Te Wetewete — The Loosing Part II

Three Traditions, One Mechanism: Whakawetewete, Te Wetekina, and the Aramaic Lord's Prayer as Witnesses to Loosing as a Clinical Category

Ruku I'Anson (June 2026)

Whakapapa of Colonisation Series — Companion Article 4

Whakarāpopototanga / Abstract

The Whakapapa of Colonisation series has established Colonisation PTSD as a clinical category, traced the mechanism of intergenerational transmission, and developed a healing arc across naming, somatic contact, metabolisation, and forward declaration. This companion paper addresses a clinical category that runs beneath that arc identified during development of Dimension Autophagy and a tool for breaking spiritual strong-holds loosing. Loosing — the deliberate, authorised undoing of binding structures in the wairua of a person — is not incidental to healing from whakapapa-pond dysfunction. It is a prerequisite for it. This paper argues that loosing constitutes a distinct clinical category, and that this claim is supported by three independent witnesses: Whakawetewete, a Mātauranga Māori spiritual cleansing practice held within appropriate transmission structures; Te Wetekina, the kaupapa Māori clinical protocol developed within Te Poutama Ora drawing on Christian spiritual authority; and Step 6 of the Aramaic Lord's Prayer as recovered by Neil Douglas-Klotz, which translates the forgiveness line as the releasing of binding cords and returning to original slender ties. These three traditions share no common origin, no shared language, and no historical contact at the point of their respective development of this practice. Their convergence on the same mechanism, the same clinical description, and in some cases the same metaphor, constitutes cross-traditional evidence that loosing is a real, named, and necessary clinical act — not a cultural preference, not a religious add-on, but a category that Mātauranga Māori held and practiced long before any of the other traditions arrived on these shores.

Keywords: *loosing, strongholds, Whakawetewete, Te Wetekina, whakapapa-pond, Aramaic Lord's Prayer, Douglas-Klotz, Mātauranga Māori, cross-traditional evidence, clinical category, wairua, intergenerational trauma*

1. Te Take / The Clinical Problem

There is a wound pattern that clinical frameworks tend to circle without naming directly. A whaiora presents with what appears to be depression, anxiety, relational dysfunction, or chronic underperformance. The standard intervention — psychoeducation, cognitive reframing, behavioural activation — produces some movement. But the movement doesn't hold. The pattern reasserts. The person returns, carrying the same configuration they carried before, wearing it more heavily each time.

Across the Whakapapa of Colonisation series, this pattern has been named as whakapapa-pond accumulation: the pooling of inherited patterning in wairua across generations. It is not simply personal history. It is the sediment of unprocessed relational, cultural, and spiritual injury passed forward through epigenetic inheritance, modelled behaviour, and the silences that surround what could not be spoken. The Poison Ivy mechanism — colonisation spreading through the whakapapa before it is noticed — describes how this accumulation operates below the threshold of conscious awareness.

Standard psychological intervention can address the surface presentation. It cannot address the binding structures that hold the whakapapa-pond in place. For that, a different clinical act is required.

That act is the ‘loosing’.

> *Loosing is not a metaphor. It is a clinical act: the deliberate, authorised undoing of binding structures in the wairua that hold inherited dysfunction in place beyond its usefulness.*

This paper does not propose loosing as a new concept. It proposes it as a named clinical category — one that three independent traditions have practised and described, and that TPO’s clinical framework integrates as a discrete intervention phase rather than an incidental element of general healing practice.

2. The Whakapapa-Pond: What Loosing Addresses

The term whakapapa-pond names the accumulation of unprocessed inherited material in the wairua of a person. It is distinct from personal trauma in that its primary source is not the individual’s own experience, but the experience carried forward through lineage — through epigenetic transmission (Yehuda et al., 2016), through modelled relational patterning (Bombay et al., 2014), and through the cultural inheritance of silenced grief, displaced identity, and severed spiritual connection.

Whakapapa-pond dysfunction presents clinically as pattern-loops that persist despite insight: the person understands the pattern, can name its origin, and cannot stop enacting it. It presents as a felt heaviness that is not proportional to current circumstances. As a kind of loyalty to suffering — as though releasing the inherited wound would be a betrayal of those who carried it before.

The binding structures that maintain the whakapapa-pond are not merely psychological. They operate at the level of the wairua — the spiritual dimension of the person — and they require a spiritual act to loose. This is not a claim that psychological intervention is irrelevant. It is a claim that psychological intervention alone cannot reach the binding layer. Wairua requires its own engagement.

This is what all three traditions in this paper independently recognised. The whakapapa-pond is held in place by something that ordinary cognitive or behavioural intervention cannot reach. Loosing is the act that reaches it.

3. The Three Witnesses

3.1 Whakawetewete — Mātauranga Māori Spiritual Cleansing

Whakawetewete is a Mātauranga Māori spiritual cleansing practice for the releasing of accumulated binding in the wairua. The word itself carries its mechanism: whaka- (to cause to become) combined with wetewete (to disentangle, unravel, undo). It is an unravelling practice, not a removal practice — the distinction matters clinically, as it acknowledges that what is being loosed was once bound for a reason, and that the loosing must be conducted with care rather than force.

Whakawetewete is held within appropriate transmission structures. The protocol is not reproduced here, in keeping with the principle that initiation knowledge requires an initiation container. What is named here is its existence as a distinct clinical category: Mātauranga Māori identified the whakapapa-pond, named the binding mechanism, and developed a kaiārahi-led loosing protocol. This knowledge was held and transmitted across generations, and it predates any of the clinical frameworks that Western psychology has developed for adjacent presentations.

> **Kaitiakitanga note**
>
> The Whakawetewete protocol is held as initiation material and is not described in this paper.
>
> Its existence as a clinical category is named as a witness to the broader argument.
>
> Kaiārahi seeking access to this knowledge are directed toward appropriate transmission pathways within te Ao Māori.

The significance of Whakawetewete as a witness is this: Mātauranga Māori did not develop this practice because it seemed theoretically coherent. It developed it because kaiārahi observed, across generations of practice, that loosing was necessary for healing — and that without it, healing stalled. This is empirical knowledge. It is held in a different epistemological container than Western clinical evidence, but it is no less empirical for that.

3.2 Te Wetekina — Loosing Within a Christian Spiritual Framework

Te Wetekina is the TPO clinical protocol for loosing strongholds. The name draws on the Greek luo and its Aramaic cognates — to loose, to release, to unbind. It operates through Christian spiritual authority: the kaiārahi invokes the name and power of Christ as the loosing agent, naming the specific binding structure, and releasing it through prayer and declaration.

Within TPO, Te Wetekina is positioned as a discrete intervention phase rather than a general spiritual practice. It is indicated when the whakapapa-pond pattern is identified as having a stronghold structure — a binding that has become self-maintaining, that persists across psychological intervention, and that presents with a spiritual weight the whaiora themselves often names. The kaiārahi requires appropriate formation before conducting Te Wetekina; it is not a technique to be applied without spiritual grounding and clinical discernment.

Te Wetekina sits at Step 6 of the TPO nine-dimension architecture — the releasing phase within the five foundation dimensions. Its placement is not arbitrary. Steps 1 through 5 establish the ground (Whakapapa, Wairua, Tuakiri, Tinana, Taha Kai) before the loosing act is possible. A person cannot effectively receive loosing without first being grounded in identity, spiritual clearing, self-becoming, embodied alignment, and sustained nourishment. Te Wetekina is the sixth movement, not the first.

3.3 The Aramaic Lord's Prayer, Step 6 — Washboqlan khaubayn

Neil Douglas-Klotz's recovery of the Lord's Prayer from its Aramaic source text reveals a prayer structured not as a series of petitions but as a nine-stage transformation journey. Each line represents a distinct movement in the pray-er's relationship with the divine and with themselves. Step 6, which the English tradition renders as "forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," is translated by Douglas-Klotz from the Aramaic Washboqlan khaubayn aykanna daph khnan shbwoqan l'khayyabayn.

The word shbwoqan in Aramaic carries both forgiveness and release. Douglas-Klotz's translation does not emphasise guilt-management but the releasing of binding cords — the ties that hold a person in patterns beyond their usefulness. His rendering speaks of "returning to original slender ties": not the elimination of relationship or consequence, but the loosing of what has become over-tight, over-binding, structural in its grip.

This is a clinical description of stronghold release. It is also a description of whakapapa-pond loosing: the binding cords that Douglas-Klotz identifies are not only personal; they extend to the person's relational and inherited field — "our debts" and "our debtors" both use the plural, suggesting a collective and intergenerational dimension to what is being loosed.

The placement of this step at position six in a nine-stage journey is consistent with Te Wetekina's placement at dimension six in the TPO architecture. In both frameworks, loosing comes after grounding and before the integration movements. It is the sixth act, not the first, and not the last.

> *"Return us to original slender ties." — Douglas-Klotz, Aramaic rendering of Matthew 6:12 This is not forgiveness theology. This is a clinical description of 'loosing' whakapapa-pond binding.*

4. The Convergence Argument

The significance of these three traditions as witnesses does not rest on any one of them alone. It rests on their convergence in the absence of shared origin.

Whakawetewete developed within te Ao Māori, transmitted across generations of Mātauranga Māori practice, without reference to Christian theology or Semitic prayer tradition. Te Wetekina developed within a Christian spiritual authority framework, drawing on Greek and Aramaic lexical roots, without reference to Mātauranga Māori protocol. The Aramaic Lord's Prayer, as recovered by Douglas-Klotz, reflects a first-century Semitic contemplative tradition that predates both the Christian formulations that produced Te Wetekina and the colonial encounter that threatened the transmission of Whakawetewete.

Three lineages. Three languages. Three cosmologies. No shared history at the point of origin, and yet each arrives at the same clinical observation: something binds in the wairua of a person. The binding is real. It requires a deliberate, authorised act to loose. Without that act, healing stalls.

In the philosophy of science, convergent validity describes the phenomenon where independent measures of the same construct produce consistent results. The convergence strengthens the claim that the construct is real rather than an artefact of one measurement approach. The same logic applies here. If only one tradition described loosing as a clinical necessity, it could be attributed to cultural preference or religious specificity. When three independent traditions — with no shared origin — describe the same mechanism in closely parallel language, the most parsimonious explanation is that they are all tracking something real about the structure of the wairua and the conditions required for its healing.

5. Normalising Without Generalising

A significant risk in cross-traditional comparative work is the collapse of distinct knowledge systems into a single generalised claim. The argument of this paper is not that Whakawetewete, Te Wetekina, and the Aramaic tradition are the same thing. They are not. They operate within different cosmologies, invoke different authorities, require different kaiārahi formation, and carry different cultural and spiritual freight. Flattening them into a single "universal loosing practice" would dishonour all three and serve none.

The argument is more precise: these three traditions are independent witnesses to the same clinical category. A clinical category, in this sense, names a real pattern of human experience that requires a specific type of intervention. Loosing — the deliberate, authorised undoing of binding structures in the wairua — is that category. Each tradition has developed its own practice within its own container for engaging that category. The container matters. The cosmology matters. The kaiārahi formation matters. None of that is erased by the convergence.

What the convergence does is normalise the category without nullifying the specificity. It provides the evidence base for saying to a whaiora, or to a kaiārahi supervisor, or to an academic reviewer: loosing is not a fringe spiritual practice or a culturally specific belief. It is a clinical reality. Mātauranga Māori held it. The Aramaic Christian tradition held it. Te Poutama Ora holds it. The three witnesses agree.

The normalising claim is this: whakapapa-pond dysfunction that has formed binding structures in the wairua requires loosing as part of its clinical resolution. This is not optional. It is not supplementary. It is a phase of treatment — and the evidence for naming it as such comes from three independent traditions spanning at least two thousand years of accumulated practice.

6. The Mātauranga Māori Priority Claim

Within this convergence, one historical fact requires explicit statement: Mātauranga Māori named and practiced loosing long before any of the other traditions arrived on these shores.

The Tohunga Suppression Act 1907 represents the colonial attempt to criminalise the transmission of Mātauranga Māori knowledge, including healing knowledge. The act did not emerge because the knowledge was ineffective. It emerged because it was effective — because tohunga was maintaining cultural and spiritual authority that the colonial project needed to disrupt to consolidate its own. The suppression is itself evidence of the knowledge's potency.

The recovery of Whakawetewete as a named clinical category within contemporary Māori healing practice is therefore not a borrowing from other traditions, not a validation-seeking exercise that requires Western or Christian corroboration, and not an innovation. It is a restoration. Mātauranga Māori held this knowledge. Colonisation interrupted its formal transmission. The transmission came through anyway — through lineage, through practice that survived suppression, through healers who maintained what they could in the face of criminalisation.

The Aramaic Lord's Prayer does not validate Whakawetewete. The convergence means something different: the Lord's Prayer — an icon whose spiritual authority is undisputed within the Christian tradition — independently confirms what Mātauranga Māori already knew. For kaiārahi who hold both a Māori identity and a Christian faith, this convergence does not require choosing between them. Both are pointing at the same clinical reality. Both are real. The

whakapapa-pond does not care which tradition loosens it, if the loosing is done with authority, care, and the appropriate formation.

> *Mātauranga Māori named and practiced loosing long before the Lord's Prayer arrived on these shores. The convergence does not grant legitimacy to Whakawetewete. It witnesses to what Māori already knew.*

7. Clinical Placement Within Te Poutama Ora

Within TPO, loosing is not a standalone intervention. It is the sixth movement in the nine-dimension architecture — preceded by grounding and followed by integration. The clinical logic of this placement is now supported by three independent traditions, each of which situates loosing at a mid-journey position rather than at the beginning or the end.

In the Aramaic Lord's Prayer, loosing appears at Step 6 of nine. In the TPO architecture, Te Wetekina sits at dimension six of nine. In both frameworks, the loosing act requires that the ground be established before it can proceed and requires that integration work follow it. The six-of-nine placement is not coincidental. It reflects a structural reality about how transformation moves through a person: identity and spiritual grounding must precede loosing, and the loosing must precede the emergence into clarity, capacity, and forward declaration.

Kaiārahi working within TPO are trained to assess for whakapapa-pond binding before proceeding with standard Dimensional Autophagy cycles. Where binding structures are present, the loosing phase is indicated before the metabolisation work of the middle cycles can proceed effectively. Te Wetekina provides the Christian-authority framework for that loosing. Whakawetewete, held within its appropriate transmission container, provides the Mātauranga Māori framework. The kaiārahi own formation, cultural grounding, and spiritual authority determine which framework is appropriate for each clinical context.

What this paper establishes is the clinical legitimacy of the loosing phase itself — not as a preference, but as a necessity. The three-witness convergence provides the evidence base. The specific practice remains held within its specific tradition. The category is established across all three.

8. He Kupu Whakakapi / Closing

The Whakapapa of Colonisation series has traced a healing arc from naming through metabolisation to forward declaration. This paper adds a layer beneath that arc: before metabolisation can proceed, binding must be loosed.

Three traditions — none were aware of the others at the point of developing this knowledge — arrived at the same clinical conclusion. The wairua can be bound. Binding in the wairua holds

the whakapapa-pond in place. The binding requires a deliberate, authorised, spiritually grounded act to loose. Without the 'loosing', healing stalls at the surface.

Mātauranga Māori knew this. Te Wetekina holds it within a Christian spiritual framework. The Aramaic Lord's Prayer speaks it in a language two thousand years old. The convergence is not proof in the scientific sense. It is the kind of evidence that kaiārahi learn to take seriously: when independent traditions, across independent histories, describe the same necessity, the necessity is real.

Ka wetewete ngā here. Ka huri ki mua.

The bindings are loosed. We turn toward what is ahead.

References

Bombay, A., Matheson, K., & Anisman, H. (2014). The intergenerational effects of Indian Residential Schools: Implications for the concept of historical trauma. Transcultural Psychiatry, 51(3), 320–338.

Douglas-Klotz, N. (1990). Prayers of the Cosmos: Meditations on the Aramaic Words of Jesus. HarperOne.

Douglas-Klotz, N. (2001). The Hidden Gospel: Decoding the Spiritual Message of the Aramaic Jesus. Quest Books.

Durie, M. (1994). Whāiora: Māori Health Development. Oxford University Press.

Herman, J. (1992). Trauma and Recovery: The Aftermath of Violence. Basic Books.

I'Anson, R. (2025–2026). Te Poutama Ora: A Nine-Dimensional Kaupapa Māori Wellness Framework. IAnTeMo.com.

I'Anson, R. (2026). Te Wetekina: Loosing Strongholds as a Distinct Clinical Category. Whakapapa of Colonisation Series Companion Paper. IAnTeMo.com.

I'Anson, R. (2026). Te Hā e Honoa Ai: The Convergent Hum Across Three Traditions of Prayer. Whakapapa of Colonisation Series Companion Paper. IAnTeMo.com.

Marsden, M. (2003). The Woven Universe: Selected Writings of Rev. Māori Marsden. Estate of Rev. Māori Marsden.

Mead, H. M. (2003). Tikanga Māori: Living by Māori Values. Huia Publishers.

Tuhiwai Smith, L. (2012). Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples (2nd ed.). Zed Books.

Walker, R. (1990). Ka Whawhai Tonu Mātou — Struggle Without End. Penguin Books.

Yehuda, R., Daskalakis, N. P., Bierer, L. M., Bader, H. N., Klengel, T., Holsboer, F., & Binder, E. B. (2016). Holocaust exposure induced intergenerational effects on FKBP5 methylation. Biological Psychiatry, 80(5), 372–380.