched in the literature on transitional justice. Mostly out of pragmatism, and in response to their growing use in post-conflict societies, transitional justice scholars have started to pay more attention to traditional justice practices and customary law. Yet, there is still very little knowledge about what they can and cannot achieve. I content that the lack of conceptual imagination of transitional justice scholars has limited their approach to these mechanisms and their ability to engage with the beliefs and conception of justice they generally embody. In my view this tendency to simply equate restorative justice and other legal and overly individualistic conceptions of justice with indigenous approaches is harmful and dangerous for it risks rendering the transitional justice scholarship homogenizing and universalizing, at the detriment of local preferences and practices.
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