

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

**TE RĒRENGA O TE RĀ**

**AUTONOMY AND IDENTITY:  
MĀORI EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS**

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements  
for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy in Education

At  
Massey University  
Palmerston North  
New Zealand

**Arohia E. Durie**

**2001**

## ABSTRACT

*Te Rerenga o te Rā, Autonomy and Identity: Māori Educational Aspirations* explores the many factors that impact on Māori educational aspirations. Both historical and contemporary trends and patterns are analysed including comparative case studies of two other indigenous peoples, in order to identify the reasons why there is disjunction between educational policies and Māori aims. The first part of the thesis comprises an historical and contemporary analysis of the relationship between Māori and the State, including a comparative exploration of indigeneity. The second part comprises a critique of Māori education research and argues for an indigenous methodology for understanding the lived reality of Māori 'at school'. The third part comprises critical policy analysis and draws conclusions as to Māori educational aspirations. An extensive examination of policy, together with interviews with forty Māori men and women formed the basis of this research.

Major educational policies are reviewed alongside wider policies and politics in order to demonstrate the connections between the position of Māori within Aotearoa - New Zealand, and the likelihood of meeting educational aspirations. The use of narrative is a standard method of information transfer in a Māori cultural context and was deliberately chosen as a research method for that reason.

The stories about education from participants, about their own times at school, and about the pursuit of their own goals, add a personal element that bring life to the findings and spirit to the inferences.

There is no single factor that will predictably lead to the fulfilment of aspirations but several major conclusions have been drawn. The first is that any analysis of Māori educational performance requires a consideration of the wider policy frameworks within which educational practice is conducted. It is of limited value to assess classroom interaction without being cognisant of the context that gives shape to the practice. The thesis draws a strong link between the degree of Māori enthusiasm for education and the extent of the state's recognition of Māori in its policies and the legislation.

The second major conclusion is that socio-economic standing, while an important measure, is not by itself a sufficient indicator of Māori aspirations. Attention is drawn to the difference between attaining socio-economic parity with non-Māori and being able to live as Māori. The third is that the retention of a cultural identity is a critical determinant of Māori satisfaction and the ability to determine directions for the future is another. Both identity and autonomy are seen as significant prerequisites for the development of an education system that is aligned with Māori objectives.

## He Mihi

*Titiro ō mata ki Hikurangi maunga, ki te toka whakairo e tū ake nei  
Whakarere iho ki te riutanga o Waiapu ki ngā mātākurae o Te Tai Rawhiti  
Porourangi tipuna, Porourangi tangata!  
Whakawhiti atu ki Te Whetumatarau, ki Te Kawakawa mai Tawhiti  
Ka tau ki Hinerupe e rere rā koe Awatere ki waho rā ki pae tawhiti e!  
Ka piko atu anō rā ki Horoera ki Mātahi o te Tau  
Tākiri mai te ata ka rere ko te rā!  
Rere ana ki Te Motu o Kaiawa ki Ngā Kuri a Tarawhata  
Hōatu to kauhau tangata ki uta, pikitia ake te tīhi taumata ki Ōtiki  
Ka mārāma te titiro ki Rangiatea, ki Matarēhua – kāinga o Te Whānau a  
Tarāhauiti Tau ake rā ki Te Ahikāroa, ki Te Tipare o Niu  
E ara ki Te Roto o Kautuku, ki te manawa ora o te iwi  
E tiu koe e taku manu kōrero! Koi, koi, koia e ara e!*

Kei nga maunga kōrero, pari karangaranga puta noa te motu, tena koutou katoa. Koia tēnei ko te kupu whakamihī atu i runga i te karanga whānui o tēnei kaupapa rangahau e kīia nei ko 'Te Rerenga o te Rā'. Ko te tūmanako ia, mā ngā whakaputanga o tēnei kaupapa rangahau, e āheī ai te iwi Māori kia eketia ngā taumata teitei o te mātauranga, kia tū rangatira ai tātou katoa i roto i te Ao Mārāma.

Tēnei anō te tuku mihi atu ki nga puna kōrero, otirā ki a koutou katoa i tautokohia ai tēnei kaupapa mahi. Ko koutou anō te take i whakatīnanahia ai ngā wawata o roto i te kukū o taku manawa. Nō reira tēnā rawa atu koutou.

Ko te mātauranga hoki he ara tika hei whāinga mā tātou katoa. Ko te pūtake o ēnei kōrero he arahi i a tātou i runga i tēnei ara.

***'Ko te pae tawhiti whaia kia tata, ko te pae tata whakamaui kia tīnā'***

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While in the end this undertaking was my own, it would not have been possible without the cooperation, support, and encouragement of others.

There were many who pioneered Māori educational advancement and they have left a lasting legacy of dedication beyond the cause, absolute commitment to their pupils, and champions of the rights of learners. Their efforts are part of the heritage that gives Māori education a distinctive character.

Nā rātou i whakatakoto tēnei kaupapa. Nā rātou te kī.

I am also conscious of the scholars and researchers who have preceded me. Much of their work has been quoted in this thesis and regardless of the viewpoints advocated, I have appreciated their writings and wisdom, and the opportunity to study their work in a wide range of publications. Teachers from many persuasions, learners at primary, secondary and tertiary levels, and parents and grandparents, have similarly left their mark on this thesis. In that respect I am particularly grateful to the forty people whose stories provided the substance for chapters 8 and 9. Their recollections and keen insights have been invaluable and incredibly illuminating. Tēna koutou.

Closer to home, I wish to acknowledge my two supervisors, Professors John Codd and Richard Harker. Although their tolerance was often tested, their advice and constructive criticism was never failing and has been much appreciated. So too has the quiet support from Te Uru Māraurau, the Department of Māori and Multicultural Education at Massey University.

Finally, I am grateful to my own family, and the wider whānau, for bearing with me, and more than that, for never doubting the outcome. Tēna koutou katoa.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Abstract</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>He Kupu Mihi</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Table of Contents</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>List of Appendices</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>Glossary of Māori Terms</b>	<b>xii</b>
<b>Chapter 1 Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
Māori Educational Participation .....	1
Research Aim .....	3
Overview .....	5
The Waitangi Tribunal .....	7
Crises within Crises .....	8
Māori Political Representation .....	10
Power Shifts .....	11
State Control .....	14
The Welfare State .....	16
The Neo-liberal Reforms .....	17
Ideological Misfits .....	18
Whānau Expectations .....	22
Curriculum .....	27
Contested Knowledges .....	30
Mahi Rangahau: Research Strategies .....	33

## **PART ONE**

### **THE LEGACY OF COLONIALISM: RESISTANCE AND STRUGGLE**

<b>Chapter 2</b>	<b>Māori and the State</b>	<b>36</b>
	Establishment of the State .....	36
	The Historical Context of the Treaty .....	36
	Power and Control: Aotearoa-New Zealand as a nation state .....	43
	Māori Claims .....	47
	Principles of the Treaty .....	47
	Māori Participation in the Affairs of the Nation .....	51
	Defining the Partnership .....	52
	Role of the State .....	55
	The Welfare State .....	59
	The Minimal State .....	60
	Constitutional Arrangements .....	61
	The Bi-national State .....	62
<b>Chapter 3</b>	<b>Māori Representation and Representations of Māori</b>	<b>63</b>
	Fairness and Justice .....	63
	Constitutional Reform .....	65
	The King Movement – Māori Sovereignty .....	69
	Right Rites .....	72
	Instruments for Justice .....	77
	Equality of Representation .....	79
	Colonial Stories .....	80
	Nation Building .....	84
	Conclusion .....	85
<b>Chapter 4</b>	<b>Indigeneity</b>	<b>87</b>
	Sovereignty Claims .....	89
	Indigenous Aspirations for Autonomy .....	90

Indigeneity versus sovereignty .....	97
Doctrine .....	99
Decolonisation .....	100
Who is indigenous? .....	101
Indigenisation .....	103
International Recognition of Indigenous Rights .....	105
Educational Case Studies .....	110
Saami Experiences .....	110
Nisga'a Experiences .....	114

## **PART TWO**

### **MĀORI AT SCHOOL: VOICES FROM EXPERIENCE**

#### **Chapter 5 Re-searching Māori Education 119**

Colonialism and Research .....	119
Critical or Critique? .....	121
Research Positioning .....	128
International Comparisons .....	131
Researchers as agents of imperialism .....	136
Good Research .....	140
False Premises .....	142
Māori Standpoints .....	143
Māori Freedom Models for Māori Development .....	156
Te Hoe Nuku Roa .....	157
Cultural and Ethnic Factors .....	158
Appropriate and Appropriation .....	158
Diasporic logic .....	161

<b>Chapter 6</b>	<b>A Paradigm for Māori Research: Ngākau Māori</b>	<b>166</b>
	Methodological Considerations	
	New Perspectives .....	166
	Ngākau Māori Research .....	169
	Māori Development Research .....	171
	Iringa Korero - Narrative Research .....	173
	Analysis .....	176
	Ethicality	179
	Research Ethics Committees .....	179
	Ethical Themes .....	181
	Ngākau Māori Research and Ethicality .....	184
	The Mana Factor .....	184
	Benefiting from Research .....	186
	Forty Voices .....	187
<b>Chapter 7</b>	<b>Māori at School: Forty Voices</b>	<b>188</b>
	Stories and Narratives .....	188
	Participants .....	191
	Wāhanga Korero: Hearing the Voices .....	194
	Analysis: Tāhuhu iringa korero .....	196
	Five Themes .....	197
	Readiness for Life .....	197
	Being Māori .....	202
	Māori at Home .....	217
	Motivation .....	217
	Diminished Horizons .....	220
	Forms of Discrimination .....	223
	Catching the Tide .....	228

## PART THREE

### EDUCATIONAL POLICY AND CULTURAL IDENTITY

<b>Chapter 8</b>	<b>Policy Discourse in Māori Education</b>	<b>230</b>
	In Search of a School .....	230
	Policy Directions .....	232
	Assimilation .....	233
	Integration .....	235
	Biculturalism .....	244
	Autonomy .....	248
	Māori in Mainstream English Schools .....	251
	Policy Platforms .....	254
	Hui Taumata .....	255
	Te Urupare Rangapu .....	257
	Devolution .....	258
	Ka Awātea .....	259
	Re-centralisation .....	262
	Gaps or Spaces .....	264
	A Māori Education Authority .....	268
	The Ministry of Education .....	270
	The Broad Strategies .....	272
<b>Chapter 9</b>	<b>Māori Educational Aspirations: Contradictions and Compromises</b>	
	Context and Compromises .....	276
	Inequality .....	278
	Kāwanatanga, Kura and Kainga .....	283
	Te Reo Māori, The Māori Language .....	286
	Monocultural Ideals .....	287
	Urbanisation .....	288
	Curriculum Progress .....	294
	Māori Identity .....	298
	Māori in Education .....	299

School Administration .....	302
Reports .....	305
Teacher Education .....	308
Whānau Wellbeing .....	310
<b>Chapter 10 Education and Māori Identity: Conclusion</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>Epilogue</b>	<b>320</b>
<b>He Rārangi Whakapuakanga: References</b>	<b>324</b>

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

Appendix 2: Interview Questions

\*

## GLOSSARY OF MĀORI TERMS

Ahikaa	retention of a territorial right by continuing occupation
Ākoranga Māori	Māori learning and teaching
Āpiti hono	joining together
Hāhi	church or religion
Hapū	tribe
Hawaiki	a homeland in the Pacific; point of origin for early voyagers
He Whakapūtanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nū Tirene	the Declaration of Independence
Huarahi	road, pathway, direction
Hui	a gathering, seminar, or conference
Iwi	tribe, or people
Ka Awātea	title of a report for the Minister of Māori Affairs, signifying a new beginning
Kainga	home, village
Kapa Haka	performing arts
Kaumātua	older person, elder
Kaupapa Māori	Māori agenda; Māori focused activities
Kāwanatanga	the government
Kawenata	covenant (used to describe the Treaty of Waitangi)
Kingitanga	Māori king movement
Kō	a digging implement
Kohanga Reo	Māori language nest
Kōrero	talk, discussion
‘Ko te pae tawhiti whaia kia tata, ko te pae tata whakamaua kia tina’.	‘Seek out the distant horizons and cherish those you attain’.
Kura	School
Kura Kaupapa	Schools where Māori language and values are practiced
Mahi Rangahau	research activity

Mahinga kai	traditional food sites
Mana a iwi	the standing of a tribe
Mana Moana	tribal authority over water
Mana Motuhake	autonomy
Mana tangata	personal dignity
Mana whakahaere	rights to undertake an activity or process
Mana whenua	traditional rights over land
Marae	tribal or community gathering place
Marae ātea	ceremonial gathering place
Mātauranga Māori	Māori knowledge
Mate	sickness or death
Nga āhuatanga - noho-a-tangata	social policy
Nga Matatini Māori	Māori diversity
Ngā - Whakanekeneketanga	change over time
Ngākau Māori	a research method based on commitment to Māori
O rātou taonga katoa	all their possessions
Paihere Tangata	collectivity and common bonds
Pākehā	New Zealander of Anglo-Saxon descent
Pāngarau	mathematics
Putaiiao	science
Rangahau Māori	Māori research
Rangatiratanga	authority
Roopu Māori	a Māori group
Runanga	tribal or community council
Taha Māori	a Māori component
Takatakahi mana	disrespect for authority
Takiwā	region,district
Tangata whenua	indigenous status
Taonga	valued possession
Taonga katoa	all valued possessions
Tapu	system of prohibition
Tatai hono	joining together
Te ao Māori	the Māori world

Tēna koutou	greetings
Te reo Māori	Māori language (or tongue)
Tikanga	rules, regulations
Tino rangatiratanga	absolute authority
Tipuna	ancestor
Tupu	growth
Turangawaewae	ancestral land
Waitohu	indicator
Whakakotahi	unity
Whakamana	create pride, esteem
Whakapapa	geneology
Whakatauaki	proverb
Whānau	extended family, or a group behaving as if it were a family

# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### *Māori Educational Participation*

Māori parents are probably not any different from parents the world over. They want the best for their children. That is certainly the case in education. However, their aspirations, as well as the hopes of their children have all too often been unrealised and in the process full potential has been denied. Now it is possible to discern a Māori mood of intolerance for a system that so often leads to failure. There is also a corresponding determination to reclaim an active leadership role in education so that future generations might fare better. It is not simply about succeeding at school; it is also about succeeding as Māori.

Educational provision and subsequent educational outcomes for Māori have been the subject of numerous research reports, government reports and commissions of enquiry. Their individual findings give cause for ongoing debate in political, education and economic sectors. Where Māori are not the focus of the documents, it has become usual to include at least a cursory reference to the standing of Māori education and Māori participation in education. The state of Māori education is regularly sensationalised in the daily press and only on rare occasions is the portrayal positive.

Māori educational performance has customarily been measured against the performance of school peers who are not Māori, as if the comparison will lead to a better understanding of the Māori position. Sometimes that approach might be useful but measurement of Māori educational performance against non-Māori peers assumes that cultural identity is of little consequence and that class, or some other social or economic indicator can satisfactorily explain the differences. Moreover, there is often an implicit expectation that non Māori criteria can form an appropriate benchmark for Māori. The point of this thesis is that the more important difference is not simply between the progress of Māori and non-Māori learners, but between the states policies for Māori education and a Māori agenda for education. Māori aspirations form the

starting point and the non-attainment of those aspirations is the avenue for inquiry. What are the aspirations? Why are aspirations not realised? How can they be met? What factors are most likely to facilitate progress?

Although the Māori agenda for education is not identical to the hopes for the revitalisation of te reo Māori, Māori language, there is an important connection that provides one clear reason why the comparative approach (between Māori and non-Māori) is of limited value in education. Whereas Aotearoa-New Zealand is the Māori homeland, the reference point for being Māori, the same does not hold true for other New Zealanders. The English language will not die if it is not taught in New Zealand schools, nor will Japanese or Samoan. In other words schools in New Zealand have a capacity to endorse a Māori identity or, alternately to seriously erode it.

English and Māori are the official languages of Aotearoa-New Zealand, but only English is compulsory in schools. English values and organisational structures will not be lost if they are not perpetuated in Aotearoa-New Zealand. However, because the infrastructures of the state have evolved from those of Britain and little exists at a state level to reflect the values and structures of Māori society, the Māori position is less secure.

The story is similar in other countries where indigenous people have been subjected to colonisation and two case studies, one involving the Saami from Norway and the other the Nisga'a from Canada, are included in this thesis to highlight the global nature of the pattern. Like Māori, each of these peoples established processes for cultural survival against the encroachment and impact of western imperialism on aboriginal economies, politics and cultures. The strategic initiatives eventually established by each nation demonstrates the existence of an ongoing need for a resolution that is satisfactory to both indigenous and non-indigenous parties.

Schools have been the most potent sites of cultural assimilation for Māori and for that reason alone it would be fitting for schools to become sites of revitalisation for appropriate aspects of Māori culture. Beyond the parameters of sound educational practice, schools as agencies of the state, have a responsibility to meet the needs of Māori communities both as an exercise in goodwill towards Māori but also as partners

to the Treaty of Waitangi.<sup>1</sup> The magnitude of the rebuilding exercise for Māori is formidable, yet people are willing to take on the work to make Māori cultural communities viable once more. Schools have a contribution to make to the vision Māori have for their communities and for their future development.

The majority of research reports on Māori educational performance draw attention to the educational needs of Māori learners at school, and raise possible solutions to specified problems. Typically, solutions are focussed on the precise area of interest that generated the report, so literacy options, numeracy options, family resource options are proposed independently of the combination of factors that lead to the educational issue behind the investigations.

Reports of this nature conceal the economic and political structures and processes that have culminated in the problems. The classroom does not exist outside the historical and political climates of the wider society. A strong connection between cultural and political identity and agency, is presumed in the thesis.

Interventions derived from policies constructed out of a fragmented database leave the core of the issue unaddressed. Only in bringing the pieces together will an accurate assessment be generated. This thought lies behind the research aim generated for *Te Rerenga o te Ra*. The framework generating the thesis is the tension between colonial and indigenous, typified in Aotearoa-New Zealand in the Māori – Pakeha relationship. The research frame is located in this interface.

## ***Research Aim***

This study examines the claim that positive Māori participation in education depends upon a number of interrelated factors. A strong cultural identity, it is claimed, is an asset to a Māori child in any educational environment but the identity factor and contingent respect and support for Māori cultural identities has yet to be given full

---

<sup>1</sup> The Treaty of Waitangi will be discussed often in this thesis. It was a document of cession signed in 1840. Under the terms of the Treaty the British Crown acquired sovereignty in return for certain guarantees and an undertaking to protect Māori interests.

credence in state policies so that Māori aspirations can be realised. A positive contribution to a strong cultural identity can come from several directions, including for example, the extent to which the curriculum reflects representations of Māori knowledge; whether school ideals recognise Māori cultural values; the nature of structural arrangements for the delivery of education – are all indicative of the ways in which state policies for Māori education are synchronised - or not - with the many factors that define Māori lives. Māori participation in education should be consistent with being Māori while at school.

The central claims of this thesis are authenticated through two major sources: the national and international literature and the recollections and reported experiences of Māori participants in the study interviewed individually and in groups. Their reflections provide graphic illustrations of the lasting impacts schools have when constraints are placed on cultural values and principles, as well as language.

Positive participation in appropriate educational provision is considered to be an important means through which Māori can effect participatory rights without having to suffer cultural dispossession. What counts as positive participation is in turn dependent on a negotiated relationship between Māori and all levels of the state and the educational spectrum. It is indicative of the collective Māori position that participation in education on Māori terms has still to be negotiated with the Crown and its institutions. At its most general, it is representative Māori participation with the Crown – a meeting of leaders - at its most specific, it is individual whānau members, parents and children, who exercise participatory rights.

In formulating policies for Māori participation in education, this thesis argues that the state has been negligent in not recognising the right of Māori children to grow up as Māori. Without the right to an education that fosters and respects Māori cultural identities, the state is in breach of the Treaty of Waitangi covenant between Māori and the Crown. Māori learners and their whānau will continue to be ambivalent about state provision of education where their representatives have had no say. Māori educational participation requires evidence of Māori ownership.

## *Overview*

Appropriate provision of education for Māori has long been a vexed issue, and one that historically has involved the exclusion of Māori from the decision making process. For the most part, determining the directions for Māori education has been a prerogative of non-Māori by virtue of the majoritarian nature of the political process. Representatives are elected into Parliament and personnel are appointed to government bureaucracies. Māori have attempted to intervene in the process by asserting the need for Māori control over Māori education and submitting numerous proposals suggesting how this might be given effect. Even so, the reality for Māori communities has been that long term alienation from decision making processes and exclusion from productive participation in education has led to a great demand on the people who provide leadership for their communities to work towards the realisation of educational goals.

The long term effects of imperialism and colonisation have effectively undermined the indigenous economic, political, social and educational structures, leaving many Māori in a state not dissimilar to anomie, without a strong connection to any particular culture, Māori or otherwise. Instead, for many the only known culture is a culture of poverty, of alienation from the strength of a positive cultural identity and of exclusion from socio-economic participation as much as from participation within Māori society.

In this thesis selected state policies for Māori compulsory educational provision are examined for their potential to bring about positive structural and cultural changes for increased participation in education by Māori. Voices from Māori in the community, education and Māori organisations are examined for points of reference with the voices of the state. Solutions put in place by indigenous peoples in Norway and in North America constitute further points of reference.

In addressing the central claims of the thesis, historical events will be discussed, as well as the major reform period of the 1980's and some of the more recent developments. Key aspects of the construction of Aotearoa-New Zealand as a

modern nation state are rehearsed, setting the scene as the colonial theatre against which changes in educational provision for Māori today are reflected. Only in appreciating the manner in which the past informs the present is it possible to trace the patterns of success or exclusion that characterise Māori at school and to understand both the barriers and the positive incentives.

Appropriate educational provision for Māori learners deserves closer attention. Few Māori writers today would attempt to consider Māori educational scenarios without examining the factors leading to the current position. It is insufficient, for example, to locate Māori as being largely in the lower socio-economic income bracket and then draw conclusions attributing educational outcomes to that position. To do so would be to attribute success or the lack of it to one factor rather than to a range of historical influences. In Māori terms the loss of economic position is one loss among many, and is therefore not sufficient as a sole explanation for Māori educational disillusionment and consequent underachievement.

The thesis examines the impact of successive government policies on Māori wellbeing as reflected in strengthening cultural identity and positive educational participation. Educational participation will be assessed in terms of the multifaceted influences that combine to produce given outcomes. Learners feel some of those influences directly within the classroom and through the curriculum, but others are more indirect and more distant. *Te Rerenga o te Rā* explores the possibility that maximum gains for Māori are dependent upon effective constitutional change to bring about a bi-national state and that progress is dependent upon the re-establishment of a strong Māori economic infrastructure. Neither of these 'distant' factors can be taken for granted; nor do they seem fully achievable, since major Māori progress remains dependent upon the sanction of a state more representative of Pākehā than of Māori. Māori independence was discounted once British law became the overriding foundation for the legitimisation of rights in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

Since the inception of the 1852 Constitutional Act passed in Westminster, which effectively empowered the minority Settler population at the expense of the majority Māori population, Māori have consistently attempted to alter the nature of the relationship between Māori and the Crown though usually with little encouragement

from the state or its agencies. In the post Constitutional Act environment, the Māori population was effectively outnumbered after major government assisted immigration for new immigrants from Britain and further a-field from Europe. As a minority population, and in the face of out-dated concepts of democracy that confuse the ballot box with fairness, Māori efforts at reform have yet to reach fulfilment.

The state itself has undergone numerous changes since 1852. The most recent major restructuring was the shift, signalled in 1984, from a welfare state to a less interventionist and more market driven neo-liberal state. If the justification for the restructuring of state systems such as education was a crisis of the welfare state, it was a crisis generated by economics, a cyclical occurrence in capitalist states. The shift to neo-liberalism, with its emphasis on individual rights and freedoms, away from welfarism and the collective good, was more than a shift in economic direction. Structural adjustments were a significant part of the changes. The neo-liberal technocratic approach, commonly referred to as Rogernomics (after the Minister of Finance of the time, Roger Douglas), appealed neither to traditional Labour party supporters nor to the majority of Māori. While there was a restructuring of the state, there would not be a place in it for Māori claims to power. Calls for a further restructuring of the state in the interests of Māori generated a crisis in the legitimacy of the state, in its exercise of power and governance in respect to tangata whenua rights. The legitimacy of the state has been questioned by Māori since the 1840 signing of the Treaty of Waitangi and the restricted ratification of the three articles contained within it.

In considering a relationship with the Crown the Treaty stands as a reference point for Māori and has the potential to be applied across all areas of policy and ensuing practice. However, the significance of the Treaty to the Crown is often indeterminate and its application has been uneven.

### *The Waitangi Tribunal*

The Waitangi Tribunal, established under the 1975 Treaty of Waitangi Act, was to make recommendations on claims relating to “the practical application of the principles of the Treaty and, for that purpose, to determine its meaning and effect and

whether certain matters are inconsistent with those principles". The wording of the legislation led to debate over the establishment of principles and whether principles derived from the wording of the Treaty had greater cognisance than the Treaty itself. Another contentious issue was the limitation of the Tribunal's jurisdiction to 1975 (the year the Act was passed) with no power to address the many grievances that had been carried for generations, often since the signing of the Treaty.

It was ten years before amending legislation was passed to allow those grievances arising from the early colonial administrations and later administrations to be heard by the Tribunal. The Treaty of Waitangi Amendment Act was passed in 1985, allowing claims dating from the 1840 signing of the Treaty to be investigated. The powers of the Tribunal were limited (with two exceptions, neither of which has been actioned) to making recommendations to Government on claims but without any binding obligations on the Crown. Despite this, by 1990, the Waitangi Tribunal was overwhelmed by the number of applications for claims and its findings to date have raised issues of credibility and legitimacy in regard to government and state policy. The deliberations of the Tribunal have been measured and the decisions covered in its reports have had far reaching effects upon Māori awareness of the extent to which their collective rights have been abrogated by successive governmental administrations, confirming the stories long held by successive generations.

### *Crises within Crises*

A 1935 Labour Government introduced the modern welfare state in response to an economic and social crisis; in 1984 the disestablishment of the welfare state was commenced by the fourth Labour Government in response to another economic crisis. But crises for Māori have been generated by disequilibrium in every sphere. At its most elemental, the struggle between the state and Māori, irrespective of which government is in power, or which economic paradigm is in favour, is the struggle to survive as Māori. In this respect, the goals of the state and the goals of iwi and ropu Māori are diametrically opposed when state policies favour assimilationist positions and tangata whenua favour cultural wellbeing and greater autonomy. Where Māori seek an education that meets the dual goals of access to a quality education and affirmation of a Māori identity, the state has been ambivalent. Institutional

arrangements engendered by colonial ideologies about the 'proper place of Māori', act as a hindrance to Māori participation in social and political change though fail to stem the rising tide of insistence from communities of interest that there be change.<sup>2</sup> Initiatives in education that work to reflect the twin goals are heavily characterised by their evolution from the people rather than from any forward thinking state policy. A specifically Māori party represented in Parliament has yet to eventuate, leaving Māori interests at the mercy of government policies directed towards the interests of the dominant rather than the indigenous position.

Beyond state discourses is a further continuity, a less formal one, but one that operates just as effectively to typecast Māori negatively. Media emphasis on negative representations of Māori actively negates efforts to improve political, educational and economic conditions by restricting and controlling the public perceptions. Legislation introduced with the passing of the Race Relations Act (1971) and the Human Rights Act (1993) has eased the outright discrimination practised against Māori but not the attitudes of some sections of society.

For Māori learners in schools other than Kura Kaupapa Māori<sup>3</sup>, the reality of Māori-Pākehā relations conditions and constrains their access to success. Pākehā cultural values, attitudes and beliefs are entrenched in the organisational structure, curriculum, and teaching and learning processes of the school. Inclusions of selections of Māori knowledge in the curriculum does not address the underlying basis of the dominance of Pākehā culture and the issues of power behind this phenomenon. Any inclusions are always subject to Pākehā veto.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Apart from iwi Runanga, Trust Boards & Urban Authorities, at national level there are the Māori Congress, New Zealand Māori Council and the Māori Women's Welfare League who combine on matters of import to deliver a unified message.

<sup>3</sup> Kura Kaupapa Māori are a form of Māori medium schooling developed as a response to the rapid growth of Kohanga Reo, or early years Māori language nests. Kura Kaupapa are "schools in which the principal language of instruction is Māori and the total curriculum is based on Māori values, philosophies, principles and practices (1993:40). The first Kura Kaupapa Māori was established in 1985. Te Aho Matua is the unique philosophy which from 2000, distinguishes Kura Kaupapa Māori in legislation.

<sup>4</sup> The identification of the exercise of Pākehā power as the Pākehā veto, was coined by Koro Dewes in 1976. Te Kapunga Dewes (1976), 'The case for oral arts', in King, M. (ed) *Te Ao Hurihuri*, Wellington, Hicks Smith & Sons pp. 55-85.

Of concern is the extent to which institutions of the state and the private sector maintain and affirm the existing social and cultural relationships and the lack of any political will by governments to bring about change. However, with designated Māori electorates, Māori will continue to be elected to Parliament, even if they are very much a minority<sup>5</sup>. Without designated Māori electorates tangata whenua are reduced in their homeland, to becoming one of a number of minorities dependent upon assimilation for representation. Tangata whenua seats are one of the few ways that Māori realities can be represented by Māori.

### ***Māori Political Representation***

The 1867 Māori Representation Act that gave Māori a voice in Parliament for the first time, was not fair representation because, based on a Māori population of 56,049, (compared to the rest of the population of 171,009 and a total of 70 seats), Māori should have had at least 20 of the seats (Gold, 1992:382). The Act allowed the Settler-only Government to appease the criticism of the Aborigines Protection Society in Britain for its ill treatment of Māori and offer a token form of conciliation as recompense for its use of manipulated legislation and force to alienate Māori from tribal lands. Until 1993 and despite the growth in the Māori population, Māori continued to have no more than four seats in Parliament based on four electorates that were geographically and numerically large and often unwieldy.

A 1986 Report from the Royal Commission into the Electoral System recommended the abolition of the Māori seats, a recommendation unacceptable to Māori who, although aware of the limitations of political representation, were also mindful of the symbolic importance the designated seats provided and the need for just representation. In the event Māori opposition to the abolition of the Māori seats was heeded and the 1993 Electoral Reform Act retained separate Māori representation but altered the formula for the number of seats. In the next general election in 1996, almost 130 years after the first Māori Representation Act, the number of Māori seats

---

<sup>5</sup> In 1867 legislation was passed allowing for four Māori electorates to be formed. Although Māori made up over a quarter of the total population at that time, they had no representation in Parliament.

was increased to 5, and by 1999, to 6. The increases were made possible because the new formula was based on the number of Māori who enrolled on the Māori electoral roll. It was part of the new Mixed-Member-Proportional (MMP) electoral system that replaced First Past the Post (FPP).

In addition to those Māori elected to Parliament, under the new MMP system, Māori could also go to Parliament if they were well placed on their respective Party lists. In the new system, Members of Parliament would either be elected, or listed sufficiently high up on the party lists to take up a list seat in the House. In a coalition government, an inevitability under MMP, the potential for a small number of members of Parliament to hold the balance of power is high. Were the members of the Māori caucus <sup>6</sup> able to agree on particular directions for policy, it would be possible for policies developed by Māori and in the collective Māori interest, to generate political will and consequent implementation.

Compared to other indigenous peoples, separate Māori representation in parliament represents an advancement, the more so since the introduction of MMP and the potential for Māori to hold the balance of power. But the underlying acceptance of indigenous rights as a starting point remains equivocal both within parliament and outside.

### *Power Shifts*

The Treaty of Waitangi, signed in 1840 between Māori representatives and those of the British Crown signified a desire by Māori and the Crown to, among other things, regulate the unruly behaviour of increasing numbers of Europeans of doubtful character within Māori tribal territories. A hiatus in chiefly ability to maintain law and order had been created. For itself, the British Crown, purportedly a reluctant interventionist, took heed of the 1837 Report of the Aborigines Committee to Parliament from 'evangelical humanitarians' on protection protocols in governing a

---

<sup>6</sup> The Māori caucus is made up of all Māori in Parliament across all parties and inclusive of elected and list seat members.

British colony. The report suggested that treaties be signed between the two parties of interest before appropriation.<sup>7</sup>

An outward display of legality and morality cushioned Māori against recognition of a new form of invasion, the full import of which would only become evident once British law displaced tribal law in the governing of the country. Appealing to these motives, had gained consent for British rule of Aotearoa-New Zealand and of the Māori nations within it. Debate continues as to exactly what was ceded to the Crown by Māori and the distinctions between governance and sovereignty have been confused.<sup>8</sup> Nonetheless, The Treaty of Waitangi became the mechanism for a massive power shift from Māori to the British Crown, beginning a path of political, cultural and economic oppression for Māori (Durie, A.E.1994).

Paul Temm (1990:18), a former member of the Waitangi Tribunal, and Queens Counsel, agrees with the Māori view that the Treaty was a 'solemn contract'. He emphasises the far reaching effects of Article Two of the Treaty which "assures Māori New Zealanders that the Crown will protect all their cultural and property rights - and this is no mere protection; it is an explicit guarantee of those rights".

If the British Government had exercised its duty of protection more conscientiously, the position of Māori today could have been very different. An office of 'Protector of the Aborigines' was established in 1840 under Governor Hobson, to give effect to the duty of protection, a significant role because it would prevent Māori from being unfairly disadvantaged in any land dealings with government or settler. The position was ambiguous because, as Orange (1987:92) observes, George Clarke, the first incumbent, was not only expected to protect Māori welfare and wellbeing, he was also to be the initiator of land sales that could undermine the position. Despite the ambiguity it was unfortunate for Māori that the office was abolished by a later Governor, George Grey, a man who was responsible for the alienation from Māori of

---

<sup>7</sup> See Durie, M. H., (1998) for a fuller explanation as to the complexities of the Treaty agreement.

<sup>8</sup> The large majority of Māori signatories to the Treaty signed the Māori language version of the Treaty, where the translation of the Māori word *kāwanatanga* is governance, a lesser concession than sovereignty and all that it implies.

millions of acres of land, causing Māori to endure generations of suffering and setting the basis for the many claims to the Waitangi Tribunal heard today. Grey instead set up the office of the Commissioner for the Extinguishment of Native Title, thereby nullifying the guarantee that the British Crown undertook to protect Māori from unscrupulous dealings.

Very early on then, the history of Aotearoa - New Zealand as an emerging bicultural nation state, was flawed because the guarantee of protection for Māori cultural and property rights, as promised in the Treaty of Waitangi, was contravened, and would be time and time again. The question of rights expected to flow from the Treaty and their legitimacy, has become a major question for legal and educational debate. Neither Māori learners nor their families should need to compromise the retention of a cultural identity in order to exercise a participatory educational right; yet that remains the invidious position for the majority of Māori today. Although the Treaty of Waitangi has had a chequered history, it remains for Māori, a statement of agreement between sovereign nations that has yet to fulfil its promise. Instead of education for assimilation, educational provision should provide Māori learners with a strong basis for cultural survival as well as the opportunity to participate in education for a wider life and livelihood.

Since the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi, when British law took effect, Māori have had to struggle to retain cultural, intellectual, material and physical properties against a concerted effort by a colonial state, reinforced by individual proprietary zeal, determined to divest them of their cultural and material assets. Because Māori properties were often deemed to be under-utilised in the sense that capitalism requires a profit motive, Māori people themselves have been represented as liabilities and their assets ripe for justified appropriation. In this frame, rights to property depend on just desert in terms of ability to return a financial profit. Taken to its logical conclusion, the argument would lead to the assumption that profit rights should over ride property rights. Under the guise of a benign paternalism, Māori land was appropriated by the Crown (often on the tenuous assumption that it was of little value to Māori, even a burden) and then on-sold to new settlers.

Māori struggles to retain cultural and material rights have taken many forms, from retaliative full confrontational land wars, to poems, songs and stories written in protest at the many losses. The 1986 Report on the Te Reo Māori claim to the Waitangi Tribunal (known as the Wai 11 claim), produced a landmark finding that the Treaty of Waitangi was not only about property rights but about cultural rights also, and that the phrase in the Māori language version of Article Two of the Treaty 'taonga katoa' (treasures qualifying for Crown protection) included language. The establishment of Te Taura Whiri i te Reo Māori, the Māori Language Commission, demonstrated government acceptance of an obligation to protect cultural rights as well as property rights. The educational system is an obvious institution through which to endorse cultural rights, particularly since it has been used for the abrogation of those rights for a century and a half.

### *State Control*

A further erosion of Māori rights expected to flow from the Treaty came with the 1852 Constitution Act and this was an erosion which effectively relegated Māori to a voiceless population denied the right to vote by criteria discriminating between individual and collective rights to property. Twelve years on from the signing of the Treaty, the establishment of Aotearoa-New Zealand as a colonial state took no cognisance of the Treaty of Waitangi though in section 71 did provide for Māori districts where a limited form of Māori control could be retained.<sup>9</sup>

As observed before,

Since in 1852, most of Aotearoa-New Zealand could be classified as aboriginal districts, ...without government will to act, the section was ignored and the social order that could have evolved did not. (Durie, A.E.:1994)

Without Māori participation in government, there was little chance of a settler government giving recognition to section 71 even though it remained on the books until 1986, with the passing of a new Constitution Act.

---

<sup>9</sup> see Durie, A.E. (1994) McIntyre & Gardner (1979). Section 71 allowed for the establishment of aboriginal districts in which the laws, customs and usages of the aboriginal inhabitants shall be maintained.

As already noted when the 1852 Constitution Act was passed in Westminster, the Pākehā population was some 27,000, while the Māori population was about 57,000, but political control passed to the hands of the settler minority, a group of people whose interests were in direct opposition to those of Māori. Māori views were ignored as politicians argued that Māori either were not interested in politics or were not 'ready' to participate in Parliament. On the contrary, however, Māori were very concerned that section 71 of the New Zealand Constitution Act 1852 was being overlooked by consecutive Settler Governments and were further concerned to find whether there was any clause in the Act that would enable Māori to establish a self governing council (Agenda for Waitangi Hui, April, 1892, arranged by Heta Te Haara). The concern was not new. The lack of representation and growing dispossession was an ongoing concern.

With a Post Treaty of Waitangi shift in power, first from Māori to Westminster, then to a Settler Government, the collective European perception of Māori also changed. The change was of sufficient magnitude for one Hugh Carlton, member of the Settler Government, to feel comfortable declaring in an 1867 Parliamentary Debate on Māori Education, "it was necessary to either exterminate the Natives or to civilise them" (Parliamentary Debates, 1867:862).

Similar attitudes can be discerned from one Hon. Mr. Harris during the debates over the Māori Representation Bill. His views about Māori participation were that Māori had no rights and unless they could meet his criteria of English language, laws and social usages he could not support the Bill. He went on to say that: "if the Bill did pass, it would be probable that before next session there would be one or two if not more honourable cannibals introduced to that chamber" (ibid,106:815). These debates reflect the post Treaty attitudes towards Māori, some wishing to foster Māori participation through the extension of rights and privileges enjoyed by non-Māori, others restricting participation to those Māori who met the assimilationist criteria of middle class English language and behaviour. Whatever the view, for Māori, participation in the affairs of government and representation in Parliament were at the whim of non-Māori.

Colonial ideologies formed the basis for the establishment of the new state of Aotearoa-New Zealand, ideologies that served to reinforce the belief that European settlers were superior to indigenous Māori. The conviction was sufficient to exclude Māori from early participation in the state, and eventually to restrict Māori to minimal representation in comparison to Pākehā.

### *The Welfare State*

At the end of 1935, the first Labour Government took office and began a period of government remembered for its efforts to temper capitalism with a social conscience. The introduction of social security, of State housing and of an education system representative of an egalitarian democracy, were key platforms of the new socialist government. New Zealanders had been through a period of extreme hardship during the Depression years and the Labour Government was seen as having the foresight to bring about a more equitable system of resource sharing and a safety net of welfare services. The Government, led by Michael Joseph Savage, took to the economic policies of Maynard Keynes, and interpreted them for the New Zealand conditions. The Social Security Act of 1938 eased fears that the experiences of the depression years could return; the general populace sought assurances of economic and social security and the Labour Government provided them.

For Māori, the Welfare State was a mixed blessing. On the one hand, Māori, like the rest of the community, gained access to welfare services, health, education, housing and stable employment, but on the other, heartland communities were stripped of their people as more and more Māori, attracted by work in burgeoning industries, moved away to the towns. The price of these new services was an increasing pace of assimilation and further erosion of the Māori cultural base. The major Māori urban migration period, took place from the end of the Second World War up until the mid 1960's. A 1991 review of Māori mobility conducted by Manatu Māori (1991:4), notes that in 1926, 16% of Māori lived in urban areas, but that by 1945, this had increased to 26%, and by 1986, to 80%.

The Māori population today remains largely an urban population although strong ties to tribal homelands remain for some. The 1960 Hunn Report, gave the first major indication of the standards of living and wellbeing for Māori since the major shifts to cities began. In spite of Hunn's efforts as Secretary for Māori Affairs to guide Māori settlement in cities, one major factor was overlooked, the strong connections to family (whānau) and to tribal homelands that would remain. Hunn's policies that "pepperpotted" Māori settlement among Pākehā in moderately priced newly built housing, ignored the standard size of a Māori family and used the Pākehā norm as a guide. Māori urban housing, was overcrowded at the outset because it took little account of the average size and makeup of a Māori family.

It was not until the 1980's reform period of the fourth Labour Government that Māori were able to reconstitute tribal infrastructures in systematic way, and begin to provide again for their constituencies beyond the seemingly benign interventions of the state.

### *The Neo-liberal Reforms*

Having outlined historical antecedents, the focus for this thesis shifts to recent times.

Ideological assumptions behind government policies and schooling practices took a fresh turn in Aotearoa-New Zealand in 1984 when a newly elected Labour Government chose to follow the lead of other Western nations in the shift towards a neo-liberalist state. Dissatisfaction with the performance of market economies was widespread after the oil shocks of the 1970's and Aotearoa-New Zealand was no exception. Rather than accept that the oil shocks were attributable to the OPEC countries exercising their right to test the market in keeping with a key platform of neo-liberalism, the global capitalists, i.e. trans-national corporations, blamed the interventionist states, and big government for their losses of profit. When it hurt big business, market forces theory was suddenly found wanting but neo-liberal proponents, unwilling to concede, looked to scapegoat their opponents.

Aotearoa-New Zealand had been a welfare state since the earlier economic crisis of the 1930's. The New Right challenges to the Welfare State found support in a period of national economic crisis. Alternatives to Keynesian economic theories gained in

credibility as the overseas debt burden in Aotearoa-New Zealand rose. A measure of blame was levelled at the education system and educational reform was promoted as an essential component of the plan to improve economic and social circumstances while reducing the debt burden. Education with a social emphasis was to become subordinate to education for an economic purpose. The economic ideology behind the neo-liberal revival was driven from within by a convinced Treasury that the economic crisis evident at the conclusion of the Muldoon led government in 1984 could only be overcome in a deregulated economy. The overseas debt burden would be reduced by selling off assets belonging to the state and its people.

In summary, the Welfare State was seen as uneconomic. State intervention, it was considered, distorted the market, undermining the incentives of capital to invest, and the incentive of labour to work. The rise of social provision had encouraged a growth in the public service that the country was no longer able to afford. The state therefore, was to be “downsized” and services trimmed to meet the requirements of a less socially oriented population. Only those whose need could be proven would retain access rights to social services without having to pay. Otherwise, tax reductions were assumed to compensate citizens for payments for services used.

### *Ideological Misfits*

In the midst of these ideological changes, a 1987 Curriculum Review, although received favourably by the then Minister of Education, Russell Marshall, was out of step with the change of direction fostered by the Minister of Education, Roger Douglas, and the Treasury. A letter to the Minister of Finance from Treasury set out their criticisms of the review, particularly the need to shift from the social emphasis promoted in the review to linking education much more closely with the new market forces philosophies underpinning the reform process. The desired response was not long in coming. As Codd (1990:195) states,

Less than two months after the minister of finance, Roger Douglas, received this letter, and just prior to the general election, the Taskforce to Review Education Administration was announced. This taskforce was to be chaired by prominent businessman and supermarket magnate, Brian Picot. Its terms of reference set an agenda in which two concepts were to be central: devolution and efficiency.

After the election, Prime Minister David Lange became the new Minister of Education, replacing Russell Marshall and dispensing with the Curriculum Review that had received Marshall support. The Picot Report could not do other than recommend in keeping with its terms of reference. Clearly, the growth of Rogernomics strongly influenced by Treasury advice, required educational policies that would disrupt entrenched alliances, particularly teacher union influence on educational policy, and find a way to reduce the cost of education yet maintain credibility.

The solution, transferred into the policy *Tomorrow's Schools*, saw the devolution of responsibility to individual schools, who are now charged, through their local school Boards of Trustees, with total responsibility for management. Boards of Trustees took responsibility for school finances, development and implementation of the curriculum (within a national framework), establishment of policies to implement the schools charter and for meeting legislative requirements such as employment obligations and health and safety requirements. Schools receive funding depending on the numbers enrolled and in addition for any special characteristics that might indicate a need for supplementary funding. Schools are closely monitored across a range of criteria by the Review and Audit Agency (renamed the Education Review Office) who review schools on a regular basis. Education Review Office Reports about schools are public information and a negative report can lead, in a self fulfilling prophetic way, to a marked drop in school enrolments. Parents can doubt the quality of education their children are receiving, whether or not the judgement is warranted or overstated.

Barrington (1990) points out that levels of dissatisfaction with existing school provision were not new in 1984, indeed some of the directions recommended by the Picot Report had been signalled much earlier by the 1976 McCombs Report, *Towards Partnership*.

Serious flaws in the existing structural arrangements were claimed by that report, recommending action to improve communication and cooperation between teachers, parents and the local communities. The charges found favour with Picot and with the Government for many of the recommendations made in the Picot Report were

implemented in the government policy statement, *Tomorrow's Schools*. As with Māori dissatisfaction with educational provision, these criticisms had become so commonplace that their use by Picot and by Treasury in their 1987 *Brief to the Incoming Government*, struck a chord of recognition with communities. The underlying agenda of devolution of responsibility and fiscal restraint would not emerge until those same communities took up their responsibilities as members on a school's Board of Trustees.

Parents were to have a direct say in the school's organisation and schools would not only be the point of implementation of education decision making, they would, in contrast to perceptions of the past, also be the sites of decision making. New school Boards of Trustees would be made up largely of trustees elected from the parents of pupils at each respective school, but like the election processes at national level, Māori representation and participation was not assured. Where Māori are not successful in Board elections, the elected Board may coopt a Māori person onto the Board. There is no assurance that the coopted member has the confidence of the Māori community as sufficiently representative to carry those views forward. Instead the confidence of the Board of Trustees has been the governing factor, placing Māori representation in jeopardy.

The school system has long been the agent of a colonial assimilative ideology for Māori, so it is reasonable to assume that it is still an agent for the dissemination of government ideologies of all kinds. The extent to which dissatisfaction is most visible is likely at times of crisis or during consequent restructuring of the public sector as was the case for Aotearoa-New Zealand from 1984. New Zealanders brought up with values of collective social responsibility even at a high personal taxation cost were wooed with promises of individual benefit through lower tax rates, greater individual opportunity and merit rates of pay.

The transition from citizens with a social conscience to citizens with the capacity to make informed 'best value' choices as consumers was swift though not necessarily beneficial for communities with little experience in seeing through the rhetoric of reforms. To be successful, the reforms required the dissemination of a new ideology, one that would rationalise the shift towards privatisation of the assets of the former

Welfare state, and the ascendancy of the New Right or neo-liberalist focus on competitive individualism. Graham Smith et al have seen the New Right agenda as one that through devolution of state services and programmes, has effectively argued the state out of schooling (1991 cited in Smith, G.1997:108). By engaging in such a move, the state has at the same time, released itself from its contractual Treaty obligations (ibid). Māori foresaw this possibility and argued strongly against the sales of state assets to private companies and subsequent distancing of the state, based on the same principles, from intervention in school business at the point of delivery.

The agenda of the reforms appeared to Pākehā as a struggle between the existing social democratic position with an interventionist state, and the neo-liberal (New Right) movement with its emphasis upon a minimal state, privatisation and market forces.(Codd, J.A., 1990, Snook, I.A., 1990, Kelsey, J., 1993, Kelsey, J., 1995. James, C., 1992, Roper, B.& Rudd, C., 1993). In education, the struggle culminated in a major restructuring of educational provision as the recommendations of the Picot Taskforce were translated into policy and enacted into law in October, 1989. Hugh Lauder (1990:1) describes this as a “New Right revolution which has sought to change the relationships between the state, the economy, and civil society”, and indeed that was an accurate portrayal of the events of the time. Marshall and Peters (1990:143, 145) located the reforms within the context of “the crisis of the welfare state”, a critique that asserts the claim that the welfare state is in crisis because of competing functions of capital accumulation and democratic legitimation. Critiques of the ideological basis for the reforms have focussed on the loss of democracy insofar as maximisation of opportunities for participation and benefit are concerned. In critiquing the arguments made by the Treasury in its publication *Government Management Vol.11*, Gerald Grace saw the document as far from a neutral representation of facts for an incoming government, but instead, “a strong bid to establish a new hegemony in educational discourse and policy” (1990:30). The document, in Grace’s view, was a move to discredit the long-standing notion of education as a public good and replace it with the idea that education is a commodity that can be traded in the market-place. Codd (1993:79-81) acknowledges the press towards an educational marketplace, identifying in the move, a change in ethical position from a social justice ethic that once typified educational policy-making in New Zealand, to a utilitarian ethic that allows the maximisation of goods distribution,

despite some people getting less in the process. Behind this thinking lies the assumption, typical of this period of reform, that neo-liberal policies would result in maximisation of a resource to such an extent that this success would have flow-on benefits to those who were not recipients of the resource in the first instance. Those who benefit most from the resource create improved conditions for those who have not benefited, hence the trickle down effect promised at the early stages of the reforms.

Few voices were raised openly against the reforms or questioned how they might affect education when the focus was on the rescue of the New Zealand economy from bankruptcy. People were convinced that the reforms would deliver a healthier economy and therefore greater opportunities for qualified people. Schools had an important role to play in realising this vision. Opposition was raised by academics who predicted that privatisation and choice in education would lead to growing rather than lessening gaps between rich and poor, heightening opportunities for the successful students and relegating the rest to unemployment or poorly paid work. Ivan Snook wrote continuously during the major reform period to critique the influence of Big Business on education policy, and on the vested interests of business in seeing that schools did become “consumer driven, user pays and increasingly privatised” (1993:2).

### ***Whānau Expectations***

Long held Māori dissatisfaction with the status quo in education became part of the argument against the welfare state used by the Treasury in its 1987 *Brief to the Incoming Government*. The Hunn Report had drawn attention to discrepancies between Māori levels of school achievement and those of Pākehā a full twenty-seven years earlier and the Hunn Report was not alone. Māori representations to Government and a raft of investigations into Māori educational progress had resulted in a series of reports but little action. John Barrington had earlier noted the under representation of Māori in the sixth forms and in higher education, and foresaw the implications of such a pattern for future race relations (1966:1). In his view, the social and economic divisions between Māori and Pākehā were the result of the

interaction of a number of factors “affecting the establishment of schools and influencing the major policies and practices governing their operation” (ibid).

A National Advisory Committee on Māori Education (NACME) struggled to get attention for the reports it provided to Government. For example, the main focus of a 1970 Report was an attempt to press for bilingual education as an antidote for earlier assimilationist educational policies<sup>10</sup>. Whereas Hunn had made reference ten years earlier, to integration as the focus for Government policy, rather than assimilation, NACME had at least seen the purported change from assimilation to be more cosmetic than real and attempted to recognise the existence of Māori cultural and linguistic differences by suggesting changing teacher attitudes and modifications to the curriculum.

It is essential that the Māori child’s self image be enhanced by his knowledge that cultural differences are understood, accepted, and respected by all with whom he associates. The Committee has accordingly emphasised that steps should be taken within the education system to ensure a growing understanding of Māoritanga, including the place given by Māoris themselves to the Māori language. It is also important that Pākehās, particularly children and teachers, be made more aware of the cultural values that form an essential part of the Māori way of life in a changing society. (NACME, 1970:3)

While the committee was made up of eight Māori and nine Pākehā, it did establish a working party with greater numbers of Māori on it.

From a community viewpoint, Governments appeared to view the reports themselves as the desired outcome without commitment to changes recommended within them. A later progress report on the outcomes of the Hunn Report (1968) noted that numbers of pre-school institutions had been set up, possibly directly resulting from conclusion 6 of the Hunn Report, which said that “Kindergartens and Play Centres are needed in Māori areas”. The progress report though, did note that “unfortunately the numbers of Māori children participating has not increased as rapidly as one would

---

<sup>10</sup> The National Committee on Māori Education (NCME) was set up In 1955 under the Chairmanship of the Director General of Education, and Included Māori representation. The Advisory Committee (NACME) was set up as an Interdepartmental Interface In 1961 as a result of recommendations of the Hunn Report.

hope for” (1968:13). This pattern of seemingly good intentions but little real change typified government management of Māori education.

A 1977 Review of the Department of Māori Affairs undertaken by Kara Puketapu, included a recommendation that Māori opinion should be gauged as part of the exercise (cited in Irwin, K.1990:113). The first of such Hui, it is stated, was held in Waiwhetu in 1979, and at that Hui, Sir James Henare challenged the gathering to prioritise Te Reo Māori and find ways to support it (ibid). The next year, the idea gained impetus as a resolution was passed “for Māori Affairs to take responsibility for the organisation and implementation of Te Kohanga Reo” (1990:115). The first Kohanga Reo<sup>11</sup> was opened at Pukeatea in Wainuiomata in 1982, two years before the fourth Labour Government came to power. Just three years later, there were 416 Kohanga attended by more than 6000 children (cited in Waitangi Tribunal, 1986, *Te Reo Māori Report*, p.12). Parents who chose the Kohanga Reo option not only had to take part in the running of the Kohanga, but there was also a charge on the parents for their children’s attendance.

No responsible government could fail to notice that Māori had taken matters into their own hands in respect to educational provision through the medium of Te Reo Māori and in exactly the area cited by the Hunn Report and by the NACME 1970 Report, namely Pre-School education, that had proved to be so elusive when policies were about engaging Māori children in English language, non-Māori Pre School education. From 1982, the Kohanga Reo movement had blossomed and by the time the Labour Government was into its second term, the first Kura Kaupapa Māori were under way.<sup>12</sup>

Their impact was such that no report of the time could ignore the initiatives. For Māori, the major problems were the lack of government funding for the initiatives,

---

<sup>11</sup> Kohanga Reo were established as child care centres wherein the language of communication would be Māori only. ‘the whanau centres will provide the highest level of child care and In addition will ensure New Zealand has bilingual children at the age of five year.’ (Working paper, “Te Kohanga Reo” July 1982, p.8).

<sup>12</sup> Hoani Waititi (1986) at the Hoani Waititi Marae in West Auckland was the first Kura Kaupapa to be established.

and the multiple demands on whānau who made the commitment to Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori. There was a substantial whānau cost in time and money for participation in a non- government funded choice. In the best Kohanga, whānau members were totally committed to the use of Te Reo Māori in their homes to support the progress of the Kohanga and Kura. The commitment was made regardless of the magnitude of the task. For some parents it meant learning Te Reo Māori from their children, for others further development of language skills already present by attending classes after work in their own time. For a minority, it meant the opportunity to educate their children in their first language. The aims of the Kohanga and Kura movement were for cultural survival and revival not economic revival. Because of that emphasis they had a strong community orientation, creating strong communities around the development of each new centre.

Outside of education, economic summits were held in Wellington to examine first the general state of the economy and then specifically, Māori in the economy. It seemed appropriate that there be an equivalent for education, and in 1984 a Māori Education Development Conference was held in Ngaruawahia to look at the issues and potential solutions.

Māori and Treasury concurred over the need for schools to improve their record in the discharge of responsibilities and this concurrence was used by Treasury to support their agenda for change but not as support for a Māori agenda. Both Treasury and Māori were engaged in what Gerald Grace has referred to as an ideological manoeuvre in policy discourse:

An ideological position makes constant use of a particular form of language which it attempts to naturalise in a commonsense way. If that language is accepted, taken up and used without question, an important part of that ideological position has already been assimilated. (1990:32)

The ideological position being constructed by Māori was that education should normalise Te Reo Māori me ona Tikanga, Māori language and custom. That Māori could expect to be able to attend school to study through the medium of the Māori language should be commonsense, as taken for granted as it would be for English speaking children to attend English language medium schools. The Government

Reforms with their emphasis on choice could hardly decry the Kohanga and Kura movements when elements of the philosophy so clearly overlapped except to the extent that one was about individualism and personal benefit, the other about Māori community wellbeing and progress through cultural restoration.

For Māori, participation in general schools was guarded; professional staff were seen as experts and therefore due a measure of respect for their positions. Without a large community population, Māori election to school governance positions was sporadic rather than consistent and without representation in the decision-making arenas of the school, Māori concerns could effectively be overlooked. Over time, Māori participation in school life had improved and performance rates were growing but for whānau members there was a cultural cost to school success. Every Māori child in a general school faces the dilemma of identity retention in the face of strong assimilative forces inherent in the organisational and informal cultures of the school.

The neo-liberal reforms may have been more about preparing schools to adapt to workforce development for the needs of a newly deregulated market economy than an alleged desire to maximise community participation, particularly in respect to increasing Māori participation. Whether the reforms made any substantive difference to educational participation for Māori is debatable because Māori needs, although they formed part of the justification for the reforms, were accorded very little place in respect to the solutions reached. Three policy documents emerged as a result of a change in government emphasis: *Before Five*, in regard to pre-school children, *Tomorrow's Schools* for the Primary and Secondary sector, and *Learning for Life* for the tertiary sector. As previously stated, by the time the reforms were at implementation stage, Kohanga Reo had made its presence felt and the policy document took note of that level of demand. For the following two statements however, apart from an option to opt out of unsatisfactory school arrangements if 21 disaffected children and their families could be found, whānau needs were not the focus. Two key forums designed to provide for parents and communities to exercise their collective voice, the Parent Advocacy Council and the Community Education Forums, were disestablished, leaving people without a formal avenue for collective debate and action. Few Maori were able to take up the option to gather 21 disaffected children and their families in order to set up more suitable schooling arrangements. In

part, the choice went against Maori values because it required the designation of existing arrangements as unsatisfactory, no matter how well intended the individual schools may have been. The families did not have the right to opt out because they envisaged something more for their children that existing schools could provide, instead they had to show how existing arrangements were less than satisfactory.

Section 3.2.1 of *Tomorrow's Schools* stated that “opportunities be made available to parents who wish to have their children learn, or be educated in the Māori language” but like *Taha Māori* before it, school compliance in respect to this right, was more than uneven. The precursor to *Tomorrow's Schools* was the controversial Picot Report, *Administering for Excellence, the Report of the Taskforce to Review Education Administration (1988)*. Māori who participated in the consultations leading up to the Report, had said that they

wanted their children to be bilingual and bicultural, and as well, to have the opportunity to be educated in the Māori language, in an environment that reflects Māori values and uses Māori forms. (1988:xiii)

In the view of the authors, “it is clear that the revival of the Māori language is seen not as an end in itself, but as the key to lifting the educational performance of Māori children”. (ibid) These deliberations resulted in the Taskforce concluding that their key deliberation in regard to Māori aspirations would be the mandatory nature of the school charter, in which schools must operate according to a charter drawn up in consultation with local groups and approved by Government. *Tomorrow's Schools* went on to state that the whānau will be able to have access to and participate in education through individuals within the whānau being eligible for election to the board of trustees, and through a close partnership established when a charter is negotiated or being reported on to the community.

## ***Curriculum***

Policies for curriculum alter depending on government imperatives of the day. Writing about political control of curriculum in the United States, Apple makes the point that:

The reasons for the increasingly powerful state regulation of symbolic control are tied up both with larger patterns of differential political and economic power as well as more specific issues that arise within the educational system itself. (Apple, M. 1993:69)

Research counts as just one thread of influence among many in the process of policy making. What becomes accepted as curriculum has become a contested issue although the power of the state is paramount in the end. However, the state is not neutral and what does get to count as curriculum reflects prevailing ideologies of the time. The major curriculum policies of the reform period 1984-1999 demonstrate the close alignment of curriculum with ideologies of the state. Curriculum reform to support a competitive edge economy finds expression in the phrase 'knowledge economy' popularised at the end of the first millennium as a suitable goal for a bright New Zealand future.

Curriculum policy for Māori education in the hands of non-Māori, as history shows, has been bound up in a tension between the strong assimilating forces typifying state educational provision for the majority of Māori and a fluctuating consciousness of social justice and fairness in regard to educational provision for Māori.

The 1950's advisory committees were set up to address the vexed issue of appropriate education provision for Māori. Their responsibility was to advise the Minister of Education on matters relating to Māori education. The committees reported and during the 1960's an advisor for Māori education was appointed to the Department of Education. School publications in Te Reo Māori began to emerge and Teachers Colleges appointed Māori Studies lecturers. These emergent activities had the potential to grow into a strong policy direction for Māori education. An appointment was made to the inspectorate targeted at Māori Education and an officer of Māori Education was appointed as were district advisors. There was clearly some expectation that the appointments would be able to facilitate the implementation of policies for the benefit of Māori.

A 1970 report from NACME concluded that the curriculum should be modified to be more closely related to the needs, interests and experiences of Māori pupils in both content and method. Lack of progress in the learning of English however, was a major concern (1970:6). Te Reo Māori and English were seen to be core issues in Māori Education and therefore for curriculum policy. In the decade from 1978, when a Primary Māori

Language Syllabus Committee was set up, Ruatoki in the Tuhoe tribal heartland was approved as a bilingual primary school, not as a result of the syllabus committee so much as of a strong petition made earlier to Parliament by Tuhoe representatives. Tuhoe whānau and their leaders wanted a school that reflected the aspirations of their people and te reo Māori was to be at the core. Thus they challenged the curriculum itself, which had previously been taken -for -granted.

In 1978 Joseph Schwab wrote:

The field of curriculum is moribund. It is unable by its present methods and principles, to continue its work and contribute significantly to the advancement of education. It requires new principles ...a new view...of its problems...and new methods appropriate to the problems. (1978:287)

The Tuhoe example was but one example that for Māori the curriculum today has become a site of contestation, a struggle for the hearts and minds of each generation of learners. Instead of taking curriculum to be solely the subject matter that teachers transfer to learners and then assess the extent to which their efforts have been successful, curriculum can be understood as forming part of a larger cultural text placed within the social relational context of school (Wexler,1989:95). Once taken for granted that curriculum was a natural selection consequence of a neutral educational process, questions are now asked as to whose cultural text is favoured in official curriculum statements and for whose benefit. Freed of the hegemonic constrictions as to what ought to count as curriculum, claims over representation and voice have multiplied.

Michael Apple, in addressing individual action by curriculum scholars, notes that:

If social political and economic forces and movements have played such a large role in determining the shape of the curriculum and have provided much of the impetus behind whose knowledge is taught, then individual action by curriculum scholars is not enough. (1999:40-41)

Instead he exhorts them to join with other groups who need the knowledge of curricular debates and traditions and who wish to make schools more progressive in intent and outcome (ibid:41). Māori communities are doing that.

## *Contested Knowledges*

Inclusions of indigenous knowledge in school curricula have had a chequered history, not merely because of a distinction in western eyes between knowledges that are worthy of study and those that are folklore and deemed unworthy of a place in a school curriculum. Indigenous knowledge has not been seen as academic knowledge, as warranting therefore, a place in the school curriculum. Alongside these views is the counter that schools are not the appropriate places for the dissemination of important indigenous knowledges, that incorporation into a school curriculum represents a forfeiture of indigenous power to non-indigenous groups. Decision making power over indigenous knowledge in regard to what will be selected, how it will be taught and how it will be assessed should not become the prerogative of non-Māori. Indigenous Intellectual Property rights have become a major topic for discussion in indigenous fora. After dispossession of so many indigenous assets with the progress of colonisation, intellectual property represents the last cultural property remaining in indigenous control. The dissemination of Mātauranga Māori, Māori knowledge, faces such a dilemma. Outside of its cultural context and beyond the influence of cultural authorities, the potential for appropriation or misrepresentation grows.

Māori experiences share commonalities with those of other indigenous peoples in seeking an education for their young ones that validates their cultural background. In school, where dominant cultural standards reign, Māori like indigenous students elsewhere, experience the negative effects of absence from curriculum or worse, either of distorted representations in the curriculum or additions as unimportant afterthoughts. Assimilation has been a common indigenous experience, requiring students to give up their own culture for the implicit culture of the school and its curriculum. Māori learners are expected to participate in highly contradictory ways in situations where participation is demanded but on terms that threaten cultural identity.

One of the recommendations of the Hunn Report was that separate Māori schools be closed down and the pupils be transferred to the closest public school. It was imagined that Māori should and could be integrated into public school life and learning environments without there being any need for Public schools to prepare to

meet the needs of Māori learners. How is it that the development of policy for Māori education and the practices that follow, could be so far off meeting actual Māori needs in education? The response must be that the policies and practices have been developed to meet the needs of the state, and through the state, the needs of Pākehā in regard to Māori education to such an extent that actual Māori needs have not been the focus of policy development for Māori education at all. Instead, what stands as policy for Māori education is limited to what Government will allow, not what Māori need. The issue of 'by Māori for Māori' has become increasingly significant as a governing philosophy for Māori research and for the development of education policy that has a chance to succeed where former policies have not. For Māori, the western gaze has become the Pākehā gaze, the west as it is represented in Aotearoa-New Zealand, is Pākehā. That gaze is governed by the ideological imperatives of the day and myopically restricted. Whatever the restriction, the outcome remains one of Pākehā control over Māori initiatives, whether in education or other sectors.

The development of Māori conceptual frameworks for academic work has evolved over time as a need for the growth of an explanatory cultural text has become more urgent.<sup>13</sup>

Efforts to make sense of diverse experiences without losing the authenticity of Māori interpretation has led to a rising volume of research parameters grounded in a Māori conceptual base.<sup>14</sup> The research pathway chosen for this work is guided in the first instance, by Māori principles. It is too early to speak only of human knowledge, to deconstruct what appears as a false dichotomy between western and indigenous knowledge, for what is acceptably human has too often been measured with a western ideological yardstick. To get closer to Māori realities, research itself has to be based on instruments that have the capacity to identify and analyse genuine Māori realities rather than those constructed from the Pākehā gaze.

---

<sup>13</sup> A chapter published in Delta 42, *Mana Māori and Development* (Durie, A.E:1989), was a first attempt at contextualising theory into practice through Māori frameworks. The work sought to draw on the philosophy inherent in *whakatauaki* to produce a Māori standpoint. *Whakatauaki* are succinct statements that provide insights into values and ideals of importance in brief encompassing bytes.

<sup>14</sup> The use of *Whakapapa* as a descriptor for relationships is one form adopted, popularly the interconnections between Rangi and Papatuanuku, symbolically encompassing a lifeworld. There is also the *whakapapa* of research paradigms which is the meaning adopted for this purpose, the notion that ideas have a history, a progenitor if you like.

A Māori centred or *Ngākau Māori* investigative position has been adopted for the interpretation of theories of imperialism and colonialism as they are reflected in the Aotearoa-New Zealand experience, and internationally, indigeneity is used as an organising principle. Three further principles, the first, tino rangatiratanga, explains the theme 'by Māori for Māori', the second, apiti hono, tatai hono, applies to the emphasis on relationships and relationship building as a social and education imperative, and the third, whakapapa, relates to the connections between korero, Mātauranga and Akoranga Māori, theory and practice, past and present.

The emphasis on Māori centred research is a deliberate position and seeks to address Māori issues in education from a place grounded in Māori thought. At the same time, Māori experiences of colonisation and the on-going effects of experiences that derive from embedded colonisation practices, means that those effects must be taken into account in any research that looks at Māori education. There is a substantial literature on colonisation and imperialism, but for the most part, the indigenous experience is not the focus. Māori experiences of colonisation therefore, form another aspect of theory building for this thesis. The recent work of Linda Smith, *Decolonising Methodologies* (1999) is a major publication in this genre, and is an extension of ideas covered in her PhD thesis (1996). Earlier work by others, such as the *Hoe Nuku Roa Māori Profiles Study* (1993-2000) adopted a Māori centred approach at the outset. A relational framework of four interacting axes, was constructed to be able to conceptualise the data gathered during the research process. The framework was the basis upon which data gathered across a range of interrelated areas could be brought together into a cohesive whole. The framework had several dimensions, Paihere Tangata, Te Ao Māori, Nga Ahuatanga noho-a-tangata, and Nga Whakanekeneketanga. Generally speaking these were translated as Human Relationships, Māori Cultural Identity, Socio-economic circumstances, and Change over time. Each axis had Waitohu, or indicators which were applicable (Durie, M. H., Black, E.T., Christensen, I., Durie, A.E., Taiapa, J., Potaka, U., Fitzgerald, E., 1994, 1995). The framework was developed and presented at research seminars from 1993, but published in 1995 in the *Journal of Polynesian Studies*.

---

Fledgling and substantive efforts were made in earlier work by some members of the team and other researchers that helped inform the development of the research framework for the profiles study<sup>15</sup>. These examples are indicative of the disquiet Māori researchers felt at engaging in research that might continue to dis-empower Māori rather than benefit them. The disquiet is reflected in much of the writing from Māori in this regard. Russell Bishop and Ted Glynn (1995:37) make reference in their paper to a 1992 publication in which they describe the belittlement of Māori knowledge and culture by researchers from various disciplines. A paper for a seminar on Māori in research was written in similar vein (Durie, A. E.1993).

Over time, the disquiet has turned into the development of a legitimate research sphere appropriate to Māori and Indigenous experiences. Linda and Graham Smith have categorised this area of work as Kaupapa Māori research, as have Bishop and Glynn.(Bishop,R.&Glynn,T.1992,1999;Smith,G.H.1992,1997;Smith,L.T.1996,1999) There is still work to be done on the development of the sphere, whether it is referred to as Kaupapa Māori, Ngākau Māori or Rangahau Māori. Common to all is the attempt to centre Māori and draw on Māori thought as the basis for the work.

### ***Mahi Rangahau: Research Strategies***

Texts representative of educational initiatives or policies were studied with a view to identifying the nature of the contribution made to Māori educational progress and to the enhancement of a Māori cultural identity. Interviews were conducted with participants who could reflect on their schooling experiences in the timeframes under examination.

---

<sup>15</sup> For example, Durie, M.H. 1983, 1985, *Whare Tapa Wha*, a framework for understanding Māori health perspectives has gone on to become a classic for *Interpreting Māori Health*, and even to *Informing the Health Curriculum for Schools*. The Ideas were first presented at a Workshop In Hamilton In 1983, and then published In 1985.  
Durie, A.E., (1993). *A Māori Identification basis*  
Winiata,W., (1988) *Hapu membership position*  
Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) *Nga Pou Mana*, also about cultural Identity but as it is connected to Māori wellbeing.

The experiences of two further groups of indigenous peoples were examined for points of similarity or difference that might allow some conclusion about the effects of colonisation on indigenous identity and educational progress to be made.

At the time the fourth Labour Government embarked on its major period of reform, Māori had already begun to reform educational provision for the next generation by taking the initiative themselves. It had been a long and costly wait, but the Māori reforms were the ones that made a difference in education for Māori. Not only were they about educational outcomes, they were the opportunity for city and rural children to regain or strengthen their cultural identity at school, and reverse the process so long the schooling imperative, of assimilation into a non Māori cultural context. Changes in educational provision were one aspect of a desire to see changes in all major aspects of life, social, economic and political as well as educational and cultural. Treaty discourses grew during the same period, creating a new vision for Māori of the potential for Aotearoa-New Zealand to look more like a bi-national state. The historical antecedents of this vision are to be discussed in the next chapter.

## **PART ONE**

### **THE LEGACY OF COLONIALISM: RESISTANCE AND STRUGGLE**

## CHAPTER TWO

# MĀORI AND THE STATE

### *Establishment of the State*

For Māori the changes wrought by colonisation eventuated in a power shift of inordinate proportions from indigenous Māori to immigrant white Settler populations.<sup>16</sup> The decentralised authority of Māori communities diminished as traditional forms of social control were displaced by settler legislation and British territorial sovereignty claims. Western expansionism and British expansionism in particular was implemented through the antithetical forces of violence, slavery, conquest, theft and disease cloaked by references to ‘civilising’ and ‘christianising’ savages. Vine De Loria refers to such intent and consequent outcomes as “the aggressions of civilisation” (1984).

In Aotearoa-New Zealand, the modified form of conquest through an orchestrated Treaty agreement might have lessened the extremes of colonial impact suffered by other nations but the goals of colonisation were nonetheless achieved at the expense of Māori wellbeing and cultural identity.

Regardless of the means by which colonisation was implemented, the outcome remained the destruction of cultural and territorial integrity. Māori have lived with the consequences of changes wrought by new national and international forces from the early colonial era and the pressure of change has not eased.

### *The Historical Context of the Treaty*

New Zealand, and Canada, are distinguished by the fact that the British gained legitimate entry to settle and colonise by Treaty rather than by conquest or full invasion. The need for such an agreement meant recognition internationally of the sovereignty of Māori tribes over New Zealand. Such sovereignty had been

---

<sup>16</sup> There was a small Chinese population early on in the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand, but it was one immigrant population that was not privileged.

recognised from the time of the *Declaration of Independence* in 1835, by the United Tribes of New Zealand. The declaration was known in Māori as '*He Whakaputanga o te Rangatiratanga o Nu Tirene*', and was drawn up at the suggestion of the British Resident, James Busby, partly to thwart the plans of a Frenchman, Baron Charles de Thierry, to establish for himself, a sovereign and independent state on property purchased in the North. The Declaration was recognised by King William IV, and acknowledged by the Colonial Office (*Te Reo o Maraehinahina*, December 1995/Jan 1996, Issue 2:1). Responsibility for the translation into Māori of the document was given to the same man who would provide the controversial translation into Māori of the Treaty document some years later, the missionary Henry Williams.

The motive for a declaration had been initiated in part by the British Resident at the time, James Busby, whose efforts also extended to the adoption, in 1834, of a New Zealand flag, a symbol of nationhood. The provisions of the declaration included the right to legislate for justice, peace and commerce. The implications of such a move were profound, but in effect, it was a movement that involved a few tribes in the far north and scarcely any further south.

The move was timely despite incomplete representation, as, by 1837, a proposal to colonise New Zealand had been put to the British Colonial Office by the newly formed New Zealand Association. The Secretary of State for Colonies, Lord Glenelg, hastened to distance Britain from such a move at that time, with his statement that,

Great Britain has no legal or moral right to establish a colony in New Zealand without the free consent of the natives deliberately given without compulsion and without fraud. (Kawaharu 1989:1)

Even after later capitulation on the desirability of colonising New Zealand, recognition of the sovereignty of the Māori tribes remained and was evident in the instructions given by Lord Normanby, who had since become the British Colonial Secretary, to the Consul designate, William Hobson. He was instructed to "treat" with the Māoris and obtain their formal consent before any transfer of sovereignty could be initiated. William Hobson was also to exercise "sincerity, justice and good

faith” in carrying out his duties, and to obtain the “free and intelligent consent of the natives according to their established usages” (*Orakei Report*, 1987:137).

Two versions of the Treaty were developed, one in Māori and the other in English. As well, the English one was translated into Māori, and the Māori one into English. The Māori Treaty and the English Treaty were not identical and the differences have given rise to dispute and debate over the meaning and application of the Treaty ever since. The Treaty is today as it began, a highly political document, yet it is brief and contains only three articles as well as a preamble and a declaration.

Over five hundred chiefs signed the Māori text of the Treaty, some fifty at Waitangi in February of 1840. Only thirty-nine signed the English version, the result of an oversight by the missionary Maunsell who did not have the Māori version on hand.

In article one of the English text, Māori ceded sovereignty “absolutely and without reservation” to the Queen of England, whereas, in the Māori text it is *kawanatanga* or governance that is ceded. At the heart of this debate is the issue of power, for the assumption by the British Crown has been that it was sovereignty that was ceded. Crucial to this assumption was the right to go on to define how the new nation would decide its legal, political, economic and cultural processes. At the very least, Māori had expected to be partners in those decisions. Who would willingly totally divest themselves of the right to decide on the future shape of their nation? Yet in assuming sovereignty, the British Crown presumed that chiefs who had a history of heroic defence of their territorial control, had meekly submitted this right in Article One of the Treaty. Māori, the Crown assumed, had willingly relegated themselves to a spectator role in their own country. Debate continues over cession despite opinion such as that of Mulgan (1989) who, conscious of the passage of time, is less than optimistic about any practical possibility of restoring a situation where the Māori view of the Treaty could be fully upheld. While Mulgan may have a point, Māori maintain that the initial interpretation has resulted in compounding injustice for Māori, and that this situation is reflected in the educational, social and economic crises that Māori are in today. Unless the source of these injustices is corrected, the Māori position will remain the one that is held to ransom in order to sustain the power relationship status quo.

The primary statement of article two of the Treaty, is the Crown guarantee of the rights that Māori would retain. In the English text these are primarily property rights and authority over them. In the Māori text, according to the Kawharu translation, the rights that Māori retained are the continuation of the unqualified exercise of chieftainship over lands, settlements and all that Māori hold to be of value. Once again a major schism exists between the two versions, but undoubtedly, the majority of Māori signed the Māori language version and therefore the understandings of the powers retained in the Māori version are what gained their consent. For Māori the cultural and social fabric of tribal society was easily as significant as property rights, as they are part of the same whole. This view is borne out by the case taken nearly a hundred and fifty years later against the Crown to the Waitangi Tribunal (1986) by Huirangi Waikerepuru and Ngā Kaiwhakapumau i te Reo Māori in regard to Māori language rights. In its report on the claim, the Waitangi Tribunal found that the words in Māori of Article two of the Treaty, *o ratou taonga katoa*, did indeed include cultural properties such as language, agreeing that Article Two had wider implications than the property rights of Article Two in the English language version of the Treaty.

A proviso giving the exclusive right of pre-emption to her Majesty the Queen of England should there be any desire to sell land is also part of article two. Land and its occupation, usage and control were cornerstones of Māori cultural existence much as it is today. While the tracts of land in Māori tribal control may have seemed vast, the landscape was already named, historied and storied. There was no part of Aotearoa-New Zealand that was not within tribal boundaries. Any potential sale therefore, had to come out of a tribal estate. Yet land was not seen by Māori as a commodity, to be traded, sold or otherwise alienated from whānau, hapū or tribal use, for the landscape to Māori is inextricably linked to cultural identity. Those individuals who did engage in so called sales without the consent of the senior tribal authorities, were often coerced by land purchasing agents into signing documents that were barely understood. The role assumed by the British Crown of arbiter by virtue of having assumed sovereignty without accepting the establishment of a Māori structural equivalence, began a train of events that led to war.

In a message from Wiremu Kingi Whiti and other Ngatiawa (Te Ati Awa) chiefs to Governor Fitzroy in 1844, Wiremu Kingi had this to say:

Friend Governor, do you not love your land – England-the land of your fathers? As we also love our land at Waitara. Friend let your thoughts be good towards us. We desire not to strive with the Europeans, but, at the same time, we do not wish to have our land settled by them; rather let them be returned to the places which have been paid for by them, lest a root of a quarrel remain between us and the Europeans. (Caselberg J.,1975:56)

Wiremu Kingi was the leader of the anti-land-selling majority of Te Ati Awa and proceeded to veto an 1859 offer by one Teira, to sell the British 600 acres at Waitara. The Governor of the time, Thomas Gore Browne, proceeded with the purchase and settlement of Waitara in the face of major Te Ati Awa opposition, and war broke out in 1860 (Belich, J. 1986:76).

In article three, Māori are granted the citizenship rights and privileges of British subjects as well as the Queen's protection. This right is seen by Māori as distinct from article two rights which is about collective rights. Article three secures individual citizen rights as they are understood in the west. The individual rights granted in article three have taken precedence over the collective rights of article two in all of the colonial structures and legislative processes that have followed. While it was important that Māori be citizens of the new nation, the concept of tangata whenua, situating Māori as indigenous peoples with indigenous rights different to citizenship rights, meant that they were not in the same situation as non-citizens, who might have migrated to the new nation, in acquiring citizenship. The notion of citizenship overtook the concept of tangata whenua, an indigenous right, the goal of equal treatment of all citizens excluded the concept of tangata whenua, a core component of a Māori view of rights. Māori went from being the proprietors and landlords of the nation to becoming indistinguishable except in their growing disadvantage. In including a citizenship right, the Treaty had not necessarily been intended to be an abrogation of a human right. However, in effect this is what happened.

Article one was what was given, the debate being over whether it was sovereignty or governance that was ceded. Article two is about guarantees of retention and

protection, over *o ratou taonga katoa*, (all that they have that is treasured), and Article three, what was acquired, that is, individual citizenship rights.

Despite debate over the differences between the two versions, the Māori view of the Treaty as a *Kawenata* or covenant has not lessened, nor has Māori understanding of the relevance of its provisions to their wellbeing. Differences do arise between the understandings to be gained from such disparate texts but a guide can be taken from international protocol on the reading of Treaty texts under such circumstances, utilising the *contra-proferentum dictum* which holds that provision be construed against the party drawing up or proposing such provision. (Jackson, M. M. 1989:7).

Treaty making with indigenous people was not uncommon as an aspect of British Colonial policy. Written treaties between the British and Indian tribes in North America for example, began in the early seventeenth century, and, as Williams (1989:65) records, the volumes known as 'Hertslets Commercial Treaties' are replete with examples of treaties for peace and cession, and for peace and friendship signed by British consuls and agents with native chiefs and states.

The question of aboriginal title has been raised by both Hackshaw and McHugh (in Kawharu, 1989) in relation to the concept of common law and international law on the matter. Hackshaw (1989:97) cites H. A. Smith (Great Britain and the Law of Nations) as concluding that evidence regarding the British Government and New Zealand in this regard showed clearly that in its relations with Māori tribes, it was governed by rules of international law in which aboriginal title is considered to be a rule of common law concerned with rights of use and occupancy in lands and waters which must be considered to continue until 'extinguished' by a colonising power. Such a rule does not require statutory recognition before being enforced by the courts.

Māori too, do not see that rights which pre-existed the Treaty were necessarily extinguished. Instead, the view is that an exchange of certain rights was provided for in return for a guarantee of protection of certain others. *Tangata whenua* rights for example, have been scrupulously maintained within a Māori social context, but were assiduously ignored by the Crown and its representatives until the Waitangi Tribunal pronouncements began to be heard. Thus far, an argument that the Treaty itself

extinguishes any aboriginal rights has not been mounted to date by any of the sectors in the Treaty debate although the question is raised by Boast (1990).

Today, each of the articles of the Treaty in either language is to be seen in relation to the other in the view of the Waitangi Tribunal. Article two in particular acts as a restraint on article one.

Shortly after the Treaty of Waitangi was signed, and with British assumptions that full and unconditional sovereignty had been obtained, the 1852 Constitution Act was passed in Westminster. Not only did it pave the way for the introduction of a Settler Government, it also contained a statement in section 71:

And whereas it may be expedient that the Laws, Customs, and Usages of the aboriginal or native Inhabitants of New Zealand, so far as they are not repugnant to the general Principles of Humanity, should for the present be maintained for the Government of themselves, in all their Relations to and Dealings with each other, and that particular Districts should be set apart within which such Laws, Customs, or Usages should be so observed: It shall be lawful for Her Majesty, by any letters patent to be issued under the Great Seal of the United Kingdom, from Time to Time to make Provision for the Purposes aforesaid.... (McIntyre & Gardner, 1971:82)

It was most unlikely that a Settler Government would have the political will to implement such a clause and while Māori made several attempts to have it recognised, no action was taken and the section remained until the passing of the New Zealand Constitution Act by the New Zealand Government in 1986.

Under the 1852 Constitution Act, the criteria set to determine eligibility to participate effectively excluded Māori. Men who were owners or lessees of property over a certain value would qualify, but communal ownership was not to count. By these means, Māori, who controlled large tracts of land, were disenfranchised and kept from participation in any of the political decision making which followed, and which was to have such unjust consequences for Māori that they can never be fully redressed. Legislation punitive to Māori was a feature of successive Settler Governments.

## *Power and Control: Aotearoa-New Zealand as a nation state*

History shows that regardless of interpretation, by 1854, the British Crown passed on responsibility for its rights as the Treaty partner with Māori, to a Settler Government, a group whose interests were in direct opposition to those of Māori. Any commitment to preserve and protect Māori had disappeared as swiftly as it had emerged, renegeing on the protective role of the Crown. Without it, a measure of protection needed by Māori against the predatory actions of settlers was not only withdrawn, but settler interests were entrenched with their monopoly on political and representation rights. The outcome of the Crown devolution was, not unexpectedly, a raft of legislation passed by the Settler government favouring themselves and working against the culturally defined person and property rights of Māori.

Māori tribal structures utilise rangatiratanga as one of the main organising concepts. This weaves social position into identification with and authority over particular territories and communities. Mana, another highly charged word, although not used by Williams to translate meanings of the Treaty, was used by chiefs present at the later (1860) Kohimarama Conference, where, in the light of growing dispossession, Māori leadership once again debated their Treaty position. Claudia Orange (1987:149) makes reference to the different ways that mana was interpreted during conference discussions, and concludes that Māori mana had been guaranteed by the Treaty. This gathering reaffirmed the Māori view of the Treaty as a Kawenata to be honoured and gathered in the support of the majority of Māori, including those who had not signed the Treaty. Orange goes on to say that the Government was not entirely satisfied with the conference for it did not give the government leave to acquire the large tracts of land remaining in Māori control.

The 1860's saw the outbreak of wars between the Crown and Māori over rights to the land. Historians such as James Belich (1986:77-78), now portray those wars as being deliberately set up by the Crown representatives of the time, so that, once forced into war, Māori could be treated as traitors and their properties confiscated if they resisted the British Army as indeed subsequently happened in the Waikato, and less so in

Taranaki. Belich argues that the seizure of land was not the main British political and military objective. In his view the issue was not mono-causal. Belich expands Alan Ward's view that the New Zealand Governors were:

... beset by a fatal tendency to believe that the Queen's government must be demonstrably exercised over all those who, since the Treaty of Waitangi, had been regarded as British subjects (1967, cited in Belich, J. 1986:78).

Belich raises the question of substantive sovereignty, a need by settlers and governors alike to "make the Māori in reality what by a legal fiction they have long been in name, British subjects." (Taranaki Herald, 4 July, 1863, cited in Belich, 1986:80) While Māori remained in charge of their tribal lands, British control was restricted, and the land 'sales' could serve at least a dual purpose, acquisition of property for on-sale to new settlers, and subjugation of independent Māori.

The Treaty of Waitangi allowed for three further stages of colonisation to take full effect: unfettered political, economic and cultural colonisation. In the hands of a Settler Government, all three formed the basis for government policy. Māori were subjected to the full force of colonial ideologies promoted by the state, aware that limited choices were available, as Liam O'Dowd observed in regard to Memmi's work on Tunisia (1990), assimilation or revolt. Maori had expected a third way, a power sharing arrangement as inferred by the Treaty of Waitangi. Without evidence of any implementation of the Treaty agreement in Māori interests, the legitimacy of the colonial order was inevitably challenged by Māori and seen as an instrument of imperialism.

Wi Tako Ngatata wrote the following to Edward Jerningham Wakefield in 1844, by which time the agreements of the Treaty of Waitangi were already receding into history in the minds of Pakeha administrators:

I ask you Pakehas, what did the Queen tell you? Did she say to you, 'Go to New Zealand and fraudulently take away the land of the natives?'. You say no. Then why do you encroach upon lands that have not been fairly purchased? (excerpt from: Caselberg, J. 1975:58)

Appropriation of Māori lands and unscrupulous land 'sales' provoked retaliation from Māori. Retribution for Māori defence of their lands came in the form of confiscations

on a large scale, a loss of some 3.25 million acres in the North Island, an unjust alienation that much later became the subject of grievance claims against the Crown. The land was not only the source of Māori livelihood, it gave substance to individual and collective cultural identities. Depletion of the land resource was a cultural loss of major proportions, assault on land ownership paralleled assault on cultural identity and wellbeing. Colonisation put all that was significant to Māori at risk, the population base, the cultural base, the economic base and the political base<sup>17</sup> and for that Māori were to be grateful. Colonisation had a logic of its own, a hegemony that hid from its perpetrators the enormity of their actions under the canvas of civilising missions.

By 1877, the invasions and revolts that were the Land Wars were coming to an end and few communities in the North Island had been left untouched by the death and destruction of war. Māori sought opportunities to return to a level of entrepreneurial life experienced in the Pre Land War period, for opportunities to re-establish their communities. Education appeared to offer Māori a chance for their children to benefit from the strengths of a former foe. At the same time, colonial administrators saw merit in extending access to schooling for Māori, as a means of domesticating an otherwise potential foe.

The pathway to the establishment of a colonial state arose directly from the agreements inherent in the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi, reaching realisation with the 1852 Constitution Act. In the intervening period, it could have been possible, given the tenets of the Treaty, to have established a bi-national state, but such thinking was premature. It became clear that the Treaty making process was about legitimating and privileging the Pakeha position in Aotearoa-New Zealand at the expense of Māori. Expectations of fairness in terms of representation in the embryonic state for Māori were soon dispelled. By the time the Kohimarama Conference was held, the virtues of the Treaty were being seen more clearly by Māori, as their state of dispossession grew.

---

<sup>17</sup> specifically whānau and hapū members, cultural identity, authority and leadership, sources of livelihood and wellbeing, and the economic base, lands, forests and fisheries.

In the intervening twelve-year period between the Treaty and the Constitution Act, the country was a Crown colony with a Governor as leader. Hobson was commissioned as Governor in late 1840, a position he held until his death in 1842. He was succeeded by Robert Fitzroy from 1843 and then George Grey in 1845, but it was Hobson who had been responsible for establishing the machinery of state. (Orange,C.1987:92) After 1845, with George Grey as Governor, protection as envisaged by the Colonial Office implying a brokering role between Māori and Settlers, did not go far enough. Instead, according to Renwick (1992:61) under Grey's direction, "amalgamation succeeded protection as a humanitarian orthodoxy". Unable to grasp the scope of already proven Māori abilities as traders, gardeners, navigators and seafarers, Grey wrote patronisingly that Māoris:

..are fond of agriculture, take great pleasure in cattle and horses, like the sea and form good sailors, are attached to Europeans, admire their customs and manners; are extremely ambitious of rising in civilisation and of becoming skilled in European arts; they are apt at learning; in many respects extremely conscientious and observant of their word... (1850, GBPP:191)

Grey was referring to a people whose navigational feats had brought them thousands of miles across the Pacific in the past, and who had made return journeys to Hawaiki from Aotearoa-New Zealand as people who 'like the sea and form good sailors.' Such an understatement reflects the clearly discernable construction of colonial superiority as carried in the heads and seen in the actions of its emissaries.

Early statements, such as the preamble to the 1844 Native Trust Ordinance, make the point even more clearly:

...in undertaking the colonisation of New Zealand, Her Majesty's Government have recognised the duty of endeavouring by all practical means to avert the like disasters from the native people of these islands, an objective which may best be attained by assimilating as speedily as possible the habits and usages of the native to those of the European population...

Grey's arrival hastened the implementation of policies of assimilation, fostering as he did, his own views as based on a principle of amalgamation. The principle was not without its critics, although major objections were more about Māori and European

being educated together than Māori being taught to read and speak in English or contributing towards the building of a nation.

### *Māori Claims*

There are no mechanisms in place for Māori to place any kind of sanction on the power of Government or the State, therefore the State cannot be made accountable for actions or inaction except by the ballot box which, as discussed in Chapter one, is an ineffective mechanism for protecting the interests of a permanent minority. Were the Treaty to have been part of the enacted Law of New Zealand, the experiences may well have been very different. In the opinion of Brookfield,

The Treaty ought to have been part of the colonial Constitution created and protected by the New Zealand Constitution Act, 1852. What was not done then should be done now...the piecemeal giving effect to the Treaty does not put it in its proper place at the basis of the Constitution. (1989:16)

Māori made numerous attempts to have the status of the Treaty determined, to have it ratified if that was what was necessary for Māori interests agreed to in the Treaty to be protected. The first visit to Queen Victoria was made in 1863, when Paratene te Manu and representatives from five tribes expressed their concern to the Queen. Three further groups would visit over the next fifty years, carrying the concerns of Māori over the lack of recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi. Up to 40,000 Māori at any one time have petitioned Parliament seeking ratification of the Treaty of Waitangi but to no avail (Rata, M. 1984:26). Without the promised protection by the Crown, or the entrenchment of the Treaty in the Constitution, Māori have been subjected to legislation that has served to move them to the periphery of the nation's structures.

### *Principles of the Treaty*

The introduction of the idea that principles could be extrapolated from the Treaty of Waitangi has allowed it to have a much broader application than was possible when the provisions were considered on their own. As principles have been progressively identified, Māori views of the Treaty have received greater recognition. The Waitangi Tribunal has a statutory role to identify principles for each claim under consideration,

but others, including the Court of Appeal have also considered Treaty principles. While there is no exhaustive list of principles, three recurring principles are partnership, active protection and tribal rangatiratanga. The Royal Commission on Social Policy (1988) also developed a set of principles to guide it in policy development, notably partnership, protection and participation. The Commission noted that there was no definitive agreement as to what the principles might be, but sees the three – partnership, protection and participation, as crucial to an understanding of the impact of the Treaty of Waitangi on social policy (ibid:49).

The Royal Commission on Social Policy identified the Māori partner as all Māori, represented by tribes and all individual Māori. The New Zealand Māori Council considered power sharing and decision-making as cornerstones of partnership, but the interpretations of partnership have varied. The Treasury, for example, as cited by the Royal Commission, qualified the claims to power sharing and partnership, by stating that the Treaty is silent in respect of employment, incomes and economic development (RCSP.:55). Protection is seen as a broad responsibility, so that “a just society is one that protects its members”.

Claims put to the Waitangi Tribunal have allowed some interpretation of protection, particularly of the forests, lands and fisheries, but the Commission considered that protection included physical protection, and any failure by the Crown to provide protection was contrary to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. A ‘principles’ approach to the development of social policy therefore, has consequences for the development and implementation of policy as well as subsequent review of policy outcomes.

The relationships are more readily drawn between social policies and the Treaty when principles can be taken into account. There is some objection to this approach. Jackson for example, in preparing a discussion paper for the Runanga Matua<sup>18</sup> on the 1989 Draft Education Bill, advised reference to the provisions rather than the principles of the Treaty. Behind this concern is the potential for principles to modify

---

<sup>18</sup> The Runanga Matua was an advisory body set up by the Minister of Education to advise on the Implementation of the Education reforms.

the meaning and intent of the actual Treaty over time so that the significance of the Treaty wording can be lost.

Reference to the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi is not a new approach. Mention of them is documented as having been made as early as 1882 when a deputation of chiefs sought an audience with the Queen of England to present a petition over grievances under the Treaty, saying:

...these matters which weigh heavily upon us are in opposition to the great and excellent principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. (Royal Commission on Social Policy, 1988:47)

Despite continued rejection of a series of Māori deputations to Britain to seek redress for ongoing breaches of the Treaty, their expectations of it and of those with whom the agreement had been made, did not cease. Māori persistence and patience over more than a century received some small reward when, at the instigation of the then Minister of Māori Affairs Matiu Rata, The Treaty of Waitangi Act was passed on the tenth of October, 1975. The Act provides for the observance and confirmation of the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi, and further, that a Tribunal be established to make recommendations on claims relating to the practical application of the principles of the Treaty, and, for that purpose, to determine its meaning and effect, and whether certain matters are inconsistent with those principles (Treaty of Waitangi Act, 1975).

From inauspicious beginnings, the Tribunal began to deliberate on matters long held in abeyance and now brought before it hopefully by Māori groups, until, after four 'cornerstone decisions', Paul Temm, Q.C. was later to write,

In one sense it is the humblest judicial body in the country. It has no power to decide anything, but in another sense, especially in Māoridom, the Waitangi Tribunal has a whisper that echoes like a thunderclap. (Temm, 1990)

The Tribunal was also required to take account of both the English and the Māori texts of the Treaty, allowing the Māori text into the national legal, political and ethical arena for the first time.

The Tribunal came to see its role as determining the principles of the Treaty to provide the foundation for a developing social contract. (Orakei Report, 1987). It was also to take upon itself the need to consider the spirit of the Treaty when establishing principles, a move in keeping with a judgement of the Privy Council in *Minister of Home Affairs v. Fisher* (1980) where generous interpretation was recommended to avoid “the austerity of tabulated legalism”. Principles subscribed to by the Tribunal include partnership, active protection and tribal rangatiratanga.

Other parties with an interest in the Treaty negotiation have also engaged in extrapolating principles from the Treaty. The fourth Labour Government established a series of five principles that would guide its actions when dealing with Treaty issues, claiming that the principles were consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi and with observations made by the Courts and the Waitangi Tribunal (Lange, D. undated, probably 1990).

Missing from the Tribunal’s principles is any reference to an obligation to provide active protection in spite of this being one of the most clearly stated intentions of the Treaty. Instead, principle two, the Rangatiratanga principle - The Principle of Self Management, observes that the Court of Appeal has stated that the duty of the Crown is not merely passive but extends to active protection. However, the Government qualifies this by interpreting it as the active protection of taonga. By referring to self - management rather than self-determination or self-governance, the status quo is maintained for the Government. A National Government came to power in 1990 and the set of principles disappeared from use. Of the five, the principle of Redress heralded the implementation of direct negotiation with Treaty claimants for the hearing of grievances, bypassing the Tribunal process and hastening the outcome. Direct negotiation with the Crown is now managed by the Office of Treaty Settlements.

In one sense, the welfare state can be seen as an attempt to provide forms of active protection for all of its citizens, but in a time of neo-liberalism with a concentrated reduction in the role of the state in the wellbeing of its citizens, active protection is not a concept that sits well with the neoliberal thrust towards a minimal state. For Māori, active protection is not only about access to health, housing and education services. It is also about protection for the right to live as Māori with cultural

priorities and possessions being afforded support against erosion and usurpation. Cultural protection distinguishes the Treaty component of protection from the citizenship and human rights component of state obligation.

The Treaty has a particular place in Māori claims to address issues of structural power, the possibilities for redistribution of power, and the Māori claim to be equal partners because of the Treaty, in the nation's structures including education. Such a claim seeks to ameliorate the marginalisation brought upon Māori by the simple majoritarian electoral system that put Māori, in de Tocqueville's terms, at the mercy of the tyranny of the majority.

### *Māori Participation in the Affairs of the Nation*

Māori remained politically powerless at a national level after eligibility to vote was restricted in constitutional legislation, to men who either owned property in their own name, or rented property over the value of ten pounds. Few Māori could meet such criteria because of the collective nature of land rights. A Māori Representation Bill was passed in 1867 and resulted in four Māori electorates established across the country, allowing Māori a voice in the Parliament despite opposition to Māori representation. A Southern member had supported the Bill, saying that he was satisfied that it would have the effect of convincing the Natives that they were in earnest in doing what they had always professed a desire to do - give the Natives the same rights and privileges as they themselves enjoyed (Parliamentary Debates, Vol 1 - 106:815).

A contrary view was expressed by the Hon. Mr. Harris, who first praised the measures undertaken by Government towards the social improvement and education of the Natives but did not support the Bill saying that:

When the time came that the Natives were qualified by education and a knowledge of the English language, laws, and social usages, he would be one of the first to recognise their right to the franchise, but until that time came he would raise his voice against admitting them to a participation in privileges which they could not properly value, and to which at present they had no right. (ibid)

Whether in support or against the Bill, the debates demonstrate the explicit colonial belief about European superiority underlining the difficulties for Māori in regaining a political and economic voice in Aotearoa-New Zealand after 1854 when the 1852 Constitution Act led to the establishment of the first Settler Government.

A small measure of representation was accorded Māori after the 1867 Representation Act when four Māori electorates were formed, reflecting the four compass points, East, West, North and South. It was a token gesture at the time, as on the basis of Māori population, fifteen seats would have been appropriate. Any population advantage held by Māori however, was soon lost after policies to introduce large scale British immigration were put in place.

Equality and basic human rights are not restricted to delivery by Treaty to those at a disadvantage either, but the disadvantage itself in a society wishing to be called civilised, warrants action to redress such imbalance.

### *Defining the Partnership*

Whatarangi Winiata (1985) has proposed an alternative constitutional arrangement based on the Treaty. A senate is envisaged, comprising ten Māori members and ten non-Māori members. It would act as a sanctioning body by ensuring that all legislation which is to go to the Governor General for royal assent is consistent with the Treaty of Waitangi. In addition it would reconcile the legislation coming forward from two legislative bodies, the chamber of Māori representatives with fifteen members, and a general chamber with approximately eighty five members.

Underpinning the proposed model is the acceptance that the Treaty partners were the founders of the modern nation, and Māori are therefore not in the same constitutional position as other ethnic minorities.

The proposal has been raised for discussion at a range of venues, including National Maori Congress, the Synod of the Anglican Church, and most recently, at the 'Building the Constitution' conference in April, 2000 in Wellington.

On January 1, 1995, a Hui was held at Hirangi, convened by Sir Hepi Te Heu Heu, to discuss Government proposals for the Settlement of Treaty of Waitangi claims. One of the outcomes was a resolution to the effect that:

Sir Hepi Te Heuheu with the support of iwi continue the initiatives he has started and work towards ensuring that Government promote constitutional arrangements which guarantee Māori tangata whenua status and all the contingent rights of self determination articulated in tino rangatiratanga.

Mason Durie went on to discuss principles to be taken into account for the development of tino rangatiratanga into the next century. The first of these was *Nga Matatini Māori* - the principle of Māori diversity, a principle acknowledging the diversity of Māori realities. At least three were identified, first, those closely linked to conservative Māori networks such as marae, iwi and hapū. Second, those aligned more closely to other Māori institutions such as Kohanga Reo, Hahi, Kapa Haka and similar, but with no significant links with iwi. Third, those who might be alienated from Māori networks and Māori society but who also rightfully claim to be Māori.

The next principle, *Whakakotahi* - was the principle of Māori unity. An identification of the potential for solidarity based on a shared sense of belonging and a common destiny. The observation was made that: "To date the full implications of Māori solidarity have not been realised, partly because there has been no mechanism to bring disparate factions together" (Durie, M.H.1995:2).

The third principle was *Mana Motuhake Māori*- the principle of autonomy and control. Here recognition is made of the fulfilment of mana motuhake, which would mean that Māori should be able to determine their own futures, control their own resources and develop their own political structures.

In 1994, the notion of tino rangatiratanga as a theory of state (Durie, A.E.:103) served to highlight the explanatory power of the concept. The association of a fair measure of political and economic power and control it is suggested, would lead to an improvement in the wellbeing of Māori with the establishment of processes and structures which reflect the exercise of tino rangatiratanga. Māori control and

authority and restoration of a Māori economic base is considered to be essential if the disparities between Māori and non-Māori are to be overcome. However, tino rangatiratanga does not mean gain at the expense of the ability to sustain a Māori identity.

The evolution of a Tino Rangatiratanga theory of state has reached the stage where the issue is now one of translation into practice. Māori are seeking confirmation of their Treaty based constitutional position and this was evident in the presentations of all the Māori speakers at the Constitutional conference held at Parliament early in 2000. Confirmation of the constitutional position would incorporate the principles as articulated by Mason Durie (1995) including the principle of self-determination and the right to development. It takes account of the increasing calls from Māori for such recognition, a unity of voice evident most clearly from 1984 and the Hui Taumata held in Wellington to discuss Māori economic development. Instead of taking such a narrow focus, the discussions ranged around all of the factors affecting Māori wellbeing. Social and economic development were being subsumed into the one phrase, Tino Rangatiratanga.

The Treaty of Waitangi was seen as crucial to the exercise by Māori of a greater degree of control over policies and services for Māori. Although the Crown had not been explicit about the relevance of the Treaty to social policies, the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1986-88), would take the Treaty basis further by emphasising that the Treaty was not only about physical resources such as land and fisheries, but was also about people and their social wellbeing. Government departments gradually developed Treaty approaches to social policy, though there was often little consistency and much depended on the interpretation of Treaty principles, especially those recommended by the Royal Commission on Social Policy - partnership, protection, participation.

Tino Rangatiratanga has broad acceptance as reflecting the constitutional rights of Māori for a number of reasons. First in relation to the concepts expressed in the 1835 Declaration of Independence and guaranteed to Māori in Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi. The English translation of the words and of the meaning does not have universal agreement. Possibly more important than finding a direct translation is locating the concept in its contemporary relevance and application. Quite apart from the exercise of authority over the development and control over resources which are

owned by Māori, tino rangatiratanga has been about the exercise of obligations and responsibilities as well. Where there is agreement to the exercise of authority, it comes with responsibilities and obligations. Tino rangatiratanga is also about preparation for the future, the ability to determine policies, to assume responsibility for affairs, and to plan for future generations.

### ***Role of the State***

The state in Aotearoa-New Zealand, as mentioned earlier, can be referred to as a colonial state. Definitions of the state should take into account more than the legislation pertaining to its authority since it operates in large part within prevailing ideologies of its power holders. In a legal sense, the colonial state finally disappeared after the passing of the 1986 New Zealand Constitution Act, sponsored in the House by Deputy Prime Minister Geoffrey Palmer.

Until that time, remnants of the 1852 Constitution Act remained on the books with the potential to be activated, at least in theory (in practice, Britain had long since abandoned any claim to interfere in New Zealand's policies). Once the first Settler Government took power, Aotearoa-New Zealand shifted from its earlier position as a Crown colony to being a Self Governing colony. The Crown delegated its responsibilities, including those pertaining to recognition of the Treaty of Waitangi, to a Settler Government elected by settler populations.

In 1903 the status changed again as New Zealand became a Dominion, a status that remained until 1946 when finally, some years after Canada and Australia had adopted the Statute of Westminster, New Zealand followed suit. Britain was no longer available to intervene in policy, and New Zealanders were no longer British subjects. Even so, however, the Privy Council remains an avenue of appeal used by New Zealanders in a search for justice when the nature of a small polity appears to preclude such fairness. Overall, the trend has been away from Britain and towards ultimate independence. At this point in time, both Australia and New Zealand have raised the possibility of moving from being monarchic states to becoming republics.

The state in Aotearoa- New Zealand can be defined as the set of political institutions at national, regional and local levels and the functions that those institutions perform (Durie,A.E.,1993:23). It is also a structure of institutionalised power comprising the legislative, executive and judicial institutions of government, an organisation of political and legal power. In my view, the state, in the legislation that it passes and the policies that it implements, reflects at any one time, particular ideological positions. The fact that the state in Aotearoa-New Zealand may be defined as a capitalist state, a democratic state, a welfare state all at the same time, means that ideological positions can be masked or appear to have been overtaken or reformed but without clear state accountability to Māori. Marxist arguments are helpful here in interrogating the role of the state.

Marxist writers attribute a relationship between class and state, claiming that there is a ruling class which owns and controls the means of production, infiltrating, as it were, the key representative positions of the state, leading Miliband (1969:128-9) to conclude that “the state apparatus is a crucially important and committed element in the maintenance and defence of the structure of power and privilege inherent in advanced capitalism”.

Against this view, Poulantzas considers a more important issue to be the relationship between the capitalist state and capitalist production (1973:331-40). To Offe (1984) the state has an interest of its own beyond the claims of Miliband and Poulantzas, for it is in the state’s self interest to foster the accumulation of capital from taxation and finance which allows it to sustain its functions. This interest is not the result of a class alliance or the power of vested interests but the need to maintain a balance between the dependence upon the accumulation process for the benefit of the state, the counter interests of private accumulation and the perception of the state as neutral. Hence, the state must maintain electoral support (legitimation) while supporting capital accumulation.

Of course Marxist arguments are interrogating the influence of capitalism in the state, attributing the maintenance of existing structures of power to an overt alliance between the state and captains of industry in the interests of both. Wealth appears to

beget political influence and political institutions appear to have major obligations to support capitalist concerns.

Although the ideological potential for capitalism may be able to be attributed in part to a Judeo-Christian work ethic, it metamorphised into much more than that in a colonialism built upon slavery and pillage combined with the Christian message. To the proponents of colonialism European nations displayed a progressiveness, a level of civilisation not found outside the Christian faith (Blaut,1993:61). Colonial expansionism is portrayed as an epic adventure, brave adventurers seeking to expand the boundaries of Christendom, to civilise savages or bring health, wealth and eternal life to the non-European where ever they were, at great risk to the bearers of these good tidings.

Once on foreign soil, adventurers became missionaries or settlers or pioneers or governors or teachers engaged in subverting the rights of the indigenous for national glory, Christian duty, or personal gain. In part, the saga has a basis in fact, good did come out of the works of some, but at the same time, the assertion of biological arguments about the superiority of those of European stock, formed the basis of classical racism. In Blaut's view, the rise of science also meant the rise of racist scientists, but he concludes that: "racism emerged from pre scientific roots and survived as long as it was useful, science or no science" (ibid:62).

Part of the role of a colonial state, it would appear, was to maintain an underlying belief in the superiority of European people through entrenching the values, attitudes and practices derived from European cultures in the mechanisms of the state. Blaut describes Max Weber, the father of modern bureaucracy, as a moderate racist, dispelling alternative rationalities as irrational while sustaining the view of European rationality as superior. For Māori, with a tenuous hold on parliamentary representation through the four Māori seats, participation in deciding the affairs of the state was always dependent upon non-Māori support but it fell to those in the four Māori seats to find a place in those affairs of state for Māori concerns to be raised, if not addressed.

Tino Rangatiratanga as a theory of state drawn from Māori rationalities, has sustained Māori hope for active partnership in the affairs of state, at least since the 1860

Kohimarama Conference, when those Māori who had been somewhat reticent about the Treaty, began to see it as an exercise in Tino Rangatiratanga. The issue remains one of translation into practice. Māori are seeking confirmation of their Treaty based constitutional position and this was evident in the presentations of all the Māori speakers at the Constitutional conference held at Parliament early in 2000. Confirmation of the constitutional position would incorporate the principle of self-determination and the right to development. It takes account of the increasing calls from Māori for such recognition, a unity of voice evident most clearly from 1984 and the Hui Taumata held in Wellington to discuss Māori economic development. Instead of taking a narrow focus, the discussions ranged around all of the factors affecting Māori wellbeing. Social and economic development was subsumed into the one phrase, Tino Rangatiratanga.

The Treaty of Waitangi was seen as crucial to the exercise by Māori of a greater degree of control over policies and services for Māori. Although the Crown had not been explicit about the relevance of the Treaty to social policies, the Royal Commission on Social Policy (1986-88), would take the Treaty basis further by emphasising that the Treaty was not only about physical resources such as land and fisheries, but was also about people and their social wellbeing. Government departments gradually developed Treaty approaches to social policy, though there was often little consistency and much depended on the interpretation of Treaty principles, especially those recommended by the Royal Commission - partnership, protection, participation.

Tino Rangatiratanga has broad acceptance as reflecting the constitutional rights of Māori for a number of reasons. It is largely about Māori control over Māori matters. First in relation to the concepts expressed in the 1835 Declaration of Independence and guaranteed to Māori in Article 2 of the Treaty of Waitangi. Quite apart from the exercise of authority over the development and control over resources which are owned by Māori, tino rangatiratanga has been about the exercise of obligations and responsibilities as well. Where there is agreement to the exercise of authority, it comes with responsibilities and obligations. Tino rangatiratanga is also about preparation for the future, the ability to determine policies, to assume responsibility for affairs, and to plan for future generations.

## *The Welfare State*

The origins and growth of the Welfare State occurred as Oliver (1977:1) suggested:

...in a broad international context made up of three elements: first the social problems created by industrial societies; second the measures available in such societies for their alleviation; and third, the ethos that enabled problems and resources to be brought together.

The Labour Party, newly elected in 1935, took office in a time of despair and social dislocation brought about by the slump, the great economic depression that beset westernised nations around the world with years of stagnation and unemployment. Under Labour, the Keynesian view was adopted, one that promoted Government intervention as a necessary strategy for full employment in a capitalist economy.

The Government set about expanding the role of the state to address the suffering felt across the country during the depression. Colonials and more recent immigrants had not come to New Zealand from the other side of the world to replicate the poverty they had left behind and the socialism of the Labour Government served to allay those spectres of the past. Socialism and the rise of the Welfare State was more than intervention to address issues of unemployment and need, it also validated beliefs of a new world order, of egalitarianism, one in which 'Jack was as good as his master'. Without intervention, the dream would be shattered. Bill Oliver cites Hanson (1975) who describes the keynote of the Labour Government package as benefits that were "non-contributory, universal, comprehensive and adequate" and provided by the state as a citizens right, not as an act of charity (Hanson, 1975:49, cited in Oliver, 1977:19).

State housing and education together with health made up the triangle of the Labour Governments socialist influence. The social security benefit was one of the cornerstones of the new government alongside better welfare such as health and housing, and universal education. In the new egalitarian democracy, all citizens were to have access to a free compulsory education. Post World War II shifts by Māori to town, made Māori families and enclaves of Māori families more visible to the masses

and not all their new neighbours welcomed the change. In this environment, the next generations of urban Māori learners would go to school.

### *The Minimal State*

Barely, it seemed, had Māori begun to use the welfare democracy for their own purposes, than that use was resented. The Welfare State assumed the role previously accorded the extended family in Māori communities, a responsibility of care to members that was subsequently weakened by the degree of intervention of the State into the lives of its Māori citizens.

Those without adequate housing were invited to expect the State to provide, similarly with Health and Education. State provision was euphemised in the phrase 'from the cradle to the grave'. It applied to all New Zealanders but Māori need induced a culture of dependency, an expectation that the state would provide.

Assumptions of New Right philosophies represent a particular brand of libertarianism, that seek to limit the role of the state in the lives of its citizens. The minimal state will protect the rights of individuals who cannot protect themselves. Law and order, defence and a minimal bureaucracy are the basis of the minimal state whose role is monitoring not providing. For Māori, without the supportive role of customary communities or the support of a welfare state, life in the cities would degenerate to crisis point. In a minimal state, responsibilities are devolved to individuals who acknowledge two kinds of rights:

1. non interference rights, whereby one person may not interfere with what rightly belongs to another, either goods or body; and
2. property rights, such that those who lack property/financial property are deprived of any means of improving their lot.

There are no welfare rights acknowledged by neo-liberal fundamentalists.

## *Constitutional Arrangements*

Despite being a numerical and political minority, Māori continue to seek a reformation of constitutional arrangements to better reflect the terms of the Treaty of Waitangi in order to give greater credence to arguments for self determination and cultural identity claimed by Māori<sup>19</sup>. The strength of Māori political resurgence is reflected in demands for compensation for past injustices and for acknowledgement of indigenous (*tangata whenua*) rights including the right to self determination (*the exercise of tino rangatiratanga*). This quest has challenged entrenched colonial attitudes and unsettled settler dynamics of power and control in the past, and there is little to suggest any substantive degree of change today.

Jim Bolger, a recent Prime Minister, expressed his opposition to a review of constitutional arrangements saying:

there is no political will to alter the fundamental constitutional arrangements of the nation involving the sovereignty of an elected Parliament ....The sovereignty of Parliament is indivisible. (in Kelsey 1985)

The statement confirms the fear of sharing power, of the depth of the entrenched view of sovereignty as indivisible. As Jane Kelsey asserts:

Legal sovereignty confirms the constitutional status quo. It reinforces the position of the central colonial state as the sole recognised authority to speak on behalf of 'its subjects', even where it has usurped their own sovereign authority or failed to represent their interests in the past. (1995:168)

There had been continual objection to the Treaty breaches. These had been voiced at home and in Britain by groups seeking audience with the Queen. Songs were composed to be sung on marae and in all places where people would understand and listen. The oral tradition helped to keep these opinions free from subversion, and prevent Māori understandings and expectations of the Treaty from being buried.

---

<sup>19</sup> In A. Durie, (1997), I argue for 'iwi Māori' as a reference to the united tribal groupings of Māori peoples, but that 'Māori' used alone, indicates a collective but less tribally specific interest.

Views of the Treaty by both Māori and Pakeha have been mixed. There were Māori and Pakeha who were sceptical at its inception, as there are Pakeha and Māori who remain so today.

### *The Bi-national State*

Whatever the perception of the Treaty of Waitangi by individuals, the Treaty debates past and present foster a growing awareness by New Zealanders of Aotearoa-New Zealand as a South Pacific nation. Gains have been made, and greater evidence of that identity is collecting. There have been Māori electorates since 1867 and after a period of being regarded as a simple nullity, the Treaty of Waitangi is regarded as the founding document of the New Zealand nation state. It has been included in some legislation and forms the basis for a range of government policies. The Māori position as tangata whenua receives acknowledgement on most state occasions, regardless of whether the participation is more symbolic than real.

Māori views and a Māori position is sought across the range of activities of the state although a means to implement these protocols for Māori as equals is yet to be worked out.

It has become clear, not only in relationship to welfare but also in connection with education, housing, justice and the resource areas of land, forests and fisheries, that Māori are not prepared to accept passive roles. As partners to the Treaty of Waitangi, Māori expect to enter into partnerships with the Crown or its agencies in the formulation of policy and the development of programmes. Tino rangatiratanga is essentially about Māori control over policies and provision for Māori.

The Treaty remains the single internal political instrument that has the potential to see the full development of a bi-national state, but this can only be realised through full and appropriate representation of and by Māori in all institutions and at all political levels of society. The next chapter argues that progress to date in this area has been far from adequate.

## CHAPTER THREE

# MĀORI REPRESENTATION AND REPRESENTATIONS OF MĀORI

### *Fairness and Justice*

While there is a range of policies affecting Māori, the policies do not necessarily reflect Māori priorities. The contemporary relationship between Māori communities and the state has a history that intimately affects the distribution of power between the two sectors. The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi signalled a power-shift of proportions that Māori of the time could not have envisaged and which was in contradiction to their reasons for signing the Treaty. From the pre-Treaty position of an independent state anticipating governance by a Confederation of Tribes, post-Treaty Māori were subjected to a raft of disabling legislation leading to erosion of cultural properties and alienation from material properties. Strong rear-guard action has been necessary to avoid annihilation altogether.

An early resistance strategy, for example, was the birth of the King Movement, an attempt to stop further erosion of Māori lands by anointing a Māori king as a symbol of Māori unity and a focus for the prohibition of land sales. A gathering of chiefs at Taupo in 1856, was instrumental in the establishment of the King movement although the idea had been raised some time before by the chiefs Tamihana Te Rauparaha and Matene Te Whiwhi in 1853 (Orange, 1987:142). The movement will be discussed again later in this chapter but for now, the existence of the King, in Orange's view, provided a rallying point for Māori nationalism. While the evidence supports this interpretation, it was also a rallying point for those dissatisfied with the extent to which Māori land was being alienated. Initially, Māori had seen the movement as a counter to their exclusion from Government because of the terms of the 1852 Constitution Act. The raising up of a Māori King, Potatau from Waikato, was a move to demonstrate a Māori equivalence to the power of the state, in keeping with the spirit of the Treaty of Waitangi. As Orange states:

King movement leaders, not unreasonably, believed that the treaty's guarantee of rangatiratanga confirmed that a relationship of equality would continue, allowing

Māori people a degree of autonomy. They desired to work with the settler government in a kind of 'conjoint' administration. (1987:143)

Behind settler opposition to the King Movement was the fear of Māori rejection of land sales, especially in the fertile lands of Taranaki and Waikato. Māori had been farming these lands successfully for some time, at least six wheat mills were erected on the Waipa and Waikato rivers, to serve the growing export market established by Māori to supply settler markets in Australasia (Oliver & Williams, 1981:153). By 1863, Waikato had been invaded by Government troops and at the completion of the wars, the Waikato lands were in Government hands.

The King Movement had been a genuine attempt by Māori to put in place a structure which could represent their expectations of participation in the political affairs of the new nation without compromising their autonomy. But, as Oliver and Williams note; the Government was at best lukewarm and at worst, hostile to a movement it saw as a threat to the Queen's sovereignty and to the well-being of her Pākehā subjects (ibid:156). Then as now, Māori moves towards autonomy threatened state perceptions of sovereignty, of indivisible power.

A goal for Māori has been the establishment of an appropriate mechanism through which policies for Māori would be made by Māori, drawn from the best available information. This goal has been articulated in many ways, most particularly in the Māori community and Māori education sectors by calls for a Māori Political Forum, a Māori Policy Forum or a Māori Education Authority. Reflected in these calls is the growing impatience at constantly being the recipients rather than the authors of policies that determine the conditions of Māori lives. At their strongest, resistance strategies call for Māori independence or the reassertion of Māori sovereignty.

Each of these concepts, *resistance*, *independence* and *sovereignty* is problematic in Māori contexts for a range of reasons. Of the three, *resistance* is the most straightforward, as independence and sovereignty are used interchangeably in some contexts, substituted for *tino rangatiratanga* in others, and generally interpreted widely to indicate a greater measure of political control over the dictates of life and freedom from subordination. Māori have sought access to the corridors of power

through a range of initiatives, the King Movement was one, the 1892 Māori Parliament another.

### *Constitutional Reform*

Māori efforts to seek reform of the nation's constitutional arrangements have gone unheeded by governments of the day, although a 2000 Conference examined the question thoroughly. A more recent example is the assertion in 1995 by Jim Bolger, Prime Minister of the time, that the sovereignty of Parliament was indivisible.<sup>20</sup>

As the change to a mixed-member-proportional style government approached in the early 1990s, Māori had felt it timely to raise the question of constitutional reform again. After all, it was Prime Minister Bolger who had opened the possibility of constitutional reform by raising the question of Aotearoa-New Zealand becoming a republic. If discussions could be opened for a new constitutional issue, the possibility of becoming a republic, surely they could be opened to address long held Māori constitutional concerns. The dogma of the indivisibility of sovereignty can be seen to be flawed in the light of the globalising tendencies of the international dynamics of capitalist expansionism. Indeed, the globalisation of capital has made issues of national sovereignty problematic (Kelsey 1999:45). For Māori, any hope of change to the comparatively invidious and undemocratic position of having 12% of the population represented by only four seats in the Parliament<sup>21</sup>, would have to lie with the outcomes of the new mixed-member-proportional electoral system.

After a strong vote in the 1993 referendum for the introduction of a 'mixed-member-proportional' or MMP electoral system, its advent in 1996 brought fresh hope to Māori voters. After decades of a political stalemate, the promise of more seats in Parliament saw numbers of Māori galvanised into canvassing their communities in an

---

<sup>20</sup> Letter to Sir Hepi Te Heu Heu from Prime Minister Jim Bolger, 12 September, 1995, in response to a communiqué from the 1995 Hirangi Hui regarding constitutional reform.

<sup>21</sup> While there were 4 electorates for the Māori population, there were 97 electorates for the remaining 88% of the population, giving Pākehā voters more than twice as much opportunity for representation as Māori had in the Parliament. Even though there have been Māori elected to represent general electorates, they represent their electoral constituencies, not Māori interests.

effort to convince them to enrol and vote on the Māori roll (Durie, M. H., 1998:119). Even though a very short window of opportunity (two months) and a minimal amount of funding was made available by the Government for the exercise, in the autumn of 1994, enough new names were entered onto the Māori roll to gain one more seat, and a new total of five Māori electorates, the first increase since they were established in 1867. At the closure of the two month period, 48% of Māori voters either did not enrol or remained on the general roll.<sup>22</sup> There had been the potential, given the number of unenrolled Māori to perhaps double the number of electorates but that outcome would have to lie in the future.

An April 1994 *Dominion* editorial considered that two months was sufficient time for Māori to return their option forms, and observed that: splitting constitutional arrangements along racial lines at this point, as some Māoris favour, would be a huge mistake.<sup>23</sup>

Clearly, to the editor, any constitutional reform which would provide Māori the opportunity for the same level of democratic participation as currently enjoyed by Pākehā was seen as a split along racial lines. Evidence that the existing constitutional arrangements are already split along racial lines in Pākehā favour is ignored. For those readers of the daily paper who rely on it for information, it would appear that Māori are the instigators of calls for constitutional reform that would introduce a race factor that had not previously been there. Only an enlightened few would know that the race factor has been present since the implementation of the 1852 Constitution Act in 1854, giving a small minority group, the white settlers, parliamentary and judicial power over the majority, iwi Māori, through the institution of a settler government. The conditions upon which individuals gained the right to vote were based upon a property ownership clause which privileged *individual* title to property, a right that was foreign to Māori, the proprietors of the largest tracts of land in the country and of most of the land, forests and fisheries.

---

<sup>22</sup> Māori may choose to have their names on either the Māori or the General electoral roll, and have to opportunity to change every few years. On the threshold of the 2002 elections, there are now seven Māori electorates.

<sup>23</sup> *The Dominion*, Editorial , April 26, 1994

If the recommendations of a 1986 Royal Commission on the Electoral System had been fully implemented, the Māori seats might have been abolished altogether, since the Commission had considered the 'mixed-member-proportional' system of itself, sufficient to meet voters needs (1986:43-44). By the time of the 1999 general elections, there were six Māori seats, the newest electorate, Hauraki, taking in a part of South Auckland and spreading out across the Hauraki plains to include the Coromandel. Without strong Māori objection to the abolition of the Māori seats at the time of discussion over the merits and demerits of MMP, the Government would have simply proceeded with the implementation of the Royal Commission's recommendation. Opportunely, a National Māori Congress justice committee had been monitoring the activities of the Government in regard to electoral reform. Discussion papers prepared by the committee for Congress delegates provided a rallying point for objection and counteraction (National Māori Congress, 1993). Contrary to the expectations of the Royal Commission on the Electoral System (RCES) while the introduction of MMP did deliver more Māori members of Parliament to the House, Māori voters were only able to vote in one more designated electorate than they had in 1867 when the Māori seats were first established.

Numerous attempts have been made by Māori to overcome unjust legislation and an inadequate level of Māori representation in the Government. Such activity has been a feature of Māori resistance since the implementation of the 1852 Constitution Act in 1854. Since this time, Māori experience of government and policy implementation by a largely non-Māori male ruling elite has been mixed. Certainly, in terms of adequate and appropriate parliamentary representation, there has been one law for Pākehā and one for Māori. While there was no specific provision for Māori or for Pākehā to vote in the 1852 Constitution Act, the regulations governing eligibility to vote effectively disenfranchised Māori, leaving them at the mercy of a Settler Government whose priority was to acquire Māori properties, not to protect them.

There had been proposals from Māori regarding Parliamentary representation but these were not successful. Māori finally gained direct representation in 1867 after the Māori Representation Bill, sponsored by Donald McLean, passed into law in that

year, providing for four Māori seats in the House of Representatives. Even though the degree of representation was less than that enjoyed by their Pākehā counterparts, it was better than none at all. The proposal, although allowing Māori to vote, kept them bound to a minority position by limiting the Māori population of around 50,000 people to four seats, while 72 seats were allocated to the 250,000 settler population. If there had been one law for all, Māori would have had at least fourteen seats allocated, but even the token of four raised the ire of some members of the Settler Parliament. Those opposed were outnumbered by supporters of the bill, one acceptable to a non-Māori Parliament perhaps only because it did not provide full representation. Regardless of the motives, it was sponsored by a Pākehā, Donald McLean, and received enough support from Pākehā Parliamentarians for it to succeed in becoming an act of Parliament

The debates over the 1867 Māori Representation Bill showed the degree of suspicion among the members regarding Māori capability and intent, the Hon. Mr. Menzies for example, stating that he would oppose the Bill, and if necessary divide the Council.

The Bill was nothing better than a sham, for it proposed to extend the franchise to men who were totally unfit to exercise it and who would not value it. (Parliamentary Debates, Vol 1 - 106:815)

A Southern member supported the Bill, saying that he was satisfied that it would have the effect of convincing the Natives that they were in earnest in doing what they had always professed a desire to do - give the Natives the same rights and privileges as they themselves enjoyed (Parliamentary Debates, Vol 1 - 106:815).

At the time that the 1852 Constitution Act was passed, the Pākehā population of Aotearoa-New Zealand was some 27,000, while the Māori population was some 57,000, over twice as large, but political control went to the settler minority, a group of people whose interests were in direct opposition to those of Māori. From the tone of the excerpts from debates in the House over Māori representation quoted in the previous paragraphs, the attitudes held by those empowered to make decisions over the condition of Māori life and lives can be deduced. The new Parliament was used as an instrument to acquire Māori lands. The Settler Government constructed and implemented legislation that Māori would have no part in, but which would foster a

landslide of alienation of lands, forests, fisheries and cultural capital from Māori to Pākehā. In the intervening years between the implementation of the Act in 1854 and the passing of the 1867 Māori Representation Bill, the Settler Government succeeded in swamping the population with new immigrants, mainly from Britain, raising the Pākehā population tenfold and heightening the demand for Māori lands.

Māori political and economic marginalisation came about swiftly after their disenfranchisement. Even after 1867 with token representation, Māori could not implement effective opposition to legislation designed to favour settler goals at the expense of Māori ones. Loss of political and economic power put Māori populations into a semi dependent state undermining their ability to serve their own communities.

One solution devised at the time by Māori, of parallel self-government, is not too different from the infrastructures enjoyed by indigenous peoples in other nations around the world<sup>24</sup>, but the Kingitanga, and the Māori Parliament were not tolerated in their time, nor have their modern counterparts fared much better. The 1867 decision had brought about four Māori seats and delivered four Māori voices in Parliament, but the right to vote still did not ensure fair representation for Māori.

The establishment in 1892, of the first Māori Parliament was an attempt to regain some political voice in the affairs of state that directly affected Māori. Through the Parliament, efforts were made to influence policy by introducing Bills passed by that forum, into the colonial Parliament. But their success was no greater than it had been with the existing representation as the Bills were either defeated or ignored (Durie, M.H.1992, *Evening Standard*, July 16).

### ***The King Movement – Māori Sovereignty***

Even earlier than that, the King Movement, in the main a confederation of tribes with Tainui affiliations, was set up in an effort to counter the loss of Māori property to

---

<sup>24</sup> Note for example, First Nations Great Councils in the United States, who make laws and implement them within their own territories, or, the Saami Parliament in Norway which has similar powers.

Pākehā ownership. A central tenet of the King Movement was their strong opposition to the sale of land. Rising land sales had caused consternation among Māori leaders of the time, leading in some instances, to war with the British who, with the support of their Settler Government, were in New Zealand to acquire Māori land. When Taranaki disputes grew to fullscale war over land, they were supported in battle by their neighbours, the Kingites. The King Movement was so successful in preventing the sale of land that Governor Grey and his supporters concocted a reason to invade the King country territories. At Grey's instruction, the invading British army under General Duncan Cameron breached the Kingite borders at the Mangatawhiri stream, proceeding a few days later, to kill Māori rallying to protect their properties from invasion. Grey had ordered that all Māoris living between the Waikato and Auckland should be expelled south of the Waikato river unless they took an oath of allegiance to Queen Victoria (Belich 1986:133).

Māori were caught in a double bind, if they swore allegiance, they would have to acquiesce to settler government laws designed to appropriate their lands; if they did not, they risked being branded traitors. There was no choice but to fight back.

The injustices endured by Tainui through that period were the basis for a successful claim against the Crown that reached conclusion in May 1995. Known as the Tainui settlement, it related to the injustice of the confiscation of 486,502 hectares of land taken under the New Zealand Settlements Act of 1863. Mason Durie supports the view that the King movement was mainly set up to stop land being sold and identifies a further threat felt by the British and the settlers. Durie says that : "They saw the King as a challenge to the might of Parliament and British rule, ...they feared that access to land purchases in the rich Waikato valley would become difficult" (1998:195).

If this were the British and settler attitude to the King movement, it is not difficult to see that it would have taken a huge sea-change to have had the provisions of the Treaty of Waitangi for political power-sharing ever implemented. There could not have been any serious intention to do so on the part of the British nor on that of their delegated authority, the settler government. James Belich does not see land-hunger as having sufficient appeal to be the main motive behind British warmongering

(1986:77). Instead he refers to an expectation of substantive British sovereignty as a more important catalyst for the British taking up arms against Māori. Belich suggests that “the British sought first to check, and then to cripple, Māori independence” (1986:80).

As noted in the 1995 Prime Ministerial response to Sir Hepi Te Heu Heu in regard to constitutional arrangements, there is little evidence to suggest that there has been any great change in government approaches to policy about Māori. The government was threatened by discussions about Māori independence and about calls for the assertion of Tino Rangatiratanga. Even calls for Māori self determination were seen as troublesome, yet given the rhetoric about devolution of decision making responsibilities and powers back to community levels, the concept ought to have sat well with government.

Visible Māori advancement appears to engender anxiety at top political levels, regardless of the form it takes. Much was made in the media of the rise in numbers of Māori in Parliament. Although the enrolment strategy entered into by Māori prior to the first MMP elections in 1996 gained only enough numbers to warrant one more constituency, the number of Māori in the House increased to fifteen, five representing Maori electorates, one a general electorate<sup>25</sup> and the remainder as party list members. MMP is a mix of list and elected members of Parliament and more Māori entered the House by being well placed on the party list, than were elected by electorates. The sudden ‘browning’ of Parliament, be it ever so slight, and disclosures about the behaviours of some of the new members fuelled a perception generated by the media, that the mixed-member- proportional model must somehow be flawed. Although Parliament had yet to learn how to manage the new model in the House, nonetheless, it was seen by many of the general public to be the cause of indecision and minority party dictate.

---

<sup>25</sup> Although there were only five Māori seats, a general seat, Tauranga, was represented by Winston Peters, also Māori, bringing the number of Māori elected to Parliament to six.

## *Right Rites*

In 1998 when a petition to reduce the number of members of Parliament from 120 to 99, was conducted by a Pākehā private citizen and presented to Parliament, it had gained 300,000 signatures. The number was sufficient to request a referendum on the issue. The woman behind the petition portrayed herself as an ordinary housewife concerned at the large number of members of Parliament in the house as a result of MMP voting, 120 as opposed to the reduction to 99 that the petition recommended. Upon closer scrutiny, it was revealed that the groups most likely to be eliminated as a result of such a reduction in the numbers of MP's, were Māori, other Polynesians and Asians. This disclosure was sufficient reason to examine the petitioner more closely. From a Māori perspective, for the first time in electoral history in Aotearoa-New Zealand, Māori had increased their representation in Parliament, a feat that seemed impossible under the old First Past the Post system. The deadlock had been broken and Māori had high expectations of the new Members of Parliament. There was even the possibility that the new members of Parliament, should they be of a mind, could hold the balance of power in the House. Were this scenario to eventuate, it would be the closest Māori will have been to the exercise of political power such as had been exercised over them for over a century and a half and this was becoming obvious.

The increase in Māori representation unfortunately did not reach its full potential to bring about informed change as it could have done if the notion of a Māori caucus had been exercised. This would have involved setting aside party loyalties in favour of a loyalty to a Māori 'cause'. It was an option that neither party whips nor every Maori member of Parliament could entertain. While the notion was supported strongly by Donna Awatere, who was an Act party list member, the New Zealand First members, who had taken every Māori seat, expressed a range of doubts about the idea of a Māori caucus.<sup>26</sup> Despite being parliamentary novices, the presence of fifteen Māori members in the new Parliament awoke a general awareness of the potential of the Māori vote and not all the attention would be positive. Some new members ignited a media frenzy about their lives, ranging from income to underwear and sunglasses.

---

<sup>26</sup> For a more detailed discussion, see Durie, M.H.1998:103

One new member was pilloried by the press for purchases on an expense account that he had held while having been a Director of a publicly funded television company, Aotearoa TV. The tabloid issues were destructive of Māori credibility each time they arose and effectively sidelined the views of the respective members as each story, in true tabloid style, intimated that the MPs in question were less than capable. The petition to reduce the numbers of seats in Parliament was shown to be likely to have the greatest effect upon those with the least representation in the House and one of those groups, Māori, who had benefited from MMP, were being subjected to character assassinations or insinuations by the press. Māori, it seems, having risen to gain a somewhat tenuous hold on a small measure of political power, were being singled out for attack from both directions.

Omi and Winant (1986) have alerted people to new forms of racism, those that adopt code words to spread fear of people who are not white. In the first MMP government, the effects were greater than simply engendering a climate of fear, for the outcome was less than satisfactory for Māori in terms of effective representation. The MMP process that brought more Māori to Parliament was under attack, and individual Māori members, portrayed in the media as less than competent or worse. A credible operational Māori caucus was undermined by the decline of the credibility of some of the Māori members of Parliament, first through negative media representation, and later, for changing party allegiance. Omi and Winant see the racial politics of the new right as having the objective of dismantling the political gains of racial minorities (1986:120). In their view, the use of 'code words' has been a key device used by the new right to limit the political gains without directly challenging democratic ideals. Since the sunglasses brand in question was not publicly associated with non-Māori MPs, the media focus on those Māori MPs who wore the sunglasses allowed them to exploit their difference in a covert and mocking way, using the sunglasses as a coding device for race-baiting. The ordinary housewife's petition is not an overt display of racism but is presented as an attempt to reduce the numbers of parliamentarians from 120 to 99, a move which would severely reduce the numbers of Māori and of minority peoples in the House. As Omi and Winant claim, "rearticulation does not require an explicitly racial discourse" (1986:125).

Māori efforts to gain leverage over educational policy decisions and practices receive similar representation in the public press, raising the ire of the extremist groups on the political right such as the One New Zealand Foundation. It is no coincidence that the self designated 'ordinary' housewife who initiated the call for a referendum, has since been identified as the wife of a former office holder in the organisation calling itself the 'One New Zealand Foundation'.

The Foundation is a neo-conservative group seeking a unitary state which would disallow, for example, a continuation of claims for reparation to Māori for injustices inflicted by state forces in the post-Treaty past. The One New Zealand style of nationalism attempts a monoculturally narrow view of New Zealand and the constitution of a peculiarly Anglo-centric New Zealand identity. In defence of the petitioner, her husband would write of his resignation from the One New Zealand Foundation, and state that his wife had never been a member. The fact that her efforts to reduce the numbers of parliamentarians from 120 to 99 would strike with most force at non-white people is to be considered coincidental.

The referendum is claimed as a genuine attempt to save the country the expense of supporting 21 members of parliament, yet for non-white people, Māori, Asian and Pacific Islanders, the additional 21 members are the brightest glimpse in the history of Aotearoa-New Zealand, of space for democratically gained political participation. The gains for participatory democracy appear to be less important to supporters of the petition than the cost of the further 21 members to the public purse.

The Foundation has as its slogan, 'One law, One people, One New Zealand', considering this indicative of its belief in one law for all, irrespective of race, colour or creed. The acting Chairman of the Foundation claimed that:

we are not anti Māori but we are against the Waitangi Tribunal, government departments, legislation or any organisation which creates separatism/apartheid between the people. (Baker, Ross, letter to the Editor, *Sunday Star-Times*, March 14,1999)

No questions have been raised at all about the legislation that created an elite white population at one end of the social and economic spectrum and an impoverished Māori population at the other.

In 2000 the reluctance to give regard to Māori concerns by the government of the day was still evident. For example, the decision to designate the Hauraki Gulf as a Marine Park was taken without the consent of the Hauraki tribes who have exercised customary rights at least over the inshore fisheries for all of the centuries of their occupation. While legally, the Hauraki tribes did not own the Gulf, it has served as a significant food source for the tribes. As the debate in the House over the Hauraki Marine Park Bill grew in seriousness for Māori because of the inability to prevent the Bill passing into legislation, the spectre of alienation from traditional fisheries echoed the experiences of Māori in the past who had not had the political power to prevent land legislation being passed which was designed to shift land from Māori hands to either to the Crown or to Pākehā settlers.

At that time in history, much as is the case today with customary fisheries, Māori did not have legal ownership of their lands but had exercised usage and occupational rights within tribal territories in accordance with tribal law. The power of legislation was once again employed, this time for usurpation of mana moana, of Māori jurisdiction over the seas and coastline of the Hauraki Gulf. This occurred at a time when the America's Cup yachting regatta was being held in the Hauraki Gulf, an event that had evoked considerable expression of nationalism. For the majority of the population still feeling the effects of Americas Cup euphoria, to criticise the setting aside of the Hauraki Gulf as a Marine Park was tantamount to denigrating national pride.

In the same week that the Hauraki Marine Park was being debated in Parliament, the media ran a series of stories that had negative overtones for Māori, the first headlining a Māori parliamentary secretary said to have been caught speeding in a ministerial car, and the other asking the question of readers as to whether or not the Māori language version of the national anthem should be sung at all major sports occasions. The loss for Māori, of control of the Hauraki Gulf customary fisheries, did not rate

headlines at all. Despite the Hauraki Trust Board's public objections to the Bill, the media were silent in this regard.

The Hauraki Marine Park Bill became law, and although the Hauraki tribes were given a place on the Board of Management, without a majority, the law that saw the Marine Park established will take priority over tribal customary usage of the Hauraki Gulf. No voices except Māori ones have been heard in protest against the Hauraki Marine Park Bill that removes rights from Māori and gives them to Pākehā in a decidedly separatist move. Few Māori use the Marine part in a recreational sense, instead it has been a source of survival as a mahinga kai, a food source. A populist perception is that Māori claims to the Waitangi Tribunal and the ensuing Tribunal recommendations have disturbed the peace, a mythical pre Tribunal harmony and unity.

At the time of the Hauraki Gulf episode, the Māori woman employed as a Parliamentary Secretary served a Māori woman Minister of the Crown, and both of them were subjected to the media power to mark, assign and classify according to a media stereotypification exercise that includes, as Stuart Hall states. "Power to represent someone or something in a certain way- within a certain regime of representation. It includes the exercise of symbolic power through representational practices" (1997:259).

Strategies of stereotyping, in Hall's view, attempt to fix meaning, in this case, of incompetence or even disregard for the law from a servant of the Crown and her Minister.

The secretary told her side of the exchange as having been pulled over by police on a hot summer day for speeding. Her story states that the speed at which she was travelling was not outside the limitation, and that the police did not believe that she was a Ministerial Secretary. She believed that her appearance, wearing a lavalava (Polynesian draped clothing) for comfort and coolness, and her long hair unbound, fed the police belief that they could treat her unjustly. Upon being requested to show her drivers' licence, it was considered by the police patrol to have expired. The secretary argued that the licence was issued as a lifetime licence, which was indeed the case. However recent legislation required holders of 'lifetime' licences to replace them with

new ones. Whether or not the secretary was driving without a current licence became a further issue.

In fact the secretary held a Master of Laws degree and had worked in a well known legal practice before accepting the position with the Minister of the Crown. After confirming her identity and her position, the police allowed her to continue her journey, but just an hour further on, she was once again stopped by police who accused her of speeding and proceeded to impound the Ministerial car. Although the secretary took and won a case against the police, including an issue of entrapment, the damage to her reputation as a servant of the Crown, but more so as a practising lawyer, suffered immeasurable harm.

Both the Minister and the secretary had a role to play in contesting a racialised regime of representation but their resistance did not come without a price. The Minister struggles with mixed media reports of her activities since, and the secretary has moved to Geneva to work on a project for the rights of indigenous peoples. Māori who reach any position of power it seems, are subject to media attack on their credibility and competency, but more so, it appears, if they reach positions of power over Pākehā as well as Māori.

In this instance, a well qualified Māori woman, was subjected to character assassination and questionable framing and her case used by the media to distract public and wider Māori attention from debate over the change in status of the Hauraki Gulf. Māori Parliamentarians have felt the effects of racism since the first representatives gained Parliamentary power over the general public through positions of responsibility. One of the earliest, Maui Pomare, is discussed later in this chapter. He suffered similar assaults on his credibility by the media of the day, when he became for a time, Minister of Health.

### *Instruments for Justice*

The long history of domination of Māori, of unconscionable acts and of token representation of the Māori population in the Parliament lies behind the need for the existence of the Waitangi Tribunal as evidenced by the number of cases prepared for

hearing. The credo of 'one people, one law' ignores differential power relationships between Māori and Pākehā, of a litany of injustices against Māori, and is an attempt to silence Māori and prevent grievances being heard and redressed. Difference is positioned as separatism or even apartheid, each of these heavily value laden race based concepts designed to elicit a negative reaction from those who could have liberal leanings and possibly support the Māori case unless otherwise persuaded.

One of the main reasons that New Zealanders in general voted for a change to Mixed Member Proportional Representation (MMP) from First Past the Post (FPP) was a desire to have more accountability from their Parliamentary representatives. For Māori, the main reason was to gain a more democratic opportunity for representation after over a century of a representation stalemate. Māori voters were optimistic about the potential for change that MMP could bring, for regardless of the growth in the Māori population, the number of Māori electorates had remained at four, static since 1867 despite the fact that the Māori population had grown exponentially since that time. The apparent success of MMP in increasing Māori representation in the House has again raised anxiety levels among some Pākehā, uncovering suspicion to a degree reminiscent of debate last century when the issue of Māori representation was being debated in the House.

While not overtly about Māori numbers in Parliament, the 1998 'ordinary housewife's' petition carries shades of a similar mentality, for in attempting to reduce the influence of minority parties, aspersions are simultaneously cast on Māori and minority capability and intent. The four original Māori seats in Parliament, while valuable, have not been able to deliver to Māori a full measure of representation because of the potential for the members to be marginalised within the House. As long as the First Past the Post electoral style delivered a large majority election result to a party, the Māori members views could be safely ignored. Only at such times as the results were close enough for the four Māori seats to contribute to the stability of a government, did the members voices gain a fair hearing. At other times, they could be ignored.

## *Equality of Representation*

Whether over the habits and dress of male Māori members of Parliament, or the petition from the 'ordinary housewife' or in earlier times, in the debates over the introduction of the Māori Representation Bill, Māori whether identified by race or by choice of sunglasses, are constructed as a threat, 'the barbarians at the gate'<sup>27</sup> intimating that Māori who could not be measured by non-Māori norms, were not deserving of a place in Parliament. An extension of the attacks on Māori gains in political power can be seen in the criticism made of the Māori seats as separatist and out-dated.

The same spectre was present at the time when the late Sir Maui Pomare was given the portfolio of Minister of Public Health, perceived as being a *white only* right.

J.F.Cody, writing of the late Sir Maui Pomare's elevation to Minister of Public Health, a position he was eminently qualified to take up, given his record in improving health among Māori, his experience in politics, and his medical profession, refers to "an outcry in some quarters that it was wrong for a Māori to be put in a position of authority over Europeans" (1953:136). Pomare's elevation disturbed ingrained perceptions of Māori as secondary status citizens despite his impeccable qualifications for the position. The assaults on the credibility of Sir Maui Pomare, were driven by similar racialised representations, but at that period in time, it was easier for the media to be explicit with their opinion than it has been for media at the turn of the millennium.

But Cody also identifies what he refers to as "The more general and generous view", expressed by the *Free Lance*.<sup>28</sup>

Some people have been making the complaint that because Sir Maui Pomare represented a Māori constituency he should not hold the important portfolio of Public Health. It certainly seems curious at this time of day when the two races are on such terms of social amity and equality, and are becoming so

---

<sup>27</sup> Used in the sense referred to by Young (1995:31) of a distinction between the civil and the savage: to be civilised meant to be a citizen of the city (preferably walled) as opposed to the wildman outside or the more distant barbarian roaming in the lands beyond.

<sup>28</sup> The New Zealand Free Lance was a weekly publication with a national circulation.

closely blended by intermarriage that such an issue should be raised. All but a very few such as the editor of the N.Z Herald who worked himself into a state of semi-panic over the news, agree that the arrangement which make a doctor the new Minister of Health is a sane and satisfactory one. (1953:136)

Sir Maui went on to implement many health reforms, particularly in the conditions of rural health and mental health provision. Despite his good work, after the 1925 elections, with Coates as the new premier, Pomare was relieved of the Health portfolio supposedly on a minor technicality based on the third schedule of the Civil List Act of 1920.<sup>29</sup>

His old 'bete blanc'<sup>30</sup> editor of the New Zealand Herald as cited by Cody, commented "it is pleasing to see this important portfolio returning to one who represents a European constituency" (153:144).

Cody goes on to say that the suggestion of colour prejudice did not go unchallenged by Sir Maui. Colour prejudice or colour bar and colour line, were terms popularly used at the time but are now more bluntly referred to as racism. To be sure, the racism was less apparent than in those countries where violent segregation was a very real aspect of life, but harmony and cooperation were not the reality either. Such stories identify a very real aspect of political life in Aotearoa-New Zealand that resonates with the experiences of Māori politicians in recent Governments.

### *Colonial Stories*

Why was it that Māori were not subjected to the extreme subjugation that can be found in the histories of so many indigenous people whose lands have been colonised? Our near neighbours, the aboriginal peoples of Australia were subjected to intense degradation. A British naval captain, J. L. Stokes, wrote of the Australian colonists, that "in theory and in practice they regarded them as wild beasts who it is lawful to extirpate" (1846,cited in Reynolds, H.1998:12). Reynolds, in reference to the Australian settlers, cites the humanitarians as being "aware of the importance of

---

<sup>29</sup> In telling the biography, Cody uses the term colour line in regard to the Prime Minister's appointment of Pomare as the new Minister of Public Health.

<sup>30</sup> i.e. bete noir. I have re-phrased the term deliberately, to better reflect the tension.

harsh racial attitudes in loosening the strictures of conscience allowing otherwise moral men to engage in deeds of blood” (ibid).

Further a-field, as early as 1836 it seems the United States was engaged in germ warfare. Ward Churchill writes:

In 1836, the U.S. Army knowingly distributed smallpox-laden blankets among American Indians, and the resulting pandemic claimed as many as a quarter million lives. This systematic elimination of the American Indians began in 1492 with the arrival of Columbus. (Churchill, W. 1995)

A variety of reasons are given for the comparative constraint shown in relation to Māori, most often attributed to evangelical humanitarian ideas. In Britain, Lord Glenelg, Secretary of State for Colonies, was said to have had strong evangelical sympathies, and to have promulgated policies characterised by a conciliatory, reformist spirit (Adams, 1977:92) A contemporary of Lord Glenelg, Thomas Fowell Buxton, a humanitarian, was influential in the production of the 1837 *Report of the Aborigines Committee*, a report which among its recommendations, suggested treaties with indigenous chiefs and recognition of the sovereignty of indigenous peoples (ibid:92). Adams goes on to observe that the report “has been regarded by many historians as the highest expression of nineteenth-century humanitarian idealism towards indigenous peoples”. An Aborigines Protection Society was formed as a result of the report and the intent of the society to protect aboriginal populations from exploitation, is evident in its suggested Bill of Aboriginal Rights, 1838.

Indeed, Aotearoa-New Zealand was recognised by Britain as a sovereign Māori nation shortly after the 1835 Declaration of Independence. Despite the Declaration, it was observed in reports to Britain, that amongst the two thousand British subjects settling in Aotearoa-New Zealand, were convicts and deserters who were “alternately the authors and the victims of every species of crime and outrage” (McIntyre & Gardener, 1971:11). The questionable acquisition of land by non Māori was also noted, and in particular, that “several hundred persons have recently sailed from this Country to occupy and cultivate those Lands” (ibid:11). The outcomes of this mass migration to Aotearoa-New Zealand was thought to be a repeat of the disasters of war

---

and spoliation experienced by other indigenous peoples upon the invasion of the “Emigrants from the Nations of Christendom”.

In an attempt to avoid these disasters, Captain Hobson, His Majesty’s consul at New Zealand, was instructed to “treat with the Aborigines of New Zealand for the recognition of Her Majesty’s sovereign authority over the whole or any parts of those Islands which they may be willing to place under her Majesty’s Dominion” (ibid:12). It was this move that led to the view that a concern about the future of native races “brought into the vicinity of Emigrants from the Nations of Christendom” and gave substance to a perception that appropriate forms of government for a proposed British colony should take into account a need to protect Māori and preserve acceptable customs and usages.

Paradoxically, twice within the next century, Māori would take into account a need to protect the British and preserve their customs and usages against invasions and perpetrations of atrocities from some of the so called ‘Nations of Christendom’ by volunteering their lives in the first and second World Wars.

But Māori were not merely passive recipients of colonial imperialism. Instead Māori gained a formidable reputation as warriors and defenders of their territories once the agreements of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi reached with the British Crown, were breached by Crown representatives. Māori were in an impossible situation, neither the Settler government laws, nor the articles of the Treaty which had given British law a paramount place, had prevented the scale of territorial intrusion and usurpation being experienced by Māori, the very opposite of the early expectations held by Māori about the reasons for a treaty and the invitations made to the British Crown. Māori survival came to depend on protest, objection and defence against British armed invasion once negotiation and reason had failed.

Although a collective body of iwi Māori had declared Aotearoa-New Zealand an independent nation with the 1835 Declaration of Independence, the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi signed with the British Crown, displaced it. The Declaration had signalled the emergence of Māori nationhood, and was intended as the forerunner to the establishment of an infrastructure to include a Māori Parliament made up of chiefs

from the Confederation of United Tribes of New Zealand. The vision of a representative unitary Māori body with the power to make policy, or even legislate for Māori, is not one that disappeared with the advent of the Treaty of Waitangi. Non-implementation of Māori expectations of the Treaty of Waitangi brought with it great dissatisfaction. Māori had signed the Treaty in order to protect their authority, lands and customs from being undermined and alienated, but were soon to be disappointed. When Māori invented ways of holding their lands from sale, there would invariably be counters by way of legislation or, as the Ngata saga which follows demonstrate, the perennial favourite, through character assassination.

Great Māori members of Parliament such as Sir Apirana Ngata were not free from attack. Ranginui Walker documents the activities of a Commission of Inquiry into Native Affairs after Ngata's land development schemes led to some issues of non-compliance according to audits by the Finance Department (Walker 2001:280). Ngata had instigated a scheme of government-funded development of Māori land, generating work, income and land protection for numbers of Māori on tribal lands, in all, an amazing seventy-six schemes were underway. Walker quotes the commission as observing that:

Influenced by his methods of approach, by his success in the field, and by his enthusiasm, the Minister launched scheme upon scheme without reasonable regard as a Minister of the Crown to the need for properly accounting for state funds. He was in a hurry, long before the unemployment situation became pressing in the late autumn of 1931. (ibid:287)

Ngata had been too successful, hence the outcomes of his work drew unavoidable attention to Māori progress and scepticism from opponents. Ranginui Walker considers that Ngata was too powerful, that he understood power and how to use it to overcome structural inequalities. The success of the Development Schemes was undeniable, but after the attacks on Ngata's credibility, he relinquished oversight of them. In a paper on Māori land settlement delivered in 1940, Ngata would say:

So the question of who should be permanent occupiers of holdings under the schemes and the nature of their tenure, is the most important under consideration today. Once more history confronts the Māori and those who have the power to decide what should be done with his lands with the same fundamental facts which

obtained one hundred years ago, and again eighty years ago, and at various other stages in the country's record. (Ngata, 1940:148)

This time, the work of a Māori politician had been thwarted by colleagues rather than the press, but the press still had a field day. Once again it was the Herald that said:

It is right and proper that there should be in the Cabinet a Minister representing the Māori people, but...without portfolio and certainly not a Native Minister. (cited in Walker, R., 2001:298)

Policies about Māori were not to be entrusted to Māori, that much was clear. Only those Māori who supported rather than challenged Pākehā goals for Māori policy were seen as trustworthy. The education portfolio was one that had not ever been entrusted to Māori hands until the appointment in 1999 of Parekura Horomia to the role of associate Minister of Education with responsibility for Māori education across the sector. This role is especially significant as the tertiary education sector undergoes major reform.

### *Nation Building*

New interest has been generated in the concept of nation-building, particularly as the new millennium provided the catalyst for review of the past and planning for the future. The 'Building the Constitution' conference in Wellington in April 2000, was important as a catalyst for some of that forward thinking. The idea of nation building has to be more than another way of conceiving an economic future, for behind it lies much unfinished business for Māori. Themes from Māori participation in the conference prioritise the need to build a Treaty-based constitution, as Denese Henare said, "it is not enough to advocate generosity of spirit, structures and systems are also needed" (2000:3).

Earlier debates have been had on the question of the place of the Treaty in New Zealand law. At the direction of Geoffrey Palmer as Minister of Justice for the time, a white paper was produced by a Working Party to examine the question of a Bill of Rights (Minister of Justice 1985). The catalyst for the draft Bill, was not the century and a half of Māori effort to gain a fair measure of representation in the nation's political structures, nor the Hikoī to Parliament about Land Rights, nor the many

protests at Waitangi during the annual Waitangi Day celebrations. Instead, as Palmer admits, the argument for a Bill came from speeches made in the election campaign leading up to the 1984 election. Palmer's catalyst had been his sense that there was a political market for it because the middle classes were disturbed about the Muldoon government high handedness, and the aftermath of the Springbok Tour protests resulting in "unease about the powers of executive government and the purposes for which they could be exercised" (1990:53).

A major Hui was called by Māori to discuss the White Paper because it contained a move to entrench the Treaty of Waitangi within the Bill of Rights. While Geoffrey Palmer considered Māori objection to the move as "foolish", the Māori view was that the Treaty itself should be paramount, not the Bill of Rights. For Palmer, the Treaty would have been entrenched as part of the fundamental law of the land, notwithstanding its positioning within a Bill of Rights. If the catalyst for the move to a Bill of Rights had been Māori concern over lack of representation and over breaches of the Treaty agreement, the White Paper might not have attempted the move to subsume the Treaty within a Bill of Rights. The thrust of the document was clearly to appease the concerns of the middle classes over the powers of executive government, not the longstanding Māori concerns.

### ***Conclusion***

For Aotearoa-New Zealand to move forward as a nation, some acceptable resolution of these issues is necessary. No policy development that ignores the longstanding grievances that Māori hold, can succeed unless it can be constructed to take account of Māori unease. In a view put forward to the 2000 conference, Judge Durie observed that honourable mention of the Treaty would not suffice. For the constitutional status of Māori must be provided for together with certain rights not covered by the common law (2000:1).

Policy proposals for Māori that do not take enough account of this background of Māori "unease", have either been piecemeal and therefore unsuccessful, or ignored and therefore unsuccessful. Māori must be at ease in their own country and a national identity will continue to fracture until this is the case.

It remains evident that Pākehā through Pākehā media and Pākehā political parties will go to great lengths to undermine Māori power over decisions that affect the Pākehā taxpayer. Thus, after a century and a half of struggle and resistance the rights associated with Maori indigeneity have yet to be acknowledged in constitutional and legislative form. This is a situation that is common to other indigenous peoples throughout the world as the next chapter will argue.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### INDIGENEITY

*What sets worlds in motion is the interplay of differences, their attractions and repulsions. Life is plurality, death is uniformity. By suppressing differences and peculiarities, by eliminating different civilisations and cultures, progress weakens life and favours death. The idea of a single civilisation for everyone implicit in the cult of progress and technique, impoverishes and mutilates us. Every view of the world that becomes extinct, every culture that disappears diminishes a possibility of life. (Octavio Paz 1967; quoted in Wilmer, 1993)*

Indigenous peoples who do not hold political power over their nations, share a common history, one of a struggle for survival as enclosed nations within a colonial state marked by a dominating settler-native relationship.

Māori see themselves as peoples with a close political and cultural relationship with other indigenous peoples who are similarly locked into dominating colonial contexts of political and cultural power at home. For the most part, Māori have shared an indigenous history of confronting the tidal wave of European expansionism flooding over their lands, cultures and peoples, by saving what they could from disaster. The history of colonisation and imperialist expansionism is characteristic of territorial acquisitions around the globe. The Māori experience echoes through all the pages of this thesis, in part because, as Linda Smith says, “colonisation is our modernity” (1999:65-75) but more than that because it was our globalisation. To the West globalisation is colonisation coming home, the tide turning, returning to the shores it left. In a world that is round, expansionism could not go on forever and not one day return. For indigenous peoples, the waves are not so different, each washing over indigenous cultures leaving detritus in their wake. Today it has been a McDonalds here and a Smart Card there; yesterday it was more marked with legislation here and a Crown there. The organising principles of world order as perceived by the West, draw upon discourses of sovereignty and self determination for legitimation but only in so far as powerful European elites have defined the parameters of the discourse. That power has served to legitimate colonial states and undermine indigenous authority everywhere it has been.

For indigenous people at home, the issue of indigeneity did not suit the colonial agenda. Questions of rights, fairness and justice were reserved for after the takeover, if they arose at all. At worst, indigenous peoples were victims of genocide, at best they were considered to be sufficiently human to be saved, to become beneficiaries of the civilising mission of the West. For indigenous peoples, the world order changed when their states were taken over by 'expanding' others. Yet globalisation outside indigenous experience, is perceived as "historically unprecedented massed forces unleashing social, political and economic changes that will reshape the world order." (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, Perraton, 1999). The indigenous world has already experienced just such forces. Māori systems, for example, were transformed by Europeanisation as were those of the Nisga'a in British Columbia. For the Saami in Norway, colonisation for assimilation or extinction is referred to as Norwegianisation.

Sites of power have not changed dramatically. Advanced capitalist states have not relinquished economic or political power. Foreign investment flows still strengthen such states, and patterns of inequality remain unchanged despite claims of a new world order. While the volume of world trade might be higher and the same true of finance and capital flows, globalisation as Māori experienced and experience it with colonisation, is and was a phenomenon with cultural, political and technological overtones as well as economic ones. Globalisation is much more than an economic phenomenon. In its most recent form it has merely shifted in emphasis from the activities of European powers in claiming indigenous resources to boost their own surplus economies, to trans-national companies engaged in capturing resources for the same ends. The discourses of the state and state building served the colonial agenda well. Now the discourses of capital and market forces serve a similar agenda. Richard Sennett notes that "in an earlier generation, social policy was based on the belief that nations, and within nations cities, could control their fortunes; now, a divide is opening between polity and economy". (*Times Literary Supplement*, 1995:13) Public or private, nation-state or multinational big business, for indigenous peoples the effects have been the same. Nation-states as an older form of geo-politics are facing threats to their existence of a far less violent nature than those faced by indigenous peoples from whose lands the new states have been constructed. The stranglehold of foreign sovereignty imposed on indigenous peoples is being loosened in the bid by nation-states for economic survival in the face of a global marketplace that is

indifferent to national borders. Supra-state formations created by global financial markets have seen the separation out of the economic sovereignty of the nation-state from political sovereignty. Aotearoa-New Zealand, for example, consciously entered into an economic alliance with Australia (CER, 1983) to boost its internal economy, and in so doing, belied the claim made by government to Maori, that sovereignty is indivisible, its power unable to be shared.

Indigenous peoples see opportunities to gain political ground with the weakening of the state but the fluidity of the authority of international capital has the capacity to defy the identification of a zone of accountability or responsibility. Without the infrastructure and the material and human resources to seek reparation for the indigenous condition, few indigenous peoples could sustain the level of organisation necessary for their revival and progress.

### *Sovereignty Claims*

The idea of a nation state and associated conceptions of sovereignty have formed a large part of Māori positioning in regard to claims over wrongs suffered in the early British colonisation period. The doctrine of sovereignty is manifested in many ways since the absolute rule of Kings was devolved to the people with the principle of the sovereignty of the people exercised through elections of a representative government. A further configuration of sovereignty in a democratic government at least, is the notion of the sovereignty of the majority. The majority is elevated to power over any other form of community structure. In a classic study of the emerging structures of the United States, Alexis de Tocqueville undertook a longitudinal observation of the developments of the infrastructure of the nation, publishing his observations between 1835 and 1840, giving comment on what he saw. As to the rise of democracy, he had this to say. “The moral power of the majority is founded upon yet another principle, which is, that the interests of the many are to be preferred to those of the few”. (1965:184)

The concept of sovereignty itself has altered over time such that McHugh (1991:45), for example, debates issues of political and legal sovereignty in relation to Treaty based claims made by Māori in the light of Anglo-New Zealand constitutional theory.

From there it is a straightforward step to raise the question of economic sovereignty, no sooner identified than questioned as to its existence. Economic sovereignty at least, is ceded when states allow their economic borders to be permeated by alternative arrangements. As mentioned earlier, Aotearoa-New Zealand, in an attempt to boost capital accumulation, signed an agreement with Australia for the free flow of goods across the Tasman, CER (closer economic relations). The 1983 arrangement to enter into a free trade arrangement with Australia was supposed to establish a common market with Australia, once border protection was lowered. As soon as New Zealand goods impacted on the Australian market, Australian businesses, with the support of their state governments, began to reverse the trend. Trade barriers were re-established by Australia through strong subsidies on their own goods and by offering tax breaks and further incentives for New Zealand based companies to shift to Australia (North & South, July, 1999:73). Australia exercised its own sovereignty to reshape the nature of the agreement to protect its own industries and to attract New Zealand business to its shores. Aotearoa-New Zealand was unable to respond in kind. At a greater level, international economic organisations were making their presence felt.

### *Indigenous Aspirations for Autonomy*

Conceptions of sovereignty assume political and legal authority over a particular territory, with final authority resting, as in the New Zealand instance, with the elected government. While the citizens, the state and its infrastructure are still considered to make up the nation-state, the question today is, whether or not the concept of a sovereign state still has a rational basis in times of the commodification of money and a stateless financial market. As Māori well know, devolution of government assets to private ownership removes them from the Maori claims process. The establishment of the State Owned Enterprises Act allowed for Māori claims for redress of past injustices in respect of state assets by placing memorials or caveats upon them. In this way, Crown properties devolved to the State Owned Enterprises Commission, could still be claimed by Māori. A minimal state has a similar effect regarding rights protection because of the inability to identify a zone of accountability. As stated earlier, international economic organisations offer even less accountability. Māori however, have benefited from the down-sizing of the public service and the rise of

contractualism. In the Welfare State the Public Service had full control over service delivery to Māori in what Māori regarded as a form of paternalism. The new commitment to the development of contractual relationships has allowed for the greatest Māori Provider development seen since Māori were autonomous. Both iwi and urban Māori groups are demonstrating their capacity to deliver social services on behalf of their constituencies in a way that meets the dual criteria of cultural and professional quality.

The contractual relationships between Māori providers and the Crown have fostered the vitality of Māori and Iwi development by providing an economic base and offering employment in keeping with Māori development goals as well as the provision of the service to those in need. The rise of the contractual state and its benefits to Māori organisations has been an unexpected outcome of the neo-liberal reforms of the 1980's. The change of government from a National Party led coalition to a Labour Party led coalition in 1999 has not halted the rise in the number of Māori service providers or the strengthening of tribal and urban organisations. For Māori who need the services, the nearness of the service and its appropriateness have been a bonus. Income streams for Māori, in the past, were dependent upon individual application and appointment to positions in either the public or the private sector where the organisational culture differed from that found in Māori organisations. Māori organisations such as Te Runanga o Ngati Porou, Te Runanga o Raukawa and the urban authorities such as Te Whānau o Waipareira are all examples of organisations with contractual arrangements with the Crown for the delivery of services to Māori. The outcomes serve the goals of Māori development and the infrastructures are enabling for Māori in general. The role of the Treaty of Waitangi in the contractual relationships is somewhat hidden. The transition of Māori customary tribal organisations into new Runanga structures were in part, a result of the policy direction indicated by Te Urupare Rangapu, and partly to older structures, such as the Māori Trust Boards that came into existence under the Māori Trust Boards Act 1955.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> For a fuller discussion see Durie, M.H. 1998:224-233

Debates over the interpretation of different translations of the Treaty of Waitangi have in part focussed on rights considered to flow from the Treaty and, in Article One, whether sovereignty was considered by Māori to have been retained or understood to have been ceded. More detailed discussion about the Treaty of Waitangi and its implications has been presented in Chapter 2. However, in the settlement of claims regarding breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi, some successful claimants have used their financial settlements to boost iwi financial activities to such an extent that their work can be seen as an exercise of Tino Rangatiratanga, of iwi or tribal economic sovereignty at least. The long running Ngai Tahu claim in the South Island for example, that reached draft settlement in 1996, had a value of some \$170 million, partly in cash and partly in assets (Durie, M., 1998:202-203). There was the promise of the return of lands from the Crown estates, though not of course to the extent land had been taken, as well as customary fisheries, mutton bird islands and greenstone resources. The claim had been made in respect of land, sea fisheries and mahinga kai (traditional food sources). It is possible for iwi to utilise the internal devolutionary process combined with the Treaty Settlement process as an opportunity for tribal economic sovereignty, to win a measure of power back.

This has parallels in the Nisga'a Treaty settlements also of 1996, when an agreement in principle was signed between the Nisga'a Nation and Canada then successfully concluded in May 2000 when the final agreement was entered into between the Nisga'a Nation and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of Canada, and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of British Columbia. At the time of the agreement in principle, the Nisga'a Tribal Council President, Joseph Gosnell Sr. said,

A Nisga'a Treaty will be a good thing for all the citizens of British Columbia – native and non-native. It will bring economic certainty, social stability and justice. (Fact Sheet, Nisga'a Tribal Council, New Aiyansh, 1996)

The Nisga'a have been careful to state that the agreement does not establish an autonomous nation state, that non-Nisga'a living within the boundaries of Nisga'a territory still have their rights protected. The Nisga'a government has direct taxation powers over Nisga'a citizens on Nisga'a lands, a power not unlike the capacity of regional councils in Aotearoa-New Zealand to charge rates. The Nisga'a lands themselves occupy approximately 2,000 square kilometres of the Nass River

watershed in northwestern British Columbia, including their four major villages, Gitlakdamixs (New Aiyansh), Gitwinksihlkw (Canyon City), Lakalzap (Greenville) and Gingolx (Kincolith). The Nisga'a have won back surface and subsurface rights to their lands and all forest and fisheries resources within their boundaries. An overall government and the four Nisga'a village governments form the primary government institutions for the Nisga'a people. The Nisga'a government has the right to make laws to govern their resources, administration of justice, environmental assessment and protection, wildlife and taxation as well as maintain their involvement in health, child welfare and education services. A cash payment of some \$190 million was also part of the agreement. The Nisga'a number approximately 5,500 people of whom about 2,500 live in the four villages in the Nass River Valley. (ibid, 1996) The final agreement was not won without stoicism, hard work and perseverance by the Nisga'a.

On August 4 1998 a final agreement between the Nisga'a nation of Northern British Columbia, the Provincial Government of British Columbia, and the Federal Government of Canada was initialled prior to full ratification by the Federal Government. On 12 May 2000, the Nisga'a Treaty was signed between the Provincial and the Federal Governments of Canada and the Nisga'a Nation of the Nass Valley, Northern British Columbia. The outcome was the result of at least a quarter of a century of negotiation with the Provincial and Federal Governments in respect of Nisga'a self determination, a limited independence giving the Nisga'a Nation control over lands within the Nisga'a tribal boundaries, forests and forest resources, fisheries, wildlife and migratory birds.

The Nisga'a Nation can exercise the right to self-government and has the authority to make laws as set out in the Nisga'a agreement with the Canadian Provincial and Federal Government. In indigenous fourth world experience, the right to make laws has been a jealously guarded right restricted to democratically elected governments. By definition, fourth world indigenous peoples are outnumbered in their countries of origin so opportunity to exercise rights in respect of making laws for the whole population has been a privilege denied to minor populations. Laws which define the boundaries within which freedoms will be constrained have been decided by representatives of majority populations and designed primarily, to meet their articulated needs. Few laws made in Aotearoa-New Zealand by successive Settler

Governments have been considered fair and just by Māori, particularly since they were clearly designed to deprive Māori of their cultural and property rights. It was the injustice of this legislation and the ensuing deprivations that instigated the claims for past injustices through the Waitangi Tribunal, a body established in 1975 to examine Māori grievances. The Nisga'a right to be a nation within a nation has won admiration from indigenous peoples, particularly the right which goes to the heart of power and control, the right to make laws. The contexts in which the Nisga'a government or Nisga'a villages have the right to make and implement laws are spelled out in the Treaty, in some instances statements identify which law, Nisga'a or Provincial or Federal will prevail in the event of any conflict between Nisga'a or Provincial or Federal law (1998:159-175).

Even as the agreement in principle was signed, there was a backlash against their success. The Nisga'a were driven to put out fact sheet posters proclaiming their position and denying rumour and fear-mongering that arose at that time, making it clear that their agreements had advantages for all British Columbians, that the Nisga'a did not want to be 'beggars in their own lands'. In the words of Chief Joseph Gosnell, the agreement

represents a hard-fought compromise that has seen a generation of Nisga'a grow old at the negotiating table. But we are making that compromise in order to become full and active participants in the social, political and economic life of this country. (Fact Sheet, 1996:1)

Saami efforts to achieve aspirations for autonomy reflect Māori and Nisga'a resistances to colonial measures to usurp their rights and undermine their existence. The Saami of Norway have experienced a range of colonisers, mainly Scandinavian, but including Nazi Germany during the second world war. A major uprising in the 1970's over plans to flood Saami villages and reindeer herding grounds for a Hydro Electric Power station reached revolutionary proportions when Saami representatives stood on the bridge over the Alta River and held government representatives at bay. This was followed by a hunger strike and civil disobedience outside the Government buildings in Oslo in 1979. Saami demanded recognition as a people, of land, water and cultural rights and importantly, the founding of a democratically elected Saami body. (1993:46) The reports of two public commissions established after the Saami

uprisings led to three major resolutions for Saami as passed in the Norwegian Storting:

1. the founding of a Saami Parliament (Sametinget);
2. legislation relating to the Norwegian constitution;
3. legislation relating to the position of the Saami language. (ibid)

Ole Henri Magga who became the President of the Sametinget, says that it has political and administrative functions. He states that the philosophy has been, and is, that if the Saami culture is to survive, its foundation must be protected and its resources managed by all Saami collectively.

The founding of the Sametinget is first and foremost recognition of we Saami as a people. Based on the expectations the government and Storting have of the Sametinget, it has become legitimate to talk of Saami autonomy and self-determination, concepts which have been associated with rather powerful objections from traditional party politics. (1993:47)

Finally from Ole Henri Magga,

At last Norway has become a home country for Saami language, culture and community life in their true sense, even though we will still feel the cold gust of the winds of the Norwegianisation policy for many decades to come. (ibid:48)

Māori calls for self-determination and autonomy resonate with those of fellow indigenous peoples. It is inappropriate to speak only of individual human rights when so many peoples are still awaiting full recognition in their own right. Within iwi Māori, Tainui for example re-established a Kauhanganui, a representative decision making body to manage the benefits expected to flow from the efforts of the Tainui corporate arm in establishing a tribal economic base. (Kelsey, J.1999:21) Their recognition by the Kahui Ariki was well established in Aotearoa-New Zealand after an early leader, Te Paea put in place a tribal infrastructure to secure cultural survival at least. The Tainui Treaty settlement brought another dimension to their activities, as the late Sir Robert Mahuta said, "The main thing about a capitalist system is that you have to have capital to produce the profit in order to be able to utilise it" (ibid).

The Māori economy had risen and fallen in concert with the economic advances and setbacks of the rest of the national economy. Māori had reaffirmed a commitment to long held claims to self-development at the 1984 Hui Taumata, with the devolution philosophy of 'tuku rangatiratanga'.

At a conference to review the progress made over the decade since the Hui Taumata, the hui instigator, Koro Wetere, would reflect upon the decade stating that: "there have been two major forces that have hindered and supported Māori Development. They are legislation and education" (1994:11). He argued that legislation such as the Treaty of Waitangi (State Enterprises) Act and the Māori Language Act had contributed to Māori development, in contrast to other legislation such as the Trust Boards Act and the Māori Reserved Lands Act which in some respects, he considered, had paralysed development (ibid).

Wetere considered that education too had the same effect, prior to 1984, suppressing Māori aspirations with efforts to ensure success being "at times a measure of tokenism" (ibid). He would go on to conclude that the two factors, legislation and education would contribute in a major way, to Māori success in the next decade largely because of the more prominent role Māori would take. In his view, the legislative process would merely be a tool to realise Māori success, for the drive to success would come from iwi, not government and that in the next decade Māori would be responsible for their own destiny (ibid:16). There are some signs that he was correct, Māori educational initiatives have grown and the successes of individual Māori are also growing. The Ngati Porou, Ngai Tahu and Tuhoe educational initiatives are just some of the evidence that Māori are taking responsibility for Māori destinies. The two Hui Taumata Matauranga hosted by Tuwharetoa at Taupo in 2001 are further evidence of Māori action and government heed. By 2004 it should be clearer as to how closely the outcomes of the two Hui Taumata match the goals that were set.

Indigenous peoples have choices to make. There are those who will choose full autonomy at whatever price, and perhaps East Timor is a valid example of the cost of independence from a nation that does not choose decolonisation for dependent peoples. Others, like the three examples given here, have chosen to stay within the

colonial state with a measure of autonomy and self-determination. The final group will be those who are most at risk, unable, for whatever reason, not to challenge state power but to operate quietly within small walls.

### *Indigeneity versus sovereignty*

For Augie Fleras, indigeneity as principle and practice, is,

concerned ultimately with restructuring the contractual basis of indigenous-state relations. It moves away from the colonisation of the past towards recognition of First Peoples as distinct societies whose collective and inherent rights to jurisdictional self-determination over land, identity and political voice have never been extinguished but serve as grounds for entitlement and engagement with the State. (in Havemann, P.1999:192)

For Fleras, indigeneity has become politicised, a form of 'politicised ethnicity', of ethno-politics arising to challenge conventional political assumptions. There is an assumption in these claims that challenges to legitimacy and entitlement are new; they are not.<sup>32</sup> There may be fresh interpretations of old local orders but clearly, if the Māori case is taken as an example, indigeneity is an expression in the international context, of a primary principle of demarcation. The Māori concept of tangata whenua, for example, is a core component of Māori culture; it is identificatory and it is political. Moreover it is not new; nor did the particular view of tangata whenua as a rights bearing concept arise with the onset of colonialism. The tension between two rights bearing concepts, indigeneity and universality, has yet to be resolved.

---

<sup>32</sup> Indigenous leaders from Aotearoa-New Zealand and from Canada and the Nisga'a in particular, have a history of attempted negotiation with the British Crown seen as embodied in the Crowned Head, to discuss what they saw as abrogation's of their own sovereignty. For Māori this was the unique application of mana or authority held by autonomous tribes over their properties. Māori visited England from 1882 onwards seeking audiences with the Queen and her successors. British Columbia chiefs visited King Edward to discuss Treaty rights, and by 1909, the Nisga'a had hired a London firm to draft a petition on their behalf to the Privy Council. Wiremu Ratana led another delegation in 1924, seeking a royal audience but was not successful. British Columbian chiefs had at least had a meeting with King Edward in 1906, but Māori were not successful until 1914 when a delegation met with George V. Indigenous peoples attempted to make their case to a range of forums, for example, there was an attempt to present the Iroquois case to the League of Nations when it was formed in 1923. In 1949, the United States was instrumental in defeating a recommendation from the United Nations General Assembly, that a study of the problems of indigenous peoples be carried out. (Wilmer, F.1993:211-212)

While the concept of universality is recognised as a foundation of modern democratic states, increasingly, the juxtaposition of indigeneity on those states raises questions of rights based not solely on citizenship, but simply on being indigenous. That is the position that Māori maintain as appropriate and right for them as peoples of Aotearoa-New Zealand. The indigenous claim runs counter to the diaspora, the travellers on the waves of expansionism.

Promotion of indigenous rights is going to be exclusive of those who left their homes to settle in the homelands of indigenous peoples and that can be problematic. The discourse around indigeneity may operate more obviously today as a counter to the discourse of sovereignty, but each of them is a statement of a culturally-based world view. Symbols of sovereignty such as royalty, the royal family, heir to the throne, kings and queens, the crown, the monarch, imply genealogy, an ethno-political association that depends for its legitimacy upon ethnic connections. Royalty is not elected, implying that they are born to rule, a far stronger claim than is made in indigenous politics where the claim is simply rights to authority over indigenous domains. Some royal families have relinquished their absolute power; some had power taken from them; others have remained as figureheads in a largely democratic state, but nonetheless, the concept of sovereignty, like indigeneity also has ethno-political origins.

Indigeneity and the indigenous peoples for whom it applies, have challenged the imposition of the concept of state sovereignty wherever colonial states have asserted their supremacy and claimed legitimacy under the western conceptualisation of sovereignty. Having seized authority, the colonial state had then to suppress any resistance or further defence of their territories by the displaced indigenous peoples. Indigenous peoples within those boundaries do not have internationally recognised sovereignty. In the words of an indigenous writer, “indigeneity is about a set of rights that indigenous people might reasonably expect to exercise in modern times” (Durie, M., 2001:8). The principle was raised as part of a discussion paper regarding Māori educational advancement presented as a keynote address for a Hui Taumata on Education, held in February 2001. In the same paper, attention was drawn to the need to find some reconciliation between what were described as “the sometimes conflicting principles of citizenship and indigeneity” (ibid). This definition makes it

clear that the principle does not suggest that the rights as so defined are about secession rather than those that can be recognised within the bounds of the state.

The debates that arose in Canada over Northern Cree claims to self-determination identified the distinction between indigenous claims from the ethno-national claim of the French Canadians in Quebec as the referendum for the secession of Quebec from Canada was underway in October 1995. The Cree, who live in Northern Quebec, threatened to secede, having also sought self determination but not been given the opportunity to participate in a referendum.

### *Doctrines of Colonialism*

Sharon Helen Venne, an indigenous writer, discusses the doctrine of discovery as a concept that allowed European powers to claim title. She quotes Lester Geoffrey as having stated that “Discovery conferred title; all European powers accepted that principle because it was in their interests to do so” (cited in Venne, 1998:3).

The Doctrine of Discovery conveniently ignored the existence of the people whose home the lands already were. Histories are written about European discovery, and valorises those who are purported to have made the discoveries. For America, Columbus was the history book discoverer, the hero who thought he had reached India and claimed America for the Spanish Crown. For indigenous America he was “an invader and a colonizer without regard for the original inhabitants of the lands he ‘discovered’” (ibid:2). New Zealand history books followed a similar line. Abel Tasman ‘discovered’ New Zealand and named it for his own homeland but he did not ‘claim’ it. He was followed by James Cook who shared the history book distinction of ‘discovering’ New Zealand. Indigenous New Zealand as do indigenous America both ask how it is possible to discover something that wasn’t lost. The doctrine of discovery is infused with European hegemony.

The language that is used to claim and name under the doctrine of discovery, akin to another doctrine, *terra nullius*, opened the way for the next step, appropriation and settlement. *Terra nullius*, as Attwood (1996:ix) describes it, was “a philosophical and

legal rationale for dispossession of indigenes”. Scottish Enlightenment philosophers Adam Smith and Adam Ferguson, for example, contended that human society evolved through a set of stages, and that those at the first stage, hunters and gatherers, had no concept of property, so their lands could be deemed no-man’s land, or *terra nullius*.(ibid:ix)

At the same time as Columbus and Cook are written into history books as heroes, indigenous histories are covered over. The people who were not lost and the land that was already ‘discovered’ are written out of the frame. As long as marginalisation can be justified by stereotypical descriptors of indigenous peoples as primitive; backward; or of another time, no political conscience need be disturbed and the doctrines legitimate colonial actions. A process of discounting original peoples because they are not western, justifies to the western international community, the invisibility of the indigenous nations.

These add a further qualification, that additional to the doctrine of discovery and other similar rights bearing doctrines, is another, a hierarchy of populations such that occupants of newly discovered lands could be ignored if they were considered to be of an “inferior civilisation”. (Von Glahn, G., 1981:316) The doctrine of civilisation, was another in the arsenal of unilateral claims in the discourse of colonial imperialism. Even the term expansionism hides a multitude of terrorist activities when used as a pseudonym for invasion or appropriation. It sits comfortably alongside the doctrine of discovery, implying a far more civilised approach to the take over of other peoples properties by force, than can be inferred from the choice of descriptors. Indigenous peoples were forcibly deprived of their rights and livelihoods and in some cases their lives, to make way for the colonizers and civilisers.

### ***Decolonisation***

Decolonisation is one way that indigenous peoples have been able to actualise their potential, that is, by resuming political and economic power in their country of origin. Franke Wilmer notes that “western powers embarked on a programme of decolonisation, resulting in the independence of many formerly subjugated peoples in

what is now the Third World.” (Wilmer, F.1993:195) There was some recognition of the rights of some peoples to political and economic self-determination, evidenced in the Pacific at least, by the ‘handing back’ to formerly colonised peoples, like Western Samoa, for example, full political and economic control of their own country. To Wilmer, this is more than a process of decolonisation, it is testimony to the de-legitimation of colonisation. For indigenous nations bound into colonial democracies by a subordinate relationship, however, decolonisation is not likely.

### ***Who is indigenous?***

There is a particular interpretation over the question of indigeneity, and one definition agreed to in the draft of an Inter-American Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples is as follows.

1. In this Declaration indigenous peoples are those who embody historical continuity with societies which existed prior to the conquest and settlement of their territories by Europeans, as well as tribal peoples whose social, cultural and economic conditions distinguish them from other sectors of the national community, and whose status is regulated wholly or partially by their own customs or traditions or by special laws or regulations.
2. Self identification as indigenous or tribal shall be regarded as a fundamental criterion for determining the groups to which the provisions of this Declaration apply.
3. The use of the terms ‘peoples’ in this instrument shall not be construed as having any implication with respect to any other rights that might be attached to that term in inter-national law. ( cited in Venne, 1998:219)

Indigenous peoples may or may not constitute a numerical majority in their homelands, and the conceptualisation of indigenous peoples as aboriginal peoples, that group of people whose ancestors had, as Maddock explains: “lived in the land before the ancestors of the rest of the population arrived” (1991:4) further defines which peoples the descriptor is intended to fit. Maddock seeks to dispel the idea that

Māori should regard themselves as fourth world, a concept given value by Manuel and Posluns (1974), in their distinction of Fourth World people as those indigenous people who maintain a traditional spiritual and economic relationship with their land. McCall (1980) adds the view that Fourth World refers to nations without states, but for Maddock, these concepts disregard the position of indigenous peoples as “co-actors in the drama of colonisation” (1991:25). For Maddock, the question of rights attached to those who are indigenous is problematic as is any perspective which is seen to attach injustice to the process of takeover of property and peoples through colonisation. In his argument, Fourth World is a political concept used to support the development claims of indigenous people (ibid:27). Yet First World and Third World are equally concepts as political as colonisation or colonial. One implies resource riches, the other not, and in general, the parlous state of the third world resource base and its peoples is a direct consequence of exploitation by the first world. The latter two presume that the establishment of a colony is an act of heroism on the part of the perpetrators who bring salvation to those who didn’t know they needed to be saved.

Colonisation from the perspective of the colonised inevitably means loss of power and control, and appropriation or theft of goods and properties. Insofar as there are at least two different perspectives of colonisation and colonised, it is just as logical to expect that there should be more than one view of the constitution of a fourth world, or that indigenous is a political concept based on rights.

In 1990, Ian Brownlie, a member of the English Bar and Chichele Professor of Public International Law in the University of Oxford, was invited to Aotearoa-New Zealand to give a series of lectures at the University of Auckland. One of the lectures in the series was titled *‘Indigenous Peoples: A Relevant Concept?’* His conclusions were somewhat disparaging of the concept of indigenous peoples as only those whose rights are secure can be. In his view there was nothing that the normal application of human rights standards would not take care of regarding the legitimate concerns of indigenous peoples and given that, then “controversy over the definition of indigenous peoples is not of great significance” (1992:62-63).

Yet it might even have been possible to draw analogies between the position of Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand and that of the Scots in Scotland as long as they remained

without a Parliament of their own or suffered from the loss of their indigenous lands and language. Instead Brownlie looks far beyond his own shores and chooses Tibet to provide an example of a country whose leadership is in exile but working towards reclamation based on the principles of human rights and self-determination.

To Brownlie, the issues are those of equity and that they can be pursued within the context of human rights principles and relevant international conventions (ibid:73). For him, there is a difference between equity and priority and privilege, implying that indigenous peoples should be satisfied with equity. Further, he raises the hoary old argument that allocation of indigenous rights will somehow mean that human rights will not prevail, “that traditional values will be placed above human rights norms and environmental programmes” (1992:74).

Given the parlous state of the environment without the traditional values of indigenous peoples, notwithstanding the human rights record of western colonising nations, the statement is incoherent. Indigenous peoples have issues in common where decolonisation has not taken place and the colonising communities remain in power.

### ***Indigenisation***

Māori discursive production iterates the position of tribal nationhood and the concept of *tangata whenua*, somewhat akin to recent conceptualisations of the rights of original peoples who have become political and numerical minorities in their own countries. Tangata Whenua is a rights bearing concept referencing implicit territorial rights and reciprocal obligations applicable at a local, regional and national level. Māori assertion of tangata whenua rights are well understood in indigenous circles, but struggle for acceptance of their legitimacy inside a colonial nation-state. Conflicts between assertion of tangata whenua rights and western rights bearing concepts such as sovereignty, have little room for resolution in the absence of negotiation in good faith.

For this reason, tangata whenua rights tend to rate acceptance at a symbolic level but resistance at implementation levels. Māori claims are based primarily on indigenous

rather than minority rights, a distinction asserting original people status. Claims to portray Māori as merely a cultural minority in Aotearoa-New Zealand or that categorisation as a cultural minority could adequately encompass the basis of Māori claims exposes the dis-empowering impact of democracy on indigenous peoples, the philosophy of survival of the largest, which is another form of Darwinism.

Ogbu (1991) for example, takes minority categorisation for granted, and in doing so privileges the majority population in a taken for granted frame. Even the language used to argue the position of minority status, is heavily overlaid with status quo perceptions. Ogbu states that:

Immigrant minorities have generally moved to their present societies because they believed that the move would lead to more economic well-being, better overall opportunities or greater political freedom....In contrast, non-immigrant minorities, whom I designate involuntary minorities, are people who were brought into their present society through slavery, conquest or colonisation. (1991:8-9)

Ogbu goes on to give a brief statement about the perceptions of such minorities as being one of “undeserved oppression” and includes Māori as belonging in his category of involuntary minorities. (ibid) Indigenous peoples argue that they are not minorities, and in doing so, the question of the rights that might obtain to indigenous peoples arises. The United Nations has debated the issues for itself but has not yet found a solution.

As Sharon Venne states,

The United Nations has promoted self-determination and protection of human rights toward maintaining peace and friendly relations among member states in over sixty international treaties and declarations. Despite this apparent progress in international legal instruments, there remain two problematic areas: Indigenous Peoples and minorities within the member states of the United Nations. Are indigenous peoples ‘peoples’ or ‘minorities’? Are minorities considered peoples within the scope of the United Nations charter? (1998:68)

The minority rights model, while not applicable to the Māori case since Māori see themselves as belonging to the category of indigenous peoples, has a partial relevance

in considerations of a western style democracy and the dilemma of the tyranny of the majority. As long as indigenous peoples are classed as minorities, indigenous peoples will be at risk.

Dalee Sambo has argued this point in regard to collective rights, stating that,

Without clear and explicit recognition of collective rights, indigenous societies and cultures would remain unnecessarily exposed to deterioration, if not possible destruction by outside forces. (1993:22-23)

### ***International Recognition of Indigenous Rights***

The European takeover of non-European lands found its legitimation not only by might, but also by prevailing doctrines from Europe over what constituted a legitimate act. If might led to conquest, there was even less likelihood of redemption for the people who lost their lands. Indigenous peoples have made use of the doctrines to argue against their imposition, for example, appropriating the doctrine of sovereignty to declare the continuity of aboriginal sovereignty.

Franke Wilmer has demonstrated the flaws in the arguments in the international legal system by illustrating the contradictions in claims at International Law that:

the doctrines of conquest, discovery and occupancy were legitimate means of extinguishing aboriginal sovereignty while at the same time recognising the right of peoples to self-determination. It cannot hold, she says, that title was legitimately obtained, from an international perspective, through treaty agreements, but also that the reciprocal obligations of such treaties is without international standing. (Wilmer, 1993:62-63)

As with Māori, indigenous tribes in the United States had treaties with Britain and hold that the obligations are still constant. In Aotearoa-New Zealand the international instruments to recognition were the *1839 Declaration of Independence*, that asserted Aotearoa-New Zealand as a sovereign nation, and the *1840 Treaty of Waitangi*, a treaty between Māori and the British Crown. The internal debates over the Treaty of Waitangi are discussed in Chapter 2. But internationally, it can be claimed that the Treaty of Waitangi paved the way for Pākeha settlement in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Pākeha settlement is not explicit in the Treaty however, and the discussion is mainly

about the sale of lands to the British Crown and the guarantee of protection for Māori by the Crown, of Māori people and property rights.

In acknowledgement of the vulnerable state of many indigenous peoples, *The International Decade for the World's Indigenous Peoples* declared by the United Nations General Assembly, began in 1995 and will continue until 2005. The decade was preceded by a year dedicated to acknowledgement of the rights and plight of indigenous peoples.

An ILO (*International Labour Organisation*) *Convention concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries* emphasises the rights of indigenous peoples to preserve and develop their culture and the duty of the authorities to support the work. As part of the work for the decade, the United Nations General Assembly recommended that states “consider ratification and implementation of the *International Labour Organisation Convention, 169 on Indigenous and Tribal Peoples...*in close consultation with the indigenous organisations of each country” (GA resolution 50/157, cited by Te Puni Kokiri 1999:01).

Prior to each of these, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the *Universal Declaration of Human Rights* after the atrocities experienced by indigenous peoples and by Jews in Germany during World War II. Each of these documents sets out the case for specific sets of rights, with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights being directed at individual rather than group rights. The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted and proclaimed the Declaration on 10 December, 1948. Article 26 of the Declaration states that “Everyone has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit” (Adopted and Proclaimed by General Assembly resolution 217 A (III) 1948).

The establishment of the *International Labour Organisation* in 1919, “to improve the working conditions of labour all over the world” (cited in Venne, 1998:30) after members of the newly formed League of Nations sought to foster peace in the labour

force as well as peace among nations introduced another player to the international scene. After the failure of the League, the ILO aligned itself closely with the United Nations after its formation in 1946, extending its oversight to “the promotion and protection of workers’ rights in relation to their human rights” (ibid:31). The ILO aims to promote ‘social justice’ by improving the life and work conditions of working people all over the world. To do this it adopts conventions and provides practical help to governments and others. Each member country is represented on the ILO by the state, and by employer and worker representatives” (Te Puni Kokiri *Discussion Document*, 1999:2).

The ILO Convention No.169 is not restricted to labour issues, instead covering a range of indigenous people’s rights, land rights, social and economic rights, cultural rights, political participation and self-governance (ibid). According to the draft discussion document the convention is premised on the idea that:

- indigenous and tribal peoples will continue to exist as distinct parts of their national societies with their own structures and traditions;
- these structures and ways of life are valuable and should be protected, and;
- indigenous and tribal peoples have the right to take part in the decision making processes of the states in which they live (ibid:2).

New Zealand is among the 13 countries who had ratified the Convention No 169 by July 1998. ILO 169 is a legally binding document for those states who have ratified it<sup>33</sup> (ibid:3).

The *Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* is a separate document prepared by The Working Group on Indigenous Peoples in accordance with its mandate from the United Nations. This document:

1. authorises the Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities to establish a working group on indigenous populations which shall meet for up to five working days before the annual sessions of the Sub-Commission in order to review developments

---

<sup>33</sup> There are 44 clauses to the convention

pertaining to the promotion and protection of the human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous populations, including information requested by the Secretary-General annually from Governments, specialised agencies, regional intergovernmental organisations, and non-governmental organisations in consultative status, particularly those of indigenous peoples, to analyse such materials, and to submit its conclusions to the Sub-Commission bearing in mind the report of the Special Rapporteur of the Sub-Commission;

2. decides that the Working Group shall give special attention to the evolution of standards concerning the rights of indigenous populations, taking into account both the similarities and aspirations of indigenous populations throughout the world (U.N.Doc.E/CN.4/Sub.2/L.566).

The *Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples* was drafted in consultation with indigenous representatives, over a period of eight years, and then forwarded to the Sub-Commission and approved in 1994. The nine main articles of the Declaration in summary are:

1. the right to self determination;
2. the right to be protected from genocide;
3. the right to be protected from ethnocide;
4. the protection of cultural property;
5. the right to land;
6. the right to resource control;
7. the protection of intellectual property;
8. the right to reclaim resources;
9. the right to environmental protection<sup>34</sup>

While the *Draft Declaration* has not been ratified, it remains a symbolic document for indigenous peoples. Partly as a result of the debates over the document and its

---

<sup>34</sup>

A detailed copy of the Declaration is included in appendix I.

wording, at least indigenous peoples are now seen as being different to minorities under international law (Venne, 1998:96).

A final document to be explored is the *Draft Document of the Coolangatta Statement on Indigenous Rights in Education*, a document with its origins in the work of a Task Force established in 1993 for the World Indigenous Peoples Conference at Wollongong in Australia. The preamble to the Statement sets out the need for such a document, identifying the denial of equity in non-Indigenous education systems, and that non-Indigenous education systems have failed to provide education services that are both scholarly and nurturing. It goes on to state that:

almost all indigenous peoples and in particular those who have suffered the impact and effects of colonisation, have struggled to access education that acknowledges, respects and promotes the right of indigenous peoples to be indigenous. (Task Force, 1993:4)

The Draft draws attention to four particular concerns for indigenous education.

- The right to be indigenous is an essential prerequisite to developing and maintaining culturally appropriate and sustainable education for indigenous peoples.
- The educational struggles of indigenous peoples are fundamentally and unequivocally concerned with the right of indigenous peoples to be indigenous.
- There is a commonality of purpose and desire among the indigenous peoples of the world for education.
- It recognises that this commonality involves a shared belief that education must be scholarly and empowering whilst at the same time the processes of education must be embedded in indigenous culture and wisdom.

The participants at the 1999 World Indigenous Education Conference endorsed the Coolangatta Statement, proclaiming that:

fundamental to all peoples is the inalienable and collective right of self-determination. A profound expression of this right is the revitalisation of

Indigenous cultural knowledge, ways of life, and the evolution of cultural education in contemporary life. (1999:4)

### *Educational Case Studies*

In each of the case studies to follow, the indigenous peoples face similar problems to those confronting Māori. How indigenous peoples can access the best of education to enable positive participation in the global environment without conceding their heritage. Strategies enacted by indigenous peoples in these case studies have some similarities as they each seek to establish a more effective relationship between themselves as peoples and the modern forms of the nation-state as it is operated by the descendants of the colonising peoples. Whereas the politico-economic structures put in place by indigenous peoples before they were taken over might once have been dismissed as 'petty tribes' for example, now there are instances where the colonial state is, to some extent, withdrawing from overbearing control of indigenous nations without proceeding to full decolonisation.

Indigenous peoples from the two groups studied have similar demands of education besides the expectation that schools will achieve high levels of critical ability in literacy and numeracy for their children. Each of the groups, Saami, and Nisga'a ask more of their schools, for in the history of each, schools have been the primary means of denying indigenous children the right to normalise their language and culture in their educational provision. Instead the common experience of indigenous peoples is that their heritage language and culture is not valued by schools, and by extension nor are the children. Just as Māori children in English speaking schools have been exposed to a concentrated programme of Europeanisation, so have the Saami endured Norwegianisation and the Nisga'a, Europeanisation.

### *Saami Experiences*

The Saami are the indigenous people of the Arctic circle mainly in Scandinavia. The Saami of the Norwegian Arctic Circle who are the largest Saami group, are the people who form the basis of this case study. The information included is taken in the main

from published accounts of Saami experience as confirmed by research advocates from the Saami community.

Saami, like Māori and Nisga'a have suffered from a prohibition against speaking their native language. Magga refers to a process of heavy-handed Norwegianisation, in which the Saami language was formally prohibited<sup>35</sup>. The Saami also suffered economic discrimination. Having herded reindeer across the northern Arctic circle for centuries, they found their paths obstructed. From 1902, Magga states, it was stipulated by law that "land could only be sold to those who could speak or write Norwegian and who used it on a daily basis"( Magga, O.H.1993:45). Jordan states that the policy of assimilation required more than being forbidden to speak Saami at school:

it was assumed that everyone was able to speak the dominant language. The children were not, for example, taught Norwegian. Yet the students were expected to understand that language and the content of the curriculum-all presented in a foreign language. (Jordan, 1988:192)

Magga states that "While Norwegianisation measures were met with strong resistance, ...the Government had at its disposal an arsenal of means which gradually became too powerful" (1993:45). Like other indigenous peoples, oppression did not necessarily lead to disappearance and like Māori and the Nisga'a, the Saami have been actively engaged in rebuilding an education that returns a cultural identity and respect for Saami to the fore.

The Norwegian educational system that incorporates Saami education, is largely a public school system that provides compulsory education from the ages of 6 -15 years.

A Saami Education Council was appointed in 1975 as an advisory body for the Ministry of Church, Education and Research in matters concerning education and learning of the Saami population. The Council carries responsibility for the development of policies for Saami education and provides policy advice to the Sametinget. The work of the Saami Education Council is varied and as well as taking responsibility for the implementation of policy, includes the obligation to develop a

---

<sup>35</sup>

Between 1898 and 1959

Saami curriculum on all levels in the educational system. To this end, for example, a reference group was set up in 1996 to discuss the issue of traditional knowledge in school curricula. The idea was that Saami cultural knowledge would be a legitimate part of the school curriculum for all Norwegian children, a far cry from the strict Norwegianisation policies of the past.

Two guiding principles for the Education Council are:

1. the school must give the new generation of Saami the possibility to interact with the wider society;
2. at the same time and as part of this, the school must give the Saami the possibility both to conserve and further create their ethnic and cultural identity. (Keskitalo, 1985:10, Haetta, 1998:2)

The Education Council is also charged with safeguarding and developing the Saami language. There are at least three distinct Saami languages spoken in Norway, the most prolific being the Northern Saami, but as well there are Lule Saamis and Southern Saamis, all of whom have their own language. The Saami Language Act was enacted in 1991 as an amendment to the Saami Act of 1987.

The Council safeguards and develops the Saami language by means of:

- bilingual administration;
- the development of different language terms within the different subjects; and
- ensuring quality and status of the Saami language in education.

It also engages in the preparation of appropriate teaching materials for dissemination throughout the schools in Norway, with a focus on those where Saami children are most populous. The teaching materials are developed in Northern Saami, Lule Saami and Southern Saami languages and in Norwegian.

The Council also safeguards the needs of Saami learners by maintaining oversight of Saami educational needs through conducting research as well as monitoring the situation in general. It engages in Bilingual Saami/Norwegian administration to

support schools who need the direction. The model of bilingual administration acts as a guide for others to take up and follow, indicating that the Saami language is able to be used in schools as a curriculum subject and as a language of communication at the administrative level. The Council develops different language terms for all the different subjects of the curriculum and ensures the quality and status of the Saami language in education.

The Traditional Knowledge project undertaken prior to the incorporation of Saami knowledge into the Norwegian curriculum as a whole, was subject to international experience for similar projects. The experiences of Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand formed part of the ongoing critique of the project so that modifications could be made where there were difficulties identified by other indigenous nations (see Durie, A. E., Lipka, & Keskitalo, 1997). The priorities of the Saami Schools project were identified as “Teaching, learning and tradition” (Haetta, E. I., 1998, personal communication). While childrens’ learning was a priority, there was also a need to retain parents and village people as a resource group. Other goals of the project were that traditional knowledge should be connected with indigenous knowledge, and that features of that knowledge could be either across the curriculum or within the curriculum.

The Saami Education Council is part of the administrative body of the Sametinget, the Saami Parliament where it is able to work closely with the political arm of the Norwegian Saami and provide substantive recommendations for the Parliament to pass on to the Stortinget for full approval.

A 1991 Saami Language Act passed as an amendment to the Saami Act of 1987, allowed for the recognition of language and cultural rights for the Saami. The Saami language has official status, giving it the force of law to be used as the language of communication and a language of study within the education system across Norway. One procedural rider on the implementation of this law is that there must be more than ten students wishing to enrol before the courses receive funding. Like Māori and like Nisga’a, the Saami see the return of the language as intrinsically connected to a Saami cultural identity. Also familiar are the procedural constraints after having won the validation of their cultural heritage and its place in education. Children with

Saami at home find that the Saami language system works reasonably well, that the demand for teachers fluent in Saami is the main problem in that case. Two other groups are seen who need extra help.

- Children not living in Saamisk, while grandparents might have the language, the parents do not and want it back. There is not a satisfactory model for that group as yet.
- Ethnic Norwegians living where Saami is the main language. Saami language is compulsory for those Norwegians. In Kautokeino all pupils have Saami as a subject, for example. Norwegians are expected to become bilingual but are not if they do not master Saamisk.

Because of these factors there is a strong effort to implement pre-school policies and see them used actively (P.c. Astra Balto, 1995). A College of Education has been established in Kautokeino for the purpose of meeting the shortcomings of teacher education to meet Saami educational needs. There is a one-year course for qualified teachers already in schools to enable them to meet the situation in schools. There is some consideration given to using elders in schools. The College of Education trains three levels of teachers, Pre-School, Primary and Further training for qualified teachers. Lecturers at the College engage in programmes of research to further their subjects (ibid).

### *Nisga'a Experiences*

The Nisga'a people, indigenous to British Columbia in Canada, also have experiences that have strong implications for those of Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand.

The Nisga'a Government's right to make laws extends to include education from pre School to grade 12, including the teaching of Nisga'a language and culture, with some provisos. These provisions address issues of standards and student mobility between Nisga'a institutions and provincial institutions without disadvantage. Further, Nisga'a have provision to certificate teachers beyond the teaching of Nisga'a language and culture, by way of a Nisga'a institution "in accordance with standards comparable to standards applicable to individuals who teach in public or independent schools in British Columbia" (1998:176), or through an equivalent provincial body.

For the certification of teachers for the teaching of Nisga'a language and culture, the standards applied will comply with those established under Nisga'a law. In respect of any inconsistency or conflict between these and federal or provincial law, the Nisga'a law will prevail to the extent of the inconsistency or conflict. Agreements for Nisga'a residing outside of Nisga'a territory or non-Nisga'a residing within Nisga'a territory, can be negotiated. Similar legislation can be made in respect of Post- Secondary Education, including degree granting institutions, curriculum determinations, and the accreditation and certification of individuals who teach or research Nisga'a language and culture. Standards must be consistent with provincial standards in respect of key areas such as accountability, degree requirements and admission standards and policies.

The Nass Valley is in the remote hinterlands of Northern British Columbia, from the Skeena Mountains in the north east, around the Alaskan Panhandle and out to the Pacific Coast. Approximately 6,000 Nisga'a live in the Nass Valley and a further 3,500 elsewhere. Like Māori, the Nisga'a were devastated by influenza among other infectious diseases brought by Europeans and they also were forbidden to speak their language and practise their own beliefs. The Nisga'a hold that they have been subjected to a system of cultural genocide for over one hundred years (1993:2). Nisga'a children were sent to residential schools designed to separate them from their home culture and assimilate them into the ways of European Canadian society, a colonial rationale implemented in similar form in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Residential schools in Canada had a history of violence towards their charges which finally, in 1998 brought an apology from the Canadian Federal Government for the treatment received in the schools by First Nations children. The Nisga'a have a saying "within the pursuit of knowledge therein one will find the true meaning of life" (1987:64).

Two Nisga'a educationists, Alvin and Bert McKay, see the involvement of all the Nisga'a people in the pursuit of a quality education as essential to their realisation (ibid). Bert McKay was the Lakalzap community's first College educated Nisga'a teacher to return to teach in that community. The McKays write about the Nisga'a educational philosophy of the child as a total being and the need for such a sound philosophy when planning a programme for people. The Nisga'a philosophy of education as a total way of life resonates with Māori philosophies of education.

Nisga'a too emphasise holism, seeing the life components of total being as physical, mental, social, emotional and spiritual. Identification of such components are not unique to Māori and Nisga'a, but for both Māori and Nisga'a it is this perception of each child that is essential for a full understanding and appropriate educational provision.

## ***Conclusion***

Educational provision that draws from Western influences is considered to be deficient and negligent towards indigenous children in its narrow approach towards education. While there have been many theoretical positions which could inform educational provision, in practice, schooling has adopted a particularly narrow view of education which confines indigenous learners to a curriculum approach devoid of appropriate indigenous representation and devoid of the vitality needed to see the child as a total being.

For all three indigenous groups, Saami, Nisga'a and Māori, control over educational provision from political authority, policy development and school conditions and circumstances are the factors that make a difference to the realisation of indigenous educational goals and aspirations as they apply to their political and cultural identity and to their scholarly goals and place in a global environment. Indigenous claims are clearly more than a reclamation of land rights as a property right, and redress for the injustices of colonisation. In all of the indigenous claims and in the draft declarations of indigenous rights, indigenous peoples seek the right to be indigenous and the right to self-determination. The right to be indigenous turns on the close connections between collective identity and ancestral lands (Durie, A.E.1989). The role that education has played in severing the identificatory relationship between indigenous peoples and their language and lands has been typical of the experiences of Māori, of Saami and of Nisga'a. This chapter has provided some insight into the strategies that each is undertaking to overcome the damage of those experiences and provide just political and societal platforms upon which a better educational future for their children can be built.

The aim of the next chapter is to examine prevailing philosophical, theoretical and political underpinnings upon which Maori educational research is premised. It builds on the discussion of indigeneity and comes to focus on the methodological flaws and innovation that have been applied to Maori education policy and practice and the assumptions made in respect of Maori learners.

## PART TWO

### MĀORI AT SCHOOL: VOICES FROM EXPERIENCE

## CHAPTER FIVE

### RE-SEARCHING MĀORI EDUCATION

The development of Māori theoretical frameworks for academic work has evolved over time, growing in potency as Māori move from a positioning in oral history tradition to an acknowledgement in wider spheres of enquiry that Māori narratives are representations of Māori realities. The implications for educational research when considering assumptions about the social political and cultural worlds of education that ignore Māori realities, have led to growing concern over promenading research that does nothing for Māori futures as decided by Māori.

#### *Colonialism and Research*

Interconnections between scholarship and colonialism became most evident during the height of British expansionism into the Pacific in the late eighteenth and the nineteenth century. For Māori these interconnections were no more apparent than during the debates over the concept of sovereignty and the issues of people and property rights arising prior to and after the 1840 signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Colonial educational systems constructed first by the early missionaries to Aotearoa-New Zealand, and then taken over by the emerging new colonial state, served to distort Māori positions and promote the political, economic and educational interests of colonialism. Māori learners in the new schooling systems were systematically conditioned to believe in the superiority of European forms of 'civilisation', and to conceive of Māori as savage albeit sometimes portrayed as noble savages. By implication, all Māori needed to be 'civilised' and to be freed from their existing state through the benefits of colonialism.

Paradoxically of course, the impact of colonialism on Māori was the loss of freedom, a freedom that Māori still struggle to regain today. For Europe, and for Britain specifically, colonialism brought progress through the capture of resources and land for re-settlement. Political, scientific and legal theories were constructed to support these colonial activities and gain popular support for the appropriations of indigenous properties and the consequent loss of freedom and independence suffered by

indigenous peoples through colonisation practices executed under the banner of civilising primitive savages.

Discriminatory 19th century government practices undermined the social organisation of Māori communities and deprived them of their economic base, reducing the majority of Māori to a subordinate economic, political and cultural position. Because Māori were not perceived to have a conception of property rights in land or have conceptualised private property, only land they were settled upon was regarded as theirs. Unoccupied lands were classified as 'waste lands', an ideological colonial construction that rationalised and facilitated occupation. Although not as dramatic as the 'terra nullius' doctrine used to appropriate the whole of Australia from the charge of the indigenous peoples there, the waste land doctrine was a related and blatant form of land usurpation. Crown sovereignty, a notion fraught with overtones of colonialism, was acquired in Australia under the notion of terra nullius, territory was treated as "desert, uninhabited country" (Stephenson, Ratnapala, 1993:103).

The establishment of an English style colonial school system in Aotearoa-New Zealand outlawed the Māori language as the language of schooling and privileged the English language together with its cultural conceptualisations of the world. The colonial project in Aotearoa-New Zealand included the use of education as an assimilatory and domesticating force. Lord John Russell, Colonial Secretary in 1840, issued an instruction to the first British Governor in Aotearoa-New Zealand, William Hobson, stating that

The education of the youth among the aborigines is of course indispensable to the success of any measures for their ultimate advancement in social arts, and in the scale of political existence. I apprehend however, that for the present this is a duty which could properly be undertaken only by the missionaries, or at least on some system to be formed in concurrence with them. (British Parliamentary Papers, 1841, (311) XV11, p.28)

The colonial message of European progressiveness and indigenous backwardness was well entrenched in the British Colonial Office and its emissaries despite evidence to the contrary. The Confederation of the United Tribes of New Zealand had, in 1835, already declared the country an independent Māori nation. Māori independence had gained international recognition, including from the King of England, William IV.

Far from Māori ultimate advancement on the scale of political existence, the Treaty of Waitangi that followed the Declaration of Independence, was not what Māori had agreed to. Instead it led to the destruction of Māori advancement politically. Without the vote and without ratification of Article two of the Treaty, Māori political progress was brought to a resounding halt.

A lay missionary, John Gorst, epitomised the colonial servant with his observations of the Māori King Movement in the Waikato, when he noted that the King movement efforts to provide for itself, not only in education but also in its administration, were superior to the colonial version. Despite this, Gorst still saw the King movement as being segregative and therefore not acceptable, adding “we can govern the Māoris better than they can govern themselves”. (cited in Daglish, N. 1980:137) heightening the role of education as a technique to undermine Māori administrative competence and promote the acceptance of English ‘civilisation’. Indigenous infrastructures for the production and transmission of knowledges and competencies were to be displaced by foreign forms of administrative provision even were these were known to be inadequate. Māori scholars are challenging the perception that Māori advancement has depended upon the dominating relationship of the Settler community with Māori; that without that relationship, Māori would somehow be caught in a time warp unable to take advantage of 19<sup>th</sup> much less 20<sup>th</sup> century knowledge and skills. Yet Māori ability to make good use of the technologies of the time demonstrate the fallacy of these arguments. It is likely that this very ability, the sight of Māori doing well was in part, responsible for Pakeha resentment and subsequent Government invasion of the King country, a fertile and productive region.

### *Critical or Critique?*

Besides building Māori scholarship, Māori scholars have brought the work of fellow scholars from a range of critical positions, in to play to critique taken-for-granted Western positions of theoretical dominance. Writers such as Said and Fanon, who write from the position of the colonised, inform the work of Māori writers in their engagement with the colonial project.

Although critical theory allows an ability to interrogate taken for granted theoretical and real positioning, Said makes reference to the body of writing dependant on what

appear to be “detached and apolitical cultural disciplines, upon a quite sordid history of imperialist ideology and colonialist practice” (1993:47). Critical theory forms part of what Said refers to as “dominant discourses and disciplinary traditions in the main fields of scientific, social and cultural enquiry” pointing out that the paradigms have drawn from what are considered exclusively western sources (ibid: 47). Examples are the works of Foucault and of Raymond Williams, whom Said describes as formidable scholars, but in his opinion, for both, the imperial experience is quite irrelevant, a theoretical oversight that is the norm in Western cultural and scientific disciplines (ibid: 47).

Said observes the reinterpretation of the western cultural archive by non-western intellectuals, a shift that he describes as reading the archive contrapuntally rather than univocally, aware at once, of the history that is being narrated, and of the other histories against which the dominating discourse acts (ibid:59).

As an Arab scholar, Said aligns himself with the growing number of writers and scholars from the formerly colonised world, who are engaged in disassembling the imperialist model, raising new possibilities and conditions of knowledge, an example being his own seminal work *Orientalism* or, maybe, the study of Englishness or Frenchness.

Māori writers have an affinity with the notion of disassembly of universalising and totalising codes; applying it readily to the growth of research and subsequent presumptions arising from flawed theoretical foundations. Māori disassembly of the received versions of colonial history includes perceptions of research and assumptions of fact. Māori collective experience of research in the past is of having not been meaningfully interpreted, sometimes to such an extent that they appear to have been actively misinterpreted.

Although Māori nations cannot claim to be among those referred to as ‘the formerly colonised world’, nonetheless Māori scholars and activists engage in the work of deconstruction of ‘totalising codes’, exposing assimilative policies and processes for their underlying agenda. The agenda is read as the intention to maintain existing power relations for current beneficiaries and their progeny. Lack of educational

success among Māori is attributed to a range of convergent factors, but overarching all of these is the unmistakable pressure of asymmetries of power in play.

Two opposing forces in Māori understanding of change that signal the growth or decline of individual and collective mana (standing, wellbeing) are tupu and mate, growth and decline. Each of these is associated with a Māori cultural identity, the spirit and reality of being Māori and what that means for those who claim to be Māori. Whereas much research about Māori in education has adopted a class generated approach, it has yet to motivate Māori to action. Class-based reductionist analyses typically assume a direct correspondence between schooling and the relations of production, but Māori identity is not bound to workplace roles. Class based arguments reflect the realities of, in particular, struggles of the working class in Britain, of Marxist theoretical claims on behalf of the proletariat, of class differentiation between the owners and the workers in the means of production and consequent differentiation in benefit. In Aotearoa-New Zealand, the union movements continue that struggle and there are Māori who work hard for the good of the union members, as there are Māori whose incomes suggest positioning as working class families, but for Māori learners in schools and their families, class differentiation is a somewhat sterile approach. That struggle may be at the heart of a working class Pākehā identity, but it is not the centre of a core Māori being.

The Māori population hovers around the half million mark so it is not large. Kinship and social ties connect Māori across a web of interrelated strands and even land itself is bound into Māori identities. Māori thought fosters the connections between people and the land, between temporal and spiritual worlds to form part of the same reality. There is not the divorce between the temporal and the spiritual as typifies modern Western thought. Māori elders have always been aware of the distinction between a secular approach to building knowledge about Māori and a Mātauranga Māori approach to knowledge building and understanding. John Rangihau addresses some of the contrasts in a discussion about Māori and knowledge. “I have been talking about such things as life force, aura, mystique, ethos, life style. All this is bound up with the spirituality of the Māori world and the force this exerts on Māori things” (1976:13).

Despite arguments about likely dislocation of Māori learners in urban schools in regard to their ancestral marae, their lack of knowledge of the Māori world, the ethos that is Māori is still more likely to have an impact on the learners and on their families in a motivational sense, than a document that catalogues their failings and a framework that takes little account of being Māori at school. The everyday reality for Māori at school is that they are Māori and that generates a range of responses to Māori learners and from Māori learners within the learning environment. Against that scenario is the recognition that whatever Māori do, the reality is that the dominant group in Aotearoa-New Zealand is Pākehā, that learning environments attended by most Māori are not defined by Māori, that decisions about resourcing Māori futures will too often lie outside Māori control.

The Gramscian distinction between ‘arbitrary ideologies’ and ‘organic ideologies’ is useful here as it is likely that Pākehā in general do not see themselves as holding Māori futures hostage with their maintenance and support of the status quo in educational arrangements. The concept of ideology was developed upon the notion of ‘organic ideologies’ to the extent that it must be capable of ‘organising human masses’ of being pervasive and persuasive enough to bring about social action, “the terrain on which men move and acquire consciousness of their position and struggle”(Gramsci, 1971:377).

For Māori, the Pākehā position equates with the concept of hegemony, of the use by the dominant group of its position to shape views of society through political, moral and intellectual leadership until consent is acquired. Without any obvious force, domination is assured. Policies for Māori education that do not foster Māori best interests; research that does not promote Māori, all contribute to restrain rather than advance Māori, and at the same time, contribute to a disabling construction of Māori in the public perception. As long as the focus in government policy direction for Māori education is solely on overcoming educational inequality, and class based arguments about Māori disadvantage are accepted, policies for the advancement of Māori education will be restrictive. The Māori challenge is more than simply to establish structural mechanisms that would allow greater Māori access to education. The system itself has to be accountable at every level. If class is part of Pākehā realities, then Māori learners taught by Pākehā teachers for whom it is meaningful,

will feel the impact of that perception. Extensions of the concepts of agency and resistance as enunciated by Graham Smith (1997) recognises the non-class formations of exclusion and domination. For Smith, a third variable, transformation, provides a means for Māori learners to rise above a restrictive one to one correspondence between school factors and Māori performance. The Pākehāness of teachers for example, has not been investigated as a significant variable in the realisation of the aspirations of Māori learners, yet it is this difference that allowed some Pākehā teachers in a study conducted by Judith Simon, to discriminate against Māori pupils. In treating all the children the same, Pākehā dominance was maintained by failing to cater for the needs of Māori children in the expectation that the children had an obligation to comply with values of Pākehāness, therefore the teachers treated all the children the same. (Simon, 1986:9) Underlying this approach is the colonial agenda of Europeanisation of Māori learners. Judith Simon does not go this far in her claims, but she does acknowledge the Pākehā cultural influence on schools in her statement that:

the fact that most schooling in New Zealand is conducted by Pākehā teachers according to Pākehā values and goals, means that Māori children are necessarily subjected to a process of acculturation within the system. (ibid:9)

The values, attitudes and beliefs that are held by teachers of Māori students create reactions in the learners that can have positive or negative effects on their learning.

In a school culture that is reflective of 'Pākehāness' on a larger scale, transitions for students who do not hold similar values, attitudes and beliefs will be a major effort if it is the learner who is expected to change and not either the teacher or the school when the educational needs of the learner are at stake. The freedom to go to school as Māori and not have cultural identity put at risk is still only fully possible in Kaupapa Māori schools. Teacher education programmes have made efforts to prepare pre service teacher education students to develop at least bicultural learning environments for learners if not multicultural learning environments, but these small initiatives compete with a monocultural ideological block to gain space in a crowded programme. Teaching for understanding should mean more than teacher knowledge of the curriculum, and pedagogy more than learning styles. That is not to say that education and schooling as it is, cannot contribute to progressive change, to fostering changes in schools and education that do contribute to Māori goals and aspirations.

What is problematic is the constant risk of cooption, of takeover and of modification to allow for an ongoing colonial mission to Māori rather than acknowledgement of the messages of Māori development.

On another front, Māori have different agendas. Māori audiences respond to korero (talk) about the survival and maintenance of Te Reo Māori, the Māori language, about Māori self determination, Tino Rangatiratanga, about Māori role models, about Māori freedom, about Māori control over Māori matters, about Māori aspirations and achievement, about Māori identity, what it means to be Māori and how that identity construction is played out in the many aspects of Māori development, including growing up as Māori and going to school as Māori. Questions of the survival of a Māori cultural identity are significant in ongoing discussions Māori have about the role of the state. Rehearsals about the rights expected to flow to Māori from the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi agreement signed between the British Crown and Māori, form the basis of Māori interpellation and interrogation of constitutional arrangements, of the role of democracy, and of the position of tangata whenua.

The breadth of korero Māori (talking points) demonstrates the futility of class reductionism as a satisfactory explanation for Māori performance in education. Even the interplay of class, gender and race as sources of domination does not reach Māori concerns, for one of the key factors for Māori, as it is for similar indigenous peoples around the world, is the concept of indigeneity. At a Hui to discuss Māori educational advancement, facilitated by the Tuwharetoa paramountcy on behalf of iwi Māori and Government ministers and agencies, Mason Durie raised the issue of indigeneity as a principle for education, noting the conflict that can arise between democratic rights of all citizens and the rights which Māori assert by virtue of being tangata whenua in Aotearoa-New Zealand (2001:7). In his view, the Treaty of Waitangi does not embody the sum total of indigenous rights, nor do indigenous rights capture the uniqueness of the Treaty, noting that increasingly the State will need to be concerned about indigeneity as an issue that is related but not identical to the Treaty of Waitangi: and the language of indigeneity will need to be heard alongside the Treaty dialogue (ibid).

Class based research has a role in generating resourcing for Māori education to overcome inequities in educational provision. It can form part of an overall strategy but in itself is an insufficient means to move Māori to fulfil their own educational aspirations. Māori education is in part about an identity crisis, a struggle to reclaim a secure identity as Māori, the right to live as tangata whenua, people who belong to this land, not as people forced to live as outcasts from it. Māori have been fortunate to withstand the onslaught of colonisation with at least, the marae base intact, whether these are tribal or urban marae, to act as anchors for the survival and maintenance of a Māori cultural identity. Even without a knowledge of whakapapa or genealogy, individual families and family members who know where their parents or grandparents came from, can access their heritage through the enduring marae base. Whereas democracy and democratic processes may serve to ameliorate the worst aspects of class division in society, for Māori, structural arrangements have yet to be found that will reconcile principles of citizenship and principles of indigeneity. Although the Treaty of Waitangi has not always been the most useful document to define the extent of indigenous rights, the tension between indigeneity and citizenship principles was signalled within the Treaty in the distinction between Article Two rights, where Māori retain cultural rights and Article Three where Māori gain citizenship rights.

The history of colonisation in Aotearoa-New Zealand and consequential research reports demonstrate clearly that Māori have been subjected to practices that guarantee their positioning as 'working class' from a non-Māori view. But standard theoretical positions have had insufficient explanatory power to explain the diversity of Māori life situations or to pose effective solutions to problems raised by Māori in relation to education. Explanations and generalisations predicated upon non-Māori values, attitudes and actions have fallen short when imposed upon Māori. Symptoms of dispossession are not solely about economic dispossession as a result of colonialism, but just as surely about cultural dispossession, about the deliberate denaturing of Māori forms of cultural identity to be repositioned as outcasts, unable to return unless it is in a Pākehā guise. As long as Māori are perceived and treated as mutated forms of western cultural entities, research will continue to be off the mark.

Most research about Māori has been of this nature, non-questioning of its own suppositions, a taken-for-granted position of universal application so that Māori non-congruence is not about beginning in a different place, but about problematising gaps. Māori resistance to such research has been strong and accentuates the view that class consciousness is less likely to be a motivational factor for Māori educational advancement than is the promise of a strong Māori cultural identity and the potential for its development. Recognition of the benefits of a strong Māori cultural identity, I see as a cultural consciousness, an awareness of the significance of being Māori and a sense of belonging.

### ***Research Positioning***

The Research Report *Māori Participation & Performance in Education* (1997) authored by Simon Chapple as the primary researcher and supported by two Māori researchers, is an example of research that aligns itself with non-Māori rather than Māori political, cultural and educational agendas, substituting non-Māori school achievement as the benchmark for Māori educational outcomes rather than Māori defined aspirations for educational outcomes. Such a focus effectively locates Māori in a deficit position in relation to non-Māori, leaving educational provision itself unquestioned. The question ought not to be how Māori might emulate non-Māori educational performance but rather, how Māori educational performance can facilitate the achievement of Māori educational aspirations.

The work by Chapple and others sought to survey the literature on disparities between Māori and non-Māori education participation and performance (1997:1). Such a position is immediately problematic for Māori not only because of the assumption that non-Māori performance is an appropriate benchmark, but also that it is that 'gap' that is in need of attention. This approach is partially explained once it is clear that it is the labour market performance gap that is the major concern of the work, with education the means to that end. Education outcomes for Māori from this perspective, are important only insofar as they are a pool of under-utilised human capital for the labour market particularly when they do not match non-Māori performance. Such a position privileges a market forces approach to education, offering the market a

choice from a wider range of potential employees. Māori goals for Māori development also include Māori capacity to improve economic standing but as one part of a greater whole.

The Chapple report relies on the findings of other 'large sample questionnaire' evidence to support its contention that differences in school performance are largely accounted for by differences in family resources, discounting as minor influences school based barriers such as racism and teacher expectations (1997:78 ). Nash's work is identified, particularly his claim that evidence favouring school practices as retarding Māori educational progress is thin (1997:123-124). Both the Chapple Report and the Nash research decline to position school factors as significantly relevant, Nash arguing that differences in family literate cultural resources produces the gap between poor non-Māori and poor Māori underperformance in school (cited in Chapple, 1997 p.78). Building upon Nash & Harker's work, Chapple et al extended it to investigate any further relationship between school factors and the size of the Māori gap (1997:80). The conclusions from this extension are that:

The intercept in both the initial and final regression indicates that in a school with the average characteristics Māori perform worse, all other things equal, than non-Māori in school certificate. The minimum size of this gap in the final regression is 2.7 percentage points for English and 4.9 percentage points for maths and science. However, in a school with otherwise average characteristics but the highest average SES, we would predict a positive rather than a negative English gap of 1.2 percentage points. If there is a fixed effect operating across all schools and all subjects which we have not included in the regression which reduces Māori performance, such as teacher expectations or racism of various varieties, we would expect this statistic to be negative. As it is not, it casts some doubt on these school barrier expectations, at least insofar as the school certificate marks gap is concerned. (ibid:81)

To some extent, *Te Hoe Nuku Roa* (Durie et al) supports another of Nash's contentions, namely, that a lack of cultural resources disadvantages Māori. The differences with the *Hoe Nuku Roa* study are that the disadvantage is in comparison to Māori identified aspirations and that the cultural resources in question are Māori cultural resources, particularly Te Reo Māori and marae access. Kura Kaupapa Māori draw on both the educational capital needed for school success and the cultural capital needed for a strong Māori cultural identity. Good schools do not require Māori learners to forgo one at the expense of the other. An evaluation of the implementation

of the Taha Māori curriculum *Tihei Mauriora* (Durie, A. E. 1993) found that despite the curriculum and associated resources being sent to every school, its implementation was sporadic. Schools decided for themselves how much time would be spent on implementing the curriculum, if at all. The result was that the degree of implementation ranged from nil to 100 percent. Not until 1999 was there any strong requirement for schools to be accountable for Māori education outcomes<sup>1</sup>.

Schools have been able to play in the League tables based on their success across the board rather than on what they do or do not do for Māori. For Chapple et al, the key resources relating to school success are those found in the homes of non-Māori children who succeed, not the resources sought by families in the *Hoe Nuku Roa* study. This attitude is supported by the practices of schools that ignore the cultural needs of Māori learners. Beneath the surface of such research lies an affinity with the arguments of E. D. Hirsch Jnr (1988). Impoverished family circumstances have a proven negative effect, but if it is, as Chapple et al. claim, the significant variable, then state education and economic policy obligations are clear. If Māori learners are to raise their standard of school performance the state will need to provide them with a greater share of the material and cultural resources at its disposal.

For Māori to raise their performance there has to be an equivalent rise in state and state agency performance. If families and caregivers are unable to put in the added value that makes the difference in education outcomes then the state, if it means what it says, should do so. Despite evidence to show that the interrelationships between health, housing, employment and education are such that for policies to be effective there should be intersectoral collaboration in the provision of appropriate policy solutions, such collaboration remains to be seen. Without collaboration, Māori progress at school will continue to be hindered at a range of turns, whether it is in the ways in which the school interacts with its community, or teachers with Māori parents and caregivers, or even between Māori students and their peers, all of these have the capacity to confound the best efforts of individuals to do well. To date, the only

---

<sup>1</sup> The new National Education Guidelines include a requirement for all boards of trustees to develop and disclose policies, plans and targets for improving Māori education outcomes and to require them to report annually against those plans and targets (Ngā Haeata Matauranga, 1998/99, p.22).

schools providing an education which meets the requirements of the majority view from the 700 Māori households surveyed for the *Hoe Nuku Roa* study are those which celebrate Tikanga Māori as applied to teaching, learning and school organisation and these are mostly Kura Kaupapa and Wharekura.

### ***International Comparisons***

In the *Third International Maths and Science Study (TIMSS)*, the top of the league table was Singapore for both Maths and Science. After Singapore in Maths, were South Korea, Japan and Hong Kong. In Science, the Czech Republic was second, followed by Japan third, and South Korea fourth. The United States was not among the top ten nations despite the fact that American children it is claimed, have three times as much money spent on their schooling as have young South Koreans (1997:21). With three times as much money being spent on them, it might be expected that the money spent would be sufficient to provide the 'literate cultural resources' identified by Nash in reference to Māori educational performance, to be able to better or match Korean performance. The Gap between the performance of United States children or New Zealand children or English children in these instances is said to be the result of bad teaching (ibid: 25). If this gap can be explained away by bad teaching, why is it not acceptable to explain the internal gaps in Aotearoa-New Zealand the same way.

It appears to be politically incorrect to claim bad teaching when it comes to Māori but correct to make the claim in respect of exogenous gaps between the New Zealand performance and those at the top of the TIMSS League Tables. Researchers cannot have it both ways. If the family literacy resource theory has credibility then it should hold as an explanation of the gap in performance between New Zealand children and others. The 'long tail of low achievers' explanation for the poor performances of America and Britain has been taken into account for this recent TIMSS study, dispelling the 'low achiever tail' factor as an acceptable explanation for poor performance. Time spent on a subject also appears to have little correlation with pupil test performance.

According to the Economist (29.3.1997) young Austrians spend long hours on Maths and Science lessons and it pays off in higher test scores. New Zealand teenagers also spend long hours on Maths and Science, but according to the report, do not do any better than Norwegians, for example, who spend a short time on lessons in both subjects (ibid, p.25). Australian children on the other hand, who have much in common with majority New Zealand children, outperform them by 9 places in Maths, and by 10 places in Science, an achievement gap of some considerable size.

For Māori researchers seeking to improve the Māori condition, issues of voice, of representation, of commitment, rights and obligations means that the commonalities that Māori share outweigh the extent of diversity among Māori and allow for methodologies to be created that are in keeping with tikanga Māori (Durie, A.1992). Such a position accepts the significance of process to the success of the research initiative, and the need for the processes to be appropriate ( Bishop, R.1993, Durie et al.1993). Margie Hohepa and Stuart McNaughton discuss a research position that starts from the assumption that development is a social and cultural construction. (1993:40) They raise cultural imperatives such as reciprocal obligations to the group, a responsibility that they say is daunting methodologically and conceptually.

*Te Hoe Nuku Roa*, the longitudinal study of 700 Māori households, implemented a research framework that brought research foci together rather than the opposite, a framework designed to overcome sectoral segregation in research. The lack of any positive impact from research on outcomes in the collective Māori interest meant that alternatives to existing research philosophies had to be found. Although it is now over a decade since Māori researchers began developing deliberate research frameworks drawn from Māori cultural bases the effects of these have yet to be fully tested.<sup>2</sup> It is expected that research based on Māori philosophies will lead to more appropriate research methods and consequently have greater effect on Māori outcomes. Dissatisfaction with existing research paradigms and the philosophies that support them is not restricted to Māori but is reflected internationally. For example, Delgado-Bernal (1998) raises the question of differences between methods and

---

<sup>2</sup> 1990 NZARE Conference, Auckland, Bishop & Glynn, He Kanohi Kitea; Durie, A. Access and Opportunity methods

methodologies in her case for a Chicana Feminist Epistemology. She cites Sandra Harding's (1987) distinction between 'method' and 'methodology'. Method is a concept limited to techniques and strategies for collecting data, while methodology is a broader concept, relating to "both theory and analysis of the research process, how research questions are framed and the criteria used to evaluate research findings" (1998:558). Māori research methodologies imply a similar understanding, recognition of the political nature of research, the ethical issues involved and the need to avoid claims to neutrality or notions of being value-free when selecting theoretical foundations. Māori research methodologies are constructed around Māori dimensional modes and theories.

Linda Smith sees western research as being more than just that located in a positivist position, but research that "brings to bear on indigenous peoples a cultural orientation, a set of values" (1999:42). Linda Smith's conclusions are indicative of the broad field of indigenous research as driven by a desire to overcome past experiences of false representation. Disappointment with the outcomes of research by non-indigenous researchers presses indigenous intellectuals to develop and work within indigenous research epistemologies. Assertions by indigenous intellectuals engaged in constructing a research field more appropriately reflective of indigenous needs, seek to work in another dimension, one which centres the cultural base, allowing for intellectual and emotional representation to unite. The evolution of Māori research thinking is not an outcome of the rise in the West of dissatisfaction with universality. Instead Māori opposition to such claims only began to be taken notice of when academics of a modernist orientation, began to hear the post modern voice and mistook it for the indigenous. Modernity is taken to mean "that distinct and unique form of social life which characterises modern societies" (Hall,1992:2). Citing Harding (1997) Delgado-Bernal refers to epistemology as involving the nature, status and production of knowledge, and therefore Chicano epistemology must be concerned with knowledge about Chicanas- about who generates an understanding of their experiences, and how this knowledge is legitimised or not legitimised (1998:560). Whether Māori or Chicana, the turn is also reflected in non-indigenous research as the de-centering of the subject (Foucault, 1988a,1988b, Nicholson, 1986).

But appropriate process and epistemologies are insufficient of themselves to realise the improvements sought for research. The research gaze has to shift from indigenous communities to an interrogation of oppressive state institutions, to work to reveal the sites of power that disable Māori and distort Māori realities and experiences. Research that objectivises Māori has not yet brought about any shift in the power relationships predominating in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Popkewitz (1999:5) talks about a sovereignty view of power as being about the rulers and the ruled, an explanation of the “ways in which groups who are favoured in decision-making and who organise the values through which decisions are made to produce a context of domination and subordination and construct structural arrangements that will maintain their power”. It is not difficult to see the application of this view of power to the Chapple Report (1997) and the consequent Chapple critique in respect of the current government’s key policy, ‘*Closing the Gaps*’. Reports that take structural arrangements such as school provision of educational services for granted and ignore the pervading power relationships paramount for Māori in attendance at general schools, support current distribution of an unequal resource, of corridors of power and influence.

Sovereignty views of power share some similarities with autocratic Māori views of power in that, distinct from democracies, there is a taken for granted inherited right to make decisions. In the Māori case, the most effective remaining autocracies, operating upon traditional systems have been the two paramountcies, the Kahui Ariki in Tainui, and the Tuwharetoa paramountcy where inherited or ascribed authority takes precedence over mechanisms favouring an electoral process. The recent Tainui Kauhanganui that was an effort to partially democratise power, led to a conflict of authority because the relationship between the two systems was unclear. Tonga is a remaining national Pacific example of autocratic rule. Elsewhere, systems with ascriptive rather than achievement criteria are under threat or have been replaced with some combination of democratic and ascriptive rights, for example, tribal runanga are elected bodies but the right to participate in the election process is based on heritage or genealogical connections to the marae which elect the members. Indigenous intellectuals work from an inside understanding of the withering effects of negative exertion of power by the state and its functionaries, schools included.

Without a critique of state policies and analyses that support established relations of power and domination, Māori wellbeing will remain dependent on the ability of Māori communities to create healthy environments in a context of toxic state policy and practice. The long term effects of colonisation have included fragmentation of indigenous networks, and for Māori, disarray in many respects. The state should not be freed from accountability in respect of its responsibility for Māori wellbeing. Constant efforts to work against the grain eventually take their toll on Māori researchers, putting unnecessary strain on an already under resourced workforce. Healthy education policies will foster Māori wellbeing by demanding positive outcomes of work conducted by state functionaries with Māori. The disarray in evidence amongst many Māori is indicative of the degree of unhealthy state education policies and practices in the first instance, a situation that should not be hidden by calls for Māori effort to right Māori situations. Indigenous researchers are not alone in their concerns over the limitations of liberal educational scholarship in providing useful frameworks for the investigation of issues of importance for different communities.

Eisner (1997:4) notes the increasingly problematic nature of the assumption that the languages of social science - propositional language and number are the exclusive agents of meaning. For Eisner, a major insight was the recognition that research did not belong to science alone. His question, what should count as research, he regards as a high stakes question, raising it in regard to legitimacy and authority followed by publication and promotion (ibid:5). The Māori position regarding Māori forms used to inform, Eisner comes to see in regard to his own cultural forms, acknowledging stories, pictures and poetry for example by stating that they “may be new in the context of educational research but they have been around forever” (ibid:5). Since Eisner is an accepted white male authority in regard to educational research, his sanctioning of methods utilised by Māori and by Feminist research has seen a growth in interest from formerly sceptical researchers.

In 1991 Eisner wrote about features that, to his mind, make a study qualitative. He identified six such features, each of which, in his view, contributed to the overall character of a qualitative study. The six features were:

- they were field focussed and non manipulative in that they study situations and objects intact;
- the self as an instrument, the researchers must see what is to be seen and see what counts, given some frame of reference and some set of intentions. Eisner describes this as the interplay of sensibility and schema;
- the interpretive character of qualitative research. Inquirers try to account for what they have described;
- the use of expressive language and the presence of voice in text. The presence of voice and the use of expressive language are important in furthering human understanding;
- Eisner asks a question that Māori researchers are able to empathise with, why take the heart out of the situations we are trying to help readers understand? (1991:37);
- the last criteria is about the criteria for judging their success. Qualitative research becomes believable because of its coherence, insight and instrumental utility.

Qualitative studies employ multiple forms of evidence, and they persuade by reason.

Qualitative inquiry, like conventional quantitative approaches to research, is ultimately a matter of persuasion, of seeing things in a way that satisfies, or is useful for the purposes we embrace. (ibid:39)

### ***Researchers as agents of imperialism***

Gaps research is the most recent hybrid of a long history of research that furthers the ideological project of cultural imperialism. Nineteenth century western writers began the service to the imperial project as historians, anthropologists or even poets or novelists as Edward Said points out in his seminal work *Orientalism*. It was Said, as Robert Young observes, who,

shifted the study of colonialism among cultural critics towards its discursive operations, showing the intimate connection between the language and forms of knowledge developed for the study of cultures and the history of colonialism and imperialism. (1995:159)

Said was analysing the notion of orientalism as a discursive construction, even a myth, constructed in the minds and language of the imagined west to such an extent that it took on a 'legitimacy' of its own, determining what could be said and what was seen as 'truth'. Unspoken but taken for granted, was the counterpoint to the imagined 'orient', the 'normal' west.

For Robert Young, Said's work utilised Foucault's notion of discourse and showed how it could expand his ideas of ideology as a form of consciousness and as lived material practice. For Said the cultural construction of Orientalism was more than simply determined by economic expansionism; the cultural sphere had a motivation of its own, a "certain autonomy" in Robert Young's words (1995:159). A second outcome of Said's work is his charting of the complicity of Western literary and academic knowledge with the history of European colonialism, of the collusion of academic disciplines in producing colonial subjugation and administration. In commenting on his work in *Orientalism*, Said says that it was animated by a critique of the way in which the alleged universalism of the fields, such as the classics, not to mention history, sociology and anthropology, was Eurocentric in the extreme, as if others had an inferior or transcended value (1995:22).

Māori messages today are most often carried in the English language and therefore distinctions have to be made between users of English language whose work continues the impact of colonialism on the social construction of Māori realities, and those who are aware of the role of literacy and language in such a construction and use the English language for Māori goals. Māori writers in English or Māori have to be conscious of the theoretical assertions and cultural claims inherent in language application.

John Codd catches some of this concern in his observations that education policy documents, for example are ideological texts:

Policies produced by and for the state are obvious instances in which language serves a political purpose, constructing particular meanings and signs that work to mask social conflict and foster commitment to the notion of a universal public

interest. In this way, policy documents produce real social effects through the production and maintenance of consent. (Codd 1988:237)

For Māori, these concerns must be taken further. Research Reports are potent ideological texts, for research on Māori has served a political purpose not in Māori best interests, for all of the research history of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Whose research counts and what research counts are crucial questions to be asked in regard to Māori development. Māori researchers, as with the emergence of Māori intellectuals, have relatively recently begun to develop research models that position Māori from a legitimated Māori view.

While this body of work is growing, it does not have full acceptance from the research community. Controversial research reports still appear that accept the view that disparities in Māori educational performance are due to Māori shortcomings, for example the Chapple, Jefferies and Walker report (1997:xi) that concluded, after reviewing the literature, that ‘currently perhaps two thirds of the gap can be put down to family resource factors’. The trend is towards labelling Māori as responsible for shortcomings rather than any problems with the social construction of schooling.

While not directly synonymous, the issue is that differences in family resource levels become seen as the responsibility of the families concerned; a deficit argument levelled at the Māori family. Whether intended or not, the research plays a role in maintaining the deficit view of Māori learners and Māori families.

That is not to say that there is not a place for disparity or equity based research, as it has been useful in the quest for equity. However, there is a risk that reducing disparities will be contextualised within a narrow deficit model to the exclusion of the wider macro-policies of the state and the impacts of colonisation. Apple (1993:19) has argued that within a New Right framework, equity itself has been redefined. “No longer is it seen as linked to past group oppression and disenfranchisement. It is now simply a case of guaranteeing individual choice under the conditions of a ‘free market’”. While Apple is referring to the ideological transition away from equity as it had been understood prior to the growth of New Right influences in the United States, Aotearoa-New Zealand has been similarly affected by New Right philosophical domination of social and economic policies and therefore by perceptions of equity as they affect Maori. Family and whānau research

therefore, insofar as it impacts on Māori, needs to be based on methodologies that are not divorced from Māori experience. Even when research concludes that Māori education performance equates with Māori working class positioning, the hand of the state and of a colonial state, whether dominated by either New Right or Welfarist thinking, in forcing that positioning stays hidden. Part of a remaining problem for Māori learners in schools, is that, despite the best efforts of researchers, teachers will continue to position Māori learners as working class or even underclass, and therefore 'naturally' destined for subordinate positions in the labour market, or worse, to unemployment as an acceptable destination for a Māori learner.

Ngugi wa Tiong'o writing about his own continent of Africa, considered that education should choose between two opposing aesthetics, the aesthetic of oppression and exploitation and of acquiescence with imperialism; and that of human struggle for total liberation (Ngugi wa Tiong'o 1981:38).

Likewise, research reports have a similar role, they seek legitimation for the new knowledge purportedly contributed within the report, but the theoretical assertions that lie behind the methodology and claims will determine whether the research and the researchers are intent upon Māori subjugation or Māori freedom. Education research, and social science research generally, is more likely to err on the side of subjugative research when researchers objectivise Māori participants.

In contrast, Māori researchers who are concerned with Māori aspirations, use Māori freedom models, those that lead to Māori development. Pākehā researchers who demonstrate a synergy with Māori aspirations also choose Māori freedom models although Pākehā appropriation of Māori intellectual thought remains a concern for research and scholarship.

Graham Smith (1992) developed a model for culturally appropriate research undertaken by Pākehā researchers that is helpful in identifying under what conditions Pākehā researchers might participate in Māori research. Four categories were distinguished, the first, the 'tiaki' or mentoring category, when authoritative Māori act as sponsors or mentors for the would be researcher; the next, the 'whangai' or adoption category, the researcher is taken under the wing as it were, of a whānau or

community. Third is the 'power sharing' category, where the combined strengths of a community of interest and experienced researchers work together to produce a worthy piece of research; and the last category is that of 'empowering outcomes', that is, research that may even be commissioned by Māori to answer Māori questions for Māori benefit. Far from limiting reason, it is the likelihood of yet further subjugative research that arouses the scepticism of Māori about research conducted by non-Māori, the history of research in the service of colonialism and imperialism.

### *Good Research*

Suppositions behind supposedly rational explanations as a basis for further steps in research have brought little change in their relevance for Māori. If research explanations do not strike a chord with Māori despite supposed rational and thorough analysis of data, it will make little difference at the family (whānau) base. On the whole, western theoretical frameworks fell short of the depth of explanation needed when Māori life-worlds were under scrutiny<sup>3</sup>. Māori experiences and the ideas through which they made sense were forced through ill-fitting cultural templates into distorted representations designed for non-Māori consumption. Research drawn from false premises from a Māori viewpoint, has led to error ridden policy decisions about best options for Māori education. Good intentions research abounds, disparity research based upon the principle of equity of educational outcomes, examines the interface between Māori achievement and non-Māori achievement and uses the difference between the two to claim further resourcing to close emerging gaps. While the intentions are laudable, the rationale is less productive because it undermines Māori goals for Māori futures beyond non-Māori definitions or expectations. In essence, it is a continuation of the colonial government policies of the past that demanded the replacement of Māori culture with that of the European.

---

<sup>3</sup> Frances V.Rains, an academic of Choctaw/Cherokee and Japanese descent, makes the point that for the Native American nations who have occupied the United States land mass 'west' of Britain for over 10,000 years, the use of the term 'western' has been appropriated by Euro-Americans to represent their paradigms, behaviours and ways of life, an irony she notes since Native nations now have little choice but to refer to their own paradigms, behaviours and ways of life as 'non-western'.

When Māori progress is pegged to non-Māori benchmarks, the goal is still Europeanisation of Māori. The habit is so deeply ingrained that even those with long established research records will miss the point. For example, a Research News Bulletin distributed by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research carries a lead article titled 'Schools Must Reach out to Māori Parents for Students to Succeed'. While the title is acceptable, the very next line claims that Māori children's achievement at school is strongly linked to how well parents and children relate to school staff. (*Research News*, Vol.31, No.2, September, 2000). The headline is referring to some excellent research conducted for NZCER by Sheridan McKinley, but the problem arises in its interpretation for publicity when the emphasis is reversed. Rather than the emphasis remaining on the responsibility of school staff to relate well to parents and children; responsibility for the quality of the relationship is transferred in the text reversal, to the parents and children (ibid:1).

Hans Wagemaker (1992:1) asked some time ago "what makes good research?" and he concluded that it was more than issues of methodological approaches, or arguments about the relative merits of qualitative versus quantitative approaches to research. His answer to his own question was that a good piece of research has more to do with rigour and internal consistency than whether it is quantitative or qualitative (ibid). But a piece of research can be thorough, consistent and reliable, yet still, when it comes to validity for the purposes of informing education processes or educational policy development for Māori, be useless because it asked the wrong questions and made the wrong assumptions.

Other measures, such as Māori progress over time, allow Māori to see a different measure, to identify the advances made regardless of the shifting benchmarks of equity research. It is too much to expect that the non-Māori benchmarks used in equity research to peg Māori performance to, will be stable until Māori catch up. Advancement for non-Māori is as important as is Māori advancement to Māori so measuring Māori progress against shifting non-Māori benchmarks will not overcome the problem of gaps in achievement levels between the two. Unless Māori research is premised on Māori experience, there is a risk that research which focuses on disparities will restrict the horizons to a model based on deficit rather than development.

If there is a crisis in Māori educational performance, it is not as a result of a negative comparison with non-Māori; instead the crisis is the waste of Māori talent and ability where it is not being developed.

### *False Premises*

Assumptions about rationality stemmed from a false premise, one that presumed 'western knowledge', or knowledge generated by western social scientists, was universal knowledge. Western rationality could be applied universally across all cultural boundaries in the search for a universal truth, a holy grail. Universities by their very name projected the idea of production of universal knowledge. That is not to say universities might not fill this role, were there to be a place for what are, at this point in time, subjugated knowledges. The European Enlightenment privileged the notion of scientific rationality, a rationality that applied Cartesian-Newtonian approaches to everything in its sphere of influence. Reference has been made to the work of the Enlightenment period as 'disenchanted' the world (Clark, N. 1991). The exclusionary bias of the standard disciplines prevalent in academia lent substance to a community perception of universities as ivory towers remote from everyday worlds. The foundations approach to education for example, dwelt upon an emphasis on disciplinary bases for the examination of education, disciplines that legitimated particular ways of knowing and de-legitimated others, constructing new forms of enchantment in the process.<sup>4</sup>

Studies of ancient European thinkers such as Plato and Rousseau, perpetuated a perception that intellectual ascent had naturally begun in that place. The European scientific and literary canon endorsed a continuation of cultural colonisation by not

---

<sup>4</sup> In field work conducted in Algeria among the Berbers, Pierre Bourdieu (1979) explored the notion of disenchantment, in the sense that, in contrast to 'archaic' or 'ancient' economies where symbolic and economic capital are not separated out, in the 'modern' forms of capital, the distinctions are one of the identifiers of the transition of a society to modernism, a disenchantment process. Just as disciplines can express new forms of enchantment, in his case, Bourdieu saw the separation between symbolic and economic capital as expressing new forms of enchantment.

disclosing itself as one among many forms of knowledge production. Shiva (1993) critiques the western system for the assumption that it is uniquely 'scientific' and universal. In her view; positivism, verificationism and falsificationism were all based on the assumption that, unlike traditional, local beliefs of the world, which are socially constructed, modern scientific knowledge was thought to be determined without social mediation (1993:11).

But dominating views of knowledge and science were a reflection of the prevailing ideologies about a hierarchy of knowledge, and a hierarchy of peoples. After centuries of colonial or imperial expansion, exercises that required physical and mental strength, it is not likely that the conquerors would give credence to the indigenous knowledge systems they found in existence, or even realise that their new homes were not offshore British islands.

W. K. Jackson, writing on New Zealand in the Pacific as recently as 1970, considered the 1960's to be the beginning of a period of major change for New Zealand, "more far-reaching than any other in our history" (1970:19). In his view, the turning point for this change was establishment of the European Economic Community and Britain's application to join it. New Zealand would take up what Jackson refers to, as "our logical place in the Pacific region" (ibid:19). Before this, New Zealanders who were not of Polynesian or Māori descent did not have to consider the Pacific environment too much, for Britain and Europe remained the focus of New Zealand economic activity. New Zealand was still behaving like a colonial outpost of a faraway home until Britain applied to join the European Economic Community.

### ***Māori Standpoints***

The dissatisfaction for Māori, after having shared experiences and thoughts with visiting researchers only to find them reinterpreted for a non-Māori cultural gaze, was more than disconcerting, and not new. Māori have over time, worked towards the development of research standpoints and processes that will advance Māori aspirations not undermine them.

Early Māori scholars like Ngata and Buck, resorted to letter writing to express their views of European scholarship and its failings through their letters of friendship and collegiality to each other. In this way, their critiques did not make headlines but did provide a safety valve for their expression<sup>5</sup>. On one occasion Buck (1986:98) wrote to Ngata expressing his hope that Ngata write up 'The Social Organisation of the Māori' for his Litt.D. Buck recognises the work Ngata has done in the field and the importance of the work for Māori, then goes on to say,

"It worries me somewhat that the Race is becoming the happy hunting ground for the student of economics and sociology to provide theses for the higher degrees when the one great opus can only be written by yourself."

The writers understanding of each other, and their deconstruction of the political and academic environments in which they worked can be found in the statement made by Ngata in Aotearoa-New Zealand to Buck in Honolulu,

From our own summit here, I look across to watch how you use the ko, whether the thrust penetrates deeply - or whether it is merely poised aloft like those of the Pākehā; and does not satisfy the enquiring mind. (op.cit)

The shortcomings of academic process were obviously known to Buck and to Ngata, for although they use Māori metaphor, it is evident that the practices of the social scientists of the time were not viewed with favour; that resulting findings were superficial and did not satisfy the enquiring Māori mind. The symbolic use of the ko, as a means of penetration and enquiry is a useful one in Māori contexts. In its literal sense, the ko is an excavator, a tool to work the soil to prepare the seedbed for new growth, but to be effective, the ko has to reach the soil medium to penetrate and aerate it for the best growing results.

Clearly Ngata and Buck consider Pākehā attempts to be superficial, to be ineffective in reaching the medium to produce the best results. Theoretically, ko represent critique, the use of Māori tools to excavate and examine substrate and expose strata to

---

<sup>5</sup> See *Na to Hoa Aroha: from your dear friend* (1986) Sorrenson, M.P.K., Auckland, Oxford University Press

view. While neither expert spoke explicitly of ideological manifestations posing as social science, their private correspondence would seem to support this view.

The metaphor of the ko combines well with the further concepts of tupu and mate, growth and decline, for the actions of the ko in either penetrating to the heart of the matter or achieving only a superficial analysis is indicative of Māori perceptions of the success or otherwise of the research process. Sound research will foster further growth, and superficial research can cause, either directly or indirectly, decline. The correct paradigm can act as a catalyst for Māori, attracting interest and action because of the understandings communicated with research based on genuine Māori frameworks.

Ngakau Māori research distinguishes genuine Māori frameworks from the superficial and is a conceptualisation used to illuminate the difference for post graduate students interested in Māori research methodologies. Māori writing begins to distinguish Māori approaches to Māori research as a critical mass of graduates emerged with University qualifications. Throughout the 1970's research into the status of the Māori language was typically work conducted by non-Māori such as Richard Benton, who had the skills to apply institutionally acceptable research methods to the Māori language area.

Anthropology had become an attractive discipline to Māori in tertiary study, often because of the mere fact that it offered Māori content of a kind. Māori in anthropology also made a contribution to the growing debate on the future of the Māori language. Bruce Biggs published language texts that found a ready market within and outside of University while controversy over the future of the language mirrored debates at the end of the 19th century about the future of the people. Where once physical survival was thought to be at risk, so, in the 20th century, cultural survival was equally at risk. Although not included as a curriculum area in Primary schools, Anthropology Departments within Universities offered studies in Māori language and accompanying cultural studies. Māori Studies Departments typically grew out of Anthropology disciplinary areas but while Anthropology as a discipline offered perceptions of Māori, these were somewhat stultified views, lacking the vitality and liveliness of Māori realities. Māori were objectified in anthropological

research, discussed more in terms of Arts and Crafts, Language, Economics, Cultural conventions than as life-worlds with living breathing people deeply connected to those aspects of life that were being clinically dissected before them. Studies of the Māori world took on a certain stuffiness, representing Māori as existing in a time warp, an anachronism in a rapidly changing world.

Titles of texts published in the 1950's and 60's the period of the advent of television in Aotearoa-New Zealand, nevertheless fostered a museum like view of Māori, *The Māori as he Was* a 1952 reprint of a 1924 publication by Elsdon Best, was in its third edition.

In the foreword, Best (1952) wrote that: "The want of a brief account of the Māori folk of New Zealand, of their ancient customs, beliefs, institutions and industries has too long been felt". He aimed to touch on all phases of Māori life in Pre-European days, "Māori mythology and religious beliefs served", he thought, "to illustrate the mentality of the natives of these isles".

A book titled *The Moa-Hunter Period of Māori Culture* (1956) was published in the same decade by the government printer, R. E. Owen and written by Roger Duff. *The Māoris of the South Island* (1954) by T. A. Pybus, was another of the same genre. They were typical of the publications that eschewed modern Māori lives and life-worlds, preferring instead to fossilise Māori by omitting modern Māori lives in favour of a past age. The texts echoed those of early colonial studies in that they colluded in the politics of representation. Even as recently as 1967, it was acceptable for authors to write about Māori as if people were objects to be closely observed and scrutinised, rather than people with thoughts and feelings who were part of a social fabric that was in constant change. Joan Metge (1967) wrote a book called *The Māoris of New Zealand*, published abroad by Routledge & Keegan-Paul. Inside the contents page identifies chapter topics as: Basic concepts of Māori culture; The bases of Daily Living; Language; Land; Kinship and Descent-groups and so forth. The titles alone of these publications effectively dehumanise Māori. There was little interest, it would appear, in publishing books titled, for example, *The Pakehas of the South Island*, or *The Pakehas of New Zealand*, with chapter topics such as Kinship and Descent-groups. Anthropology as a discipline had a history of such treatment, but only towards

carefully selected 'others'. Roy Wagner does not refer to the process as dehumanisation, preferring instead to see the perspective of the anthropologist as "an especially grand and far-reaching one....anthropology teaches us to objectify the thing we are adjusting to as 'culture' much as the psychoanalyst or shaman exorcises the patients anxieties by objectifying their source" (1975:pp1-8).

A book titled *Māori and Pākehā: A Study of Mixed Marriages in New Zealand* (1966) at least attempted an examination of a modern phenomenon rather than one from another era. While mixed marriages were not uncommon from the moments of first contact between Māori and Pakeha, the book presented Māori intermarriage, or Pākehā intermarriage as if it were novel. The text continued the anthropological style of the time, writing about marriage between Māori and Pākehā in an exercise of epistemological privilege, judging and evaluating the relationships from the safety of the observation post, a mythical distancing from the subject. The author of the text, John Harre, writes:

According to the work of R.J.Havighurst, the most reliable indicators of socio-economic status in New Zealand are type and locality of accommodation and occupation....These tables indicate that the socio-economic status of the intermarried couples who are only racially mixed, is dictated more by the cultural affiliation of the individuals than by whether it is the husband or wife who is Māori. However, in the case of normal fully mixed couples there is a tendency for those with higher status to be Māori men with Pākehā wives. (Harre, J.1966:34)

By constructing Māori and those Pākehā whom some Māori married, as objects of study, Harre, unwittingly or not, conjures up Stuart Hall's "racialised regime of representation" (Hall, 1981). There are echoes of representations of stereotypical black masculinity in Harre's positioning of Māori men with Pākehā wives when he perceives them to have a higher status supposedly than Pākehā men with Māori wives. Implied within this result is a view of the wife defining the status of the relationship. Although Harre distinguishes racially mixed from 'normal fully mixed' couples, his findings conclude a higher status for the Māori man, Pākehā woman couple suggesting that it is the Pākehā woman who defines the higher status. If the Pākehā woman is not marrying for status, the attraction to a Māori man has to lie in other attributes and these remain undisclosed but hint of Stuart Hall's racialised regime.

Further racialised is the view that Pākehā men who marry Māori women marry 'down', Māori men who marry Pākehā women marry 'up'. Māori women, it seems, occupy the bottom end of Harre's social scale.

If the tertiary level of the education system, through its knowledge brokers, could produce texts that so clearly situated Māori outside 'society' as the authors saw it, the Primary and Secondary levels could feel justified in reflecting similar views in their work with Māori in schools.

Graham Smith devoted the whole of a thesis to what he refers to as "an organising concept of 'Kaupapa Māori' as theory and as transformative praxis", suggesting that these are new formations of resistance, marking a significant shift within Māori transformative strategies (1997:I). Expanding on these ideas, Graham Smith sees Kaupapa Māori theory and praxis as an educational strategy, one in which he considers that the twin crises of education and culture can be transformed, that education and schooling as significant sites of resistance, can be transformed through the strategy as a response to existing conditions of Māori crisis (1997:27). Smith argues for a cycle of "conscientisation, resistance, and transformative praxis", drawing on Freire's notion of praxis and transformation and rejecting a "narrow focus on critical pedagogy approaches which emphasise the components of conscientisation and resistance" (ibid:39). Drawing from Gramsci's concept of the organic intellectual, Smith uses it to explain his own approach in regard to his view of the reflexive and formative progression of 'Māori struggle' (ibid:149).

Smith draws up ten points that he considers typify his concept of the Māori 'organic intellectual' as a person who will:

- develop transformative praxis driven by emancipatory ideals;
- emphasise a unity between practice and theory;
- undertake the liberation of both the subordinate and dominant interests and structures although the emphasis is on those with whom the organic intellectual belongs;
- endorse the point of view that all men and women are intellectuals;
- acknowledge that schools and education are complex sites of struggle between dominant and subordinate interests;

- understand that the formation of struggle has to be adaptable;
- understand that organic intellectuals must have the support of the people for whom they presume to be speaking;
- undo hegemony that stifles the interests of the exploited, oppressed and marginalised groups;
- develop counter hegemonic praxis as direct resistance response to the oppressive features of dominant hegemony;
- accept that schools and education are not neutral sites, arguing for a partisan consideration of Māori interests, needs and aspirations; and
- distinguish between individual and collective emancipation, acknowledging that both areas need to be worked on.

These points have features in common with other Māori researchers, features that define their work that differentiates them from those researchers who are Māori but who do not work with a view of Māori development at the centre. While Graham Smith's work emphasises the notion of resistance, it is but one of the many overlays put upon research by Māori with Māori.

Linda Smith earlier explored similar research territory in a draft document within which she sets out developments she classifies as "Kaupapa Māori research". In her view, Kaupapa Māori research assumes the validity and existence of Māori knowledge, language and culture and as she puts it, asks a simple set of questions:

- what research do we want to carry out?
- who is that research for?
- what difference will it make?
- who will carry out this research?
- how do we want the research to be done?
- how will we know that it is a worthwhile piece of research?
- who will own the research?
- who will benefit?

For Linda Smith, these are merely a set of principles to underpin Māori research (1994:3).

Bishop and Glynn confront the dilemma of research questions developed for Māori performance and achievement in education when the cultural perspective adopted lies outside that of the people being assessed or evaluated (1995:37). In their view, it is not merely a matter of substituting one research paradigm for another, quantitative to qualitative for the power to define the research questions still lies with the researcher not the participants. The risk, they say, is more from the ignorance and culturally inappropriate behaviour of many educational researchers than from the paradigm adopted. (ibid:38) This would suggest, in my interpretation, that training and education could overcome the shortcomings of inappropriate research and impotent research. However, without a means to accredit researchers for work in Māori contexts, a training and education requirement would be difficult to implement. Russell Bishop has developed further his views on a tradition of research that has perpetuated colonial values, a tradition that was of the view that Māori culture was not able to cope with current human problems and from that, conclude that Māori culture is inferior to that of the colonisers (Bishop, R.,1996). Bishop posits the existence of Kaupapa Māori research, a form that he sees as having emerged from:

the wider ethnic revitalisation movement that developed in New Zealand following the rapid urbanisation of Māori in the post World War Two period. In his view, this revitalisation movement blossomed in the 1970's and 1980's with the intensifying of a political consciousness among Māori communities. (ibid:146)

In this, he differs from the work of Graham Smith and from a number of leading Māori researchers when he attributes the rise of Māori initiatives in education to an “ethnic revitalisation movement” that developed in New Zealand over a particular period in time. In adopting this term, Bishop is utilising the work of James Banks, a black American writer who used it in conjunction with a typology that he says “attempts to outline the major phases of the development of ethnic revitalisation movements in Western societies” (Banks, J.1994: 29). Banks saw the typology as an ideal-type construct, dynamic and multifaceted rather than static and one-dimensional. Ethnic revitalisation was conceptualised as having four phases, but he acknowledges their basis on United States events and suggests that it might be less generalisable to other nations (ibid:29). Bishop does not go to the extent of identifying which of the

four phases identified by Banks, he would see as relevant to the period he identifies as its blossoming.

An alternative explanation would be that it is not so much a revitalisation phase as evidence of a critical mass of Māori researchers and writers who are using the pen rather than the sword to further concerns carried for over a century by Māori in regard to invasive research as well as questions of constitutional arrangements, social justice, tangata whenua rights and the proper place of the Treaty of Waitangi in the political infrastructure of the nation. These issues have never been off the Māori agenda; they have merely been gathering in intensity as Māori and Pākehā writers begin to draw attention to them in books, articles and in their own political forums. Māori and Pākehā collaboration on Treaty issues has had considerable influence on Governments of the day to recognise and deal with Māori claims.

Bishop touches on Māori concerns over researcher and research accountability. Who is the researcher answerable to? Who has control over the initiation, procedures, evaluations, construction and distribution of newly defined knowledge? (1996:145) These concerns were beginning to emerge in papers delivered at the New Zealand Association for Research in Education, in Auckland in 1990. They were raised by Bishop and Glynn in a paper there, and by myself in a brief paper delivered as part of a symposium on the Access and Opportunity project being undertaken at Massey University at the time. (Access and Opportunity Project Paper 3, Durie, A. 1990). Accountability issues were very much to the fore as 40 Māori families were to be interviewed as part of the project. Two aspects of accountability were discussed, tribal authority obligations between iwi and members, and accountability of the researchers, at least in the first instance, to those holding mana whenua in the region. The group who might act on behalf of the participants at any stage in the research was most likely to be local iwi authorities. Justification for the position adopted was given as follows:

1. iwi (tribe) right to be informed of research activity in their area;
2. the establishment of an avenue for iwi and hapū to interact with and question the research group, especially since the project could interface with iwi educational activity;

3. vulnerability of the collective identity that upholds tribal mana (standing), to negative research findings;
4. Māori values to be taken into account;
5. information sharing;
6. space for iwi involvement;
7. obligation to confer over draft findings and validity of interpretations (ibid:6-7).

A chapter published in *Delta 42*, “Mana Māori and Development” (Durie, A.E: 1989), was a personal first attempt at contextualising theory into practice through Māori frameworks. The work sought to draw on the philosophy inherent in whakatauaki or Māori sayings, to produce a Māori standpoint. Whakatauaki are succinct statements that provide insights into values and ideals of importance in brief encompassing bytes. Few examples existed to support the development of a Māori theoretical framework for application to Māori research. These attempts are over a decade old now and Māori research methodology has grown considerably since that time, every step building on earlier positions. At a Māori research seminar held in 1992, the question of the value of research to Māori was raised in a statement that “It may well have served the researchers ends admirably, yet those of Māori not at all...hit and run researchers leave behind a legacy of mistrust and scepticism amongst Māori” (Durie, A.E.1992:1-2). Researcher competencies to be identified before researchers engaged in Māori research included:

- in depth understanding of Māori values, attitudes and mores;
- understanding and willingness to abide by a Māori system of ethics and accountability;
- demonstrable competencies in negotiating social norms of Māori communities;
- Māori involvement as co-researchers if not primary researchers;
- access to draft findings for critique or comment;
- acknowledgement of role of researchers as knowledge brokers;
- identify benefits for Māori in research project;
- understanding of Māori research methodologies (ibid: pp. 4-7).

Today it would be possible to write a whole thesis on the development of Māori theoretical frameworks not only for research but also to facilitate positive action.

While the early chapter described above was a personal milestone, the dissatisfaction for Māori of having shared experiences and thoughts with visiting researchers only to have them reinterpreted for a non-Māori cultural gaze was more than disconcerting, and not new. It is not that Māori wish to revert to the past, to use the past as a hitching post, so much as a desire to use a rich cultural past as a guiding post for sound research for healthy futures.

In 1992 also, a group of Māori researchers who had worked in collaboration with a non-Māori researcher from Massey University on a research project, identified a number of themes from their research that were considered important to research among Māori. The first of these was the view of research as an exercise in control and a statement from one of the researchers on the team is quoted in the text as follows:

Research is used as a damage control (strategy) on Māori. You can implement policies which take into account how far you can accommodate Māori without them rioting. Government policies can just accommodate them based on the research about us. Research which has been done has a negative impact on us. It is just damage control. (Ngahiwi Tomoana cited in Teariki, C., Spoonley, P. & Tomoana, N.1992:3)

Further themes were: that research was something non-Māori do; research was conducted for self-interest and that research emphasised negative statistics about Māori. The paper then went on to set out what they considered to be basic steps:

Research as partnership, involving negotiation prior to proceeding; accountability, about who can and should monitor, direct and even veto research; self monitored research, engage with Māori about what constitutes good research; and lastly, in relation to the products of research, establishment of ownership of research material. (ibid: pp.3-6)

Ngahuia Te Awekotuku had in 1991, prepared a document for Manatu Māori, about Research Ethics in the Māori Community. She outlined three separate responsibilities, responsibility to the Iwi studied; responsibility to the wider Iwi, and Responsibility to the

Ministry. The responsibilities to the iwi reflected the standard ethical cautions developed to guide all researchers, such as informed consent, the right to withdraw, the right to draft material for comment, the right to anonymity and freedom from harm. While these are not expressed in exactly the same words, the intentions are the same. One point differs from the usual and that is that researchers must not exploit informants, or the information volunteered for personal gain or aggrandisement (Te Awēkotuku, N.1991:2). Presumably the point is made to ensure that past practices are brought to a halt in relation to 'hit and run' researchers.

University students would not have difficulty meeting the need not to exploit, but when research must count towards a qualification which does count as personal gain, the statement may arouse confusion. Te Awēkotuku concludes that the principles presented were for further discussion as she notes that:

those working in the Māori field have no actual controlling professional body. Apart from the marae forum – itself a formidable institution-there is no established process of accountability, or monitoring agency. (ibid:3)

By 1994, at least three different Māori researchers were beginning to refer to Kaupapa Māori research. Kathie Irwin saw it as research that is 'culturally safe', protected and overseen by kaumatua who act as mentors for the research. Such research would be undertaken by Māori researchers as compared to a researcher who happens to be Māori (Irwin, K., 1994:27). Russell Bishop (1994) added another dimension, locating Kaupapa Māori within Treaty of Waitangi discourses. The earliest reference however, is that of Graham Smith (1990) in ideas presented in a paper to the NZARE Special Interest Conference held at Massey University in 1990. Extending the concept of Kaupapa Māori to include educational research makes sense in the context of involvement with the establishment of Kohanga Reo and Kura Kaupapa Māori that were a high priority at the time.

The move to combine Māori theory and research with Māori practice was inevitable. The next step for Kaupapa Māori research must be the ability to work and deliver results not only within a Māori framework but equally as important, in Te Reo Māori. That is not to exercise Te Reo as a form of exclusion or mystification but rather as a reason for

celebration. The generation of Māori researchers who can do that is already waiting in the wings. It is more than research about Te Reo Māori for the language already exists for that work, but to conduct educational research that meets all the requirements of valid and reliable outcomes from a Māori and an international view, requires further steps to bring it within reach. Once that takes effect Māori research will almost have come full circle from the days of Ngata and Buck, but rather than have to retain korero in personal letters, Māori will be able to have Māori research in Te Reo Māori, out in the public arena for further critique and development whether it will come under the umbrella of Kaupapa Māori, Ngakau Māori or Māori freedom research models will likely not be a problem.

Chris Cunningham attempts to categorise some of the approaches adopted by Māori under the banner of Māori research, setting out a framework in regard to its potential relevance in educational research for Māori. (1999:7) He sets out four types of research for definition, research not involving Māori, Research involving Māori, Māori-Centred Research and Kaupapa Māori Research. Within these categories, new definitions are put on categories well documented by other Māori researchers, for example, Kaupapa Māori research as has already been stated in this chapter, is covered in some detail by both Graham and Linda Smith, and the genre title is generally attributable to them. Similarly, Māori-centred Research is well documented by Mason Durie, whose work reflects this approach but again as the author of the genre his work is not acknowledged although the description and examples are clearly taken from the longitudinal study Hoe Nuku Roa, for which the category was first devised (ibid:8).<sup>6</sup> The document is work in progress but it has already reached the public arena.

For some Māori researchers, the key concepts are not so much reactive but proactive in that by centering Māori and concentrating on the Māori development model, the discourse rises from a different place, not so much out of struggle and resistance but from standing firmly upon turangawaewae (Māori space) and grounding Māori research in that position. Unless Māori research is premised upon Māori experience there is a risk that research which focuses on disparities will restrict the horizons to a model based on deficit rather than development.

---

<sup>6</sup> The longitudinal study was built on the intention to work within a Māori centred framework, to ensure that the nuances of Māori realities could be better reflected.

The starting point for analyses of Māori positions employing Māori standpoints allows for the construction of modes of thought that derive from values and representations authentically representative of the breadth of Māori experience. An introduction to some of the positions and research frameworks being used for Māori research has been covered here but it is a sample rather than a definitive selection.

### *Māori Freedom Models for Māori Development*

Māori researchers who are concerned with Māori aspirations, use what I term Māori freedom models. Freedom models are expected to foster Māori development; to work towards the realisation of Māori educational aspirations by breaking up the triangle of tyranny between policy, research and educational practice that owes its ethos to cultural imperialism.

Linda Smith refers to Kaupapa Māori research as a category related to issues of social justice (1999:189). In Linda Smith's view, Kaupapa Māori research is that which sets out to make a positive difference for the researched. In that respect it is not so different from Māori centred research, a conceptualisation adopted by Mason Durie during a health research seminar in 1996. Māori centred research is about research that locates Māori people, views, values, at the centre.

For the development of a paper on Indigenous Research Methodologies, I have used the term Ngakau Māori Research (1999) to distinguish Māori centred research rather than include it as a form of Kaupapa Māori research which for my purposes was too broad a catch all category capturing too much Māori work without distinction. Māori centred research as a paradigm, as it suggests, places Māori at the centre, whereas Kaupapa Māori research suggests only that the rationale, rather than the people, are the justification. Linda Smith's elaboration of Kaupapa Māori research aligns itself with the practices taught by Māori within academic disciplines for some considerable time. Both Kaupapa Māori research and Māori centred research are constructed by Māori to secure a research position that validates Māori research frameworks.

Māori involvement in commissioned research will sometimes lead to compromise in research ideals, allowing research approaches to be more aligned with the dictates of the commissioners than to Māori research methodologies and Māori aspirational goals.

### *Hoe Nuku Roa*

In the research project *Hoe Nuku Roa*, a research framework which could reflect the interrelationships between the dimensions of influence upon Māori was attempted. Identified as a framework to conceptualise and describe the position of Māori individuals and households, the work was first presented at a Sociology conference in 1994.

The name of the project, *Hoe Nuku Roa* came about because of the longitudinal nature of the study. *Hoe Nuku Roa* was an extract from a karakia offered by a tohunga when setting out on an uncharted journey. For each dimension of the research an indicator was developed, the dimensions represented as axes.

Although that project is not yet complete, the idea of an integrated conceptual framework is one that is attempted for the purposes of this research to try to capture the complexities of the multidimensional nature of forces which influence Māori existence and progress.

A composite model for examining the determinants of educational success can be applied to the Māori situation. In it education is a product of a multi-determinant approach and together the following factors justify the multi-determinant approach:

- general socio-economic and cultural conditions;
- living and working conditions;
- social and community influences;
- individual characteristics;
- family influences;
- political power;

## *Cultural and Ethnic Factors*

Revitalisation occurred when among other things, cultural pride was restored and a positive identity as Māori was actively advanced. In a study of Māori households, Te Hoe Nuku Roa, the emerging data seems to support the notion that people who are culturally secure are more likely to be better placed to take advantage of educational opportunities.

## *Appropriate and Appropriation*

Non-Māori academics have recently begun to take notice of Māori domains of thought and have attempted to utilise these to guide teaching and research. While this may be interpreted as a positive shift towards an acceptance of Māori thought in the academy and an acknowledgement of the shortcomings of western theories in this instance, an alternate view is that Māori work is coopted by ill informed non Māori writers as an epistemological mining exercise rather than an acceptance of the relationship between values and appropriate explanations. Māori theoretical frameworks serve to provide explanations which resonate with Māori realities and without an understanding of the binding relationship between the two only a superficial overlay is possible.

Not all non-Māori writers are ill informed fortunately, and these writers will be well known in respective Māori communities for their support and contribution over time. With these writers there is an understanding of the multifaceted aspects of power underlying the construction and dissemination of knowledge, and an awareness of the difference between writing that is appropriate and writing that is appropriation. Mātauranga Māori, broadly translated as Māori philosophies, wisdom and knowledge and the processes, strategies and frameworks which it informs, has largely avoided elimination from Māori life through a basis in oral literature. In relation to western epistemological and curricular power, Mātauranga Māori, became a subjugated knowledge system as part of the impact of colonisation.

Writing for the Third World Network, Vandana Shiva (1993:9), raised the notion of 'Disappeared' knowledge systems in relation to the disappearance of local knowledge

through its interaction with dominant western knowledges. Shiva makes clear that western systems of knowledge are not universal in an epistemological sense, but versions of local knowledge carried by a dominating and colonising culture; “modern knowledge systems are themselves colonising” (op.cit). Representations of the dominating epistemology were seen as ‘scientific’, derived from an open knowledge system, in contrast to closed knowledge systems, the latter in the western view, more accurately descriptive of traditional cultures. In making this point, Shiva is referring to Horton’s opinion that “In traditional cultures there is no developed awareness of alternatives to the established body of theoretical levels, whereas in the scientifically oriented cultures, such an awareness is highly developed” (cited in Shiva,V.1993:11).

Everywhere indigenous peoples face assaults on their local knowledge by, as Shiva has argued, “rendering local knowledge invisible, declaring it non-existent or illegitimate”. As I have argued elsewhere, appropriation of indigenous knowledges in the vanguard of advanced capitalism is another way to make it disappear, as, much like patenting the humane genome, origin is obliterated.

Ward Churchill (1993:12) writes of the expropriation of Indian spiritual tradition, of the misuse or abuse of it, “turning our spirituality into a commodity in books or movies or classes or ‘ceremonials’”. Māori see similarly, through the use of metaphor “The nibble, the bite and the swallow”, the same feeling of expropriation of the core ideas of the culture.

The Mataatua Declaration drawn up in June 1994 at a Conference of Indigenous Peoples hosted by Mataatua iwi in the Bay of Plenty, was a demonstration of the degree of concern felt by indigenous peoples including Māori, over the exploitation and appropriation of indigenous knowledge. Shiva refers to the diminishing diversity of knowledges in the wake of scientism as breeding “a monoculture of the mind” (ibid, p.12). Local ecological knowledge systems evolve in the context of the needs of locals, for example, so that uses of the environment for spiritual and physical sustenance proscribed a need for balance, a need to conceptualise the environment as one with people, a living environment, a life-world. By the last quarter of the 20th century, enlightenment was beginning to appear in the scientific world, the closed

system of thought that had been science was catching up with some of the truths of indigenous thought.

The process discussed by Said (1993:59), as reading the western cultural archive contrapuntally, has relevance to the establishment of a bicultural scholarship for its growth is in part a compensatory effort to put in place theoretical frameworks that make up for oversights of the past. Like Said, Māori academics too have work to do in deconstructing imperialist modes of thought and reason to allow for new possibilities and conditions of knowledge. As Linda Smith states, “imperialism frames the indigenous experience. It is part of our story, our version of modernity” (1999:19).

While there are formidable scholars working from the realms of Western thought, the colonial experience and all of the quakes and tremors set off among indigenous colonised peoples as a result of that experience, are either ignored or misinterpreted by western scholars for whom the imperial experience is triumphant, and disastrous indigenous outcomes grounds for apology but not restoration. Said (1993:47) sees such theoretical oversight as the norm in Western cultural and scientific disciplines. Conscious of the rise of power in non-Western writing and of the attention being drawn to flawed western scholarship posing as universalisations, the intellectual beneficiaries of those dominant discourses and disciplinary traditions have leapt the chasm from colonialism to post colonialism, an addition to the archive that posits any interrogation of colonialism as post-colonialism, inferring an end at some point in time past, of colonising traditions and practices. For those unwitting victims of the worst of the colonial theatre with all its violence and dominating traditions and practices, the damage wrought is an everyday reality.

For this, post -colonialism is a cover up. An engagement in a bicultural scholarship is not a feature of a mythical ‘post-colonialism’, instead bicultural scholarship creates fissures in the authority and stability of established canons when previously unheard indigenous voices call for social and intellectual change. Indigenous scholars raise questions in the academy and engage in promoting a transformative curriculum and an engagement with difference. Like Said, Māori scholars generally, do not claim to be detached and objective, instead, in an engagement with exposure of injustices, of

domination and of appropriation of cultural and material properties, there is work to be done in acting as a critic and conscience of society.

Forms of logic can be discerned that rationalise actions and allow a perpetuation of positions of dominance and subordination. The constant movement of people from one country to another in search of a better lifestyle or a more lucrative income, has behind it, a justifying logic for the interests of those who move for these reasons.

### *Diasporic Logic*

For centuries nomadic cultures have moved from place to place, searching for a livelihood wherever one could be found. Eighteenth and nineteenth century colonial expansionism generated an inter-continent and intra continental nomadic culture, nomads who moved beyond the bounds of their traditional territories into those of others, displacing them from their homes and livelihoods or annihilating them altogether. New nomads travel the globe in search of career advancement, greater economic opportunity and an appealing lifestyle. Loosened ties to former homelands and greater attachment to economic opportunity have seen flows of people crossing borders from one nation to another searching as nomads of old for improved livelihoods. Movement at this level has generated an emphasis on legitimating the place of the mobile, the assertive claims of diasporic identity over indigenous identity, valorising disassociation from place, and through theory and practice, inculcating a justifying logic of the diasporic.

Romanticised identities serve to gloss over the realities of the appropriation of mind and space, seeding key institutions with the language of the diaspora, words such as 'discoverer, pioneer, settler, adventurer, scientist, governor, missionary, saviour, benefactor, protector, teacher' all convey a positive representation of actions of a dubious nature. Each colourful description pervades the folktales of the diaspora, dictating the boundaries of perception, submerging the realities of the takeover actions, reflecting them positively for all to inspect. Indeed they are not all totally unfounded for it is the elements of truth in the claims that allows them to persist. The elemental grains of truth are wrapped in tissues of exaggeration and denial.

Independent of sponsoring nations, the diasporic population<sup>7</sup> reforms on foreign ground, adopting a new host, propelling the alien into place amidst a plethora of strategies legitimating representation for the new formations.

The diaspora is a continuation of a grand narrative, once colonial imperialism, once multiculturalism now fashioned into a multitude of representations. But what has not changed is the primary reference group, those who move out of their originating localities to settle in another in an act of displacement. Strangely, the moderns, the post moderns and the post colonials all subscribe to the universalising agenda, that their position, whatever its claims, can be all encompassing. Post labels are a matter of conjecture rather than statements of fact. But what of the diaspora that settles, does it remain diaspora or does its adaptation to its host extend to a takeover of the host identity?

There are arguments that question the indigeneity of Māori, that claim Māori as the bridgehead of diaspora, the first settlers rather than the first people. The so-called traditional Māori account, as Michael King (1989:171) puts it, saw Māori tradition stating that “the people found in New Zealand were black and that their culture was extremely primitive”, the inference being that Māori found people already settled in New Zealand upon their arrival. King cites the view that “the Moriori were a different people from Māori and that they had been driven from New Zealand when the more enterprising and combative Māori arrived there” (ibid). The publication of the book *Moriori* by Michael King, gave rise to as much conviction that Māori were not ‘original’ inhabitants as it did that they were. King’s book places Moriori in what is now known as the South Island and more particularly on the Chatham Islands group that he refers to as Rekohu in deference to the Moriori nomenclature. King quotes the work of Henry Skinner, an ethnologist from Otago University, whom he says set about disproving the myth that contained an implicit justification for European conquest of New Zealand which was that “Our ancestors only did to the Māori what the Māori did to the Moriori” (King, M.1989:174-5).

---

<sup>7</sup> I use diasporic amoeba here to reflect the self contained propensity for division and growth.

Apart from Māori tradition citing numerous voyages across the Pacific too and from Hawaiki or Rangiataea, earliest oral history does not include meetings with strangers so much as meeting up with descendants of earlier voyages. Voyages between the South Island and the Chathams were clearly possible and King makes mention of at least Te Ati Awa activities in the Chathams, referring to testimonies to the Native land court in the nineteenth century and to oral evidence collected by Alexander Shand from Ati Awa elders between 1868 and 1900. (ibid:12) The ethnologist Skinner, is quoted as having concluded that the evidence derived from Moriori material culture is:

decisively in favour of the New Zealand origin of that people...their relationship is closest with what I have elsewhere called the Southern culture of New Zealand....The Moriori culture and the southern culture of the Māoris have points of relationship far and wide in the Pacific regions and ...this relationship seems closest with eastern Polynesia and particularly with Easter Island. (cited in King, M.1989:176)

King makes mention of contradictory theories about the origins of the Moriori, including that they are extinct, that they never existed, and lastly that they are alive today.

Research carried out of Human Mitochondrial DNA shows what the authors refer to as:

“a markedly reduced variability in Polynesians compared to other groups and that this variability decreases from West to East Polynesia”. They go on to say that “variability is the lowest in New Zealand of any sizable human group studied so far. The decrease in diversity in Polynesia they consider, is consistent with predictions from a series of founder effects from small populations settling small island groups” (Murray-McIntosh, Scrimshaw, Hatfield, Penny, 1996).

What can be concluded from the range of evidence is that Polynesian peoples did move around the Pacific as Māori oral history dictates, that founder effects are evident in the low variability of human mitochondrial DNA, the greater the expanse of ocean the lower the variability. Māori must either have moved with Polynesian migrations, east in Polynesia, or, as the lowest variability associated with New Zealand might also suggest, Māori have the longest uninterrupted occupation of the largest Pacific Islands group, Aotearoa-New Zealand.

In the squeeze between New Right reactionary onslaughts and the retreat of the Welfare State, Māori have been in the middle, not convinced by raw capitalism nor quite taken with democracy as it exists in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Instead Māori are attempting to forge a different system that takes account of a Māori cultural identity, of Māori aspirations and Māori development. Māori as tangata whenua are seeking to exercise a different set of rights, indigenous rights that might be seen as undemocratic or against the interests of capital or even a 'knowledge economy'. Paul Spoonley touches on the counter to Māori development present in one New Zealand world-view, the assumption that separate facilities, even separate electorates:

“are either unacceptable because they reinforce division or because the same resources are not available to other minority groups. But the arguments go farther than this, they associate positive discrimination in New Zealand with the system of apartheid in South Africa.... It is claimed that Māori, and to a lesser extent Pacific Islanders are privileged in New Zealand and that this patronage by the State is a form of invidious separatism.” (Spoonley, P.1993:17)

Rightly, Spoonley notes the move to portray Pākehā as victims, as those who are deprived of a share of resources when there is perceived privileging of Māori and Pacific Islanders. Yet Pākehā domination over Aotearoa-New Zealand is undeniable and no system is able to guarantee justice. The socio-economic and political realities that structure Māori lives are undeniable, for example Moana Jackson estimates that Māori dispossession has been legalised by over 100 pieces of legislation since 1840 (Jackson, M. 1993:77) Māori gains since this time are presented as concessions from Pākehā, as dispensations rather than compensations for past injustices. But the compensatory view is still not where Māori want to be for once again Māori are hostage to the nexus of Pākehā power. Against these views is the visionary Māori view of tangata whenua autonomy, a rights driven position that is not a compensatory view, not the standard view of Māori disadvantage or a need for equity. Dispossession and urbanisation have not been enough to destroy an underlying sense of Māori cohesion and with it the notion of a common Māori good or a collective Māori vision of society that rises beyond getting equal.

Māori development methodologies based upon a concept of indigenous rights have implications for the kind of state that might develop and the type of education Māori learners might expect. Māori research by Māori researchers for Māori development holds promise for a healthy Māori future.

While Māori are not a homogeneous group, it is possible, despite the differences in the experiences from one iwi to another of colonisation practices, of inter-tribal conflict, of the degree of intermarriage, to describe some generalisations in the forces of identity construction. Most obvious are the forces of colonisation, and urbanisation, on a tangata whenua identity. Who Māori are has a significant bearing on research for Māori benefit.

## CHAPTER SIX

### A PARADIGM FOR MĀORI RESEARCH:

### NGĀKAU MĀORI

#### *New Perspectives*

This chapter explores the several dimensions that underpin Māori research in modern times and sets the parameters for the research conducted for this thesis. First it examines methodological perspectives and second, it discusses a range of ethical issues and the response of ethical committees to them. In both sections Ngākau Māori research is introduced as an extension of earlier research methods and an original contribution to the Māori research understandings.

For many years Māori were simply subjects for non-Māori researchers. Early anthropologists were fascinated by tribal life, rituals of encounters, material culture and the never ending search for Māori origins. Later, social scientists from a range of disciplines explored Māori well-being using non-Māori as the benchmark and inevitably conceptualising Māori aspirations according to non-Māori values and ambitions. The assumptions were – perhaps still are – that Māori could be understood by using the methodologies of western research and the same tools of inquiry that might be applied to any other group. Standard western methodologies were seen to transcend background, ethnicity, and culture and the researchers lived under the illusion that interaction with Māori required no particular skills other than those that could be masked by the cloak of objectivity.

However, the shortcomings of research methods that purport to address the Māori condition but draw solely from western frameworks has long been seen as problematic. Ngata and Buck discussed this issue between themselves over many years of collegial correspondence and encouraged each other to research aspects of Māori culture and tradition, making use of insider knowledge and access to information ( e.g. Sorrenson 1988:231-243 ). But in more recent times it was Ranginui Walker who drew attention to the inappropriateness of both western frameworks and western researchers to investigate the Māori situation. “To put the

matter succinctly it is difficult for those who are monocultural to analyse problems from a bicultural point of view” (Walker 1973:112).

The Pākehā majority who dominate the decision making positions within New Zealand society make many decisions on behalf of the minority. If those decisions are to be effective then they need to be made within the total social context of biculturalism and not from a single cultural frame of reference. (Walker 1974:54)

A new generation of Māori academics has continued the debate in education and allied disciplines, but it was in the field of health that the introduction of a Māori framework significantly changed the way theory, research, policy and practice could be advanced.

The *Whare Tapa Wha* framework devised by Mason Durie drew on key Māori concepts of health. It was first presented to a 1982 conference in Hamilton to begin the Waikato stage of the Māori Women’s Welfare League research project *Rapuora* (Durie, M. 1994). The framework legitimated the role of the League as researchers in their own right and ignited Māori communities to examine their own health status and take action to implement strategies for progress. The *Whare Tapa Wha* framework was adopted just as quickly by Māori health professionals looking to build on the ideas, and it appeared in a Health Department Bulletin as well as providing the background for an introduction to a Hui on Māori health, *Hui Whakaoranga*. About the same time Rose Pere (*Ako*, 1982) had prepared a monograph about concepts of learning in traditional Māori communities, a reminder of another body of knowledge that might contribute to contemporary Māori learning and teaching needs. In a similar vein, after meeting with officials from the Department of Māori Affairs to further “Science Plans,” Evelyn Stokes from the Social Sciences Committee of the National Research Advisory Council prepared a discussion paper on what was referred to as a ‘*Māori Research Perspective*’ (1985). Again the focus was on the utilisation of key Māori values in research and practice.

If these three initiatives are considered together, it can be seen that they all had significant impact well beyond the circumstances of the initial presentation. The Durie framework had its immediate effect on Māori communities and professionals as

well as on the national Māori organisation, the *Māori Womens' Welfare League* and the research hui where it was presented. The ideas in the framework spread further through subsequent hui on Māori health and research held in and around the Manawatu and Horowhenua in the early 1980's and subsequently Te Whare Tapa Wha was embraced widely as a model of health. *Ako* was an academic publication that legitimated a space for the Māori academic community to include among its theoretical approaches a powerful Māori concept for learning and teaching. Teaching professionals could benefit from the work, drawing from it major implications for pedagogy and critique of existing methods. The paper developed by Evelyn Stokes (1985:1), was timely given the undertakings by the Labour government of the day to examine the question of Māori economic development and the need for better research to inform government policy.

These contributions which all appeared in the early 1980s, introduced Māori thought and values into research and academic arenas and gave a concerted push to the evolving Māori research movement. For Māori they signalled a sense of return of cultural sovereignty, a view from within rather than without, using intuitive and taken-for-granted insights that were beyond anthropological claims to interpretation. In each field Māori were taking control over discourses about Māori, thus giving a legitimisation of the 'Māori voice'.

The work of earlier writers who raised Māori philosophical issues and claimed a place for Māori thought in the everyday lives of their people prepared the way for Māori analytical frameworks across a range of sectors including health, education, land, and social policy. For example, several of the chapters found in the 1976 publication edited by Michael King, *Te Ao Hurihuri*, discuss a range of Māori concerns from a Māori view.

Many Māori are actively engaged in furthering Māori approaches to research and Māori theoretical foundations to inform practice. At *Te Wananga o Raukawa*, Te Ahukaramu Charles Royal has work that is centred around the ideas of Mātauranga Māori and Whakapapa as a research methodology (*Te Oru Rangahau*, 1998:79-87). That work adds a greater dimension to the concepts of Māori epistemologies and how they may be used. Chris Cunningham from the Māori Studies Department at Massey

University, has attempted a typology of Māori research, identifying what he sees as characteristics of each category in use in the broad field of Māori research. (*Te Oru Rangahau*, 1998:394-405)

Linda Smith (1999) has published a major text titled '*Decolonising Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples*' that calls for the decolonisation of research methods. In her opening sentence she expresses the view that "from the vantage point of the colonised...the term 'research' is inextricably linked to European imperialism and colonialism". (Smith,L.T.1999:1) Both Linda and Graham Smith have classified their research approaches as Kaupapa Māori research and continue to build on this classification in their work. Mason Durie has built a range of research frameworks around a category he has classified as Māori centred research to single it out more clearly from more general Māori approaches to research. (Te Hoe Nuku Roa, 1993) Undoubtedly the classificatory terms will grow as researchers find categories that more accurately represent the core of their particular work.

A range of categories have been distinguished within Māori research paradigms; the most general is the category of Kaupapa Māori research and there is some question as to whether or not there is but one research paradigm evolving and whether this category captures the features of it. Regardless of the question, the growth is evident. Māori centred research methods arose in response to a need for a research paradigm to capture a Māori reality, including lifestyle, patterns of thought, aspirations for the future, and a determination to retain a Māori identity.

### ***Ngākau Māori Research***

In this thesis however, the notion of Māori centred research has been extended to encompass the researcher as well as the method. This extension, Ngākau Māori research, reflects the qualities of the engaged researcher as well as the characteristics of the research methodology (Durie, A.E. 1999). Ngākau Māori research builds upon Māori centred research but implies a greater alignment with the qualities of the researcher and the focus of the research.

Māori often refer to a person as having a 'Māori heart' a Ngākau Māori, if there is a capacity to connect in a way that makes sense to Māori and which includes the intuitive nuances of communication. It can be summed up as an ability to respond to 'nga mea Māori' all that is Māori, including what might be called the collective 'Māori good' as in public good. Ngākau Māori research does not necessarily mean that the researcher has to be Māori, but being Māori is more likely to satisfy Māori communicative understanding and in the process demonstrate a Māori heart.

At the same time, when the researchers are Māori, there remains a greater obligation to the participant community than exists in a research relationship with non-Māori researchers (Durie, A.E.1990, Bishop & Glynn, 1990, Hohepa & McNaughton, 1993, Durie M.H. et al, 1994). It is an expectation from both the researchers and the communities they work in and reflects the prized value of reciprocity that dominates marae encounters as much as whānau and hapū dynamics.

Those who work in Māori research are confident about the place of Māori thought and values in informing research frameworks and the place of selections of Māori knowledge in the academy. Critical to the process, however, is the endorsement from Māori communities. Sometimes endorsement is configured as a Treaty obligation but increasingly it is being seen as best practice, since any research that does not recognise the rights and contributions of respondents and communities, contradicts modern ethical understandings.

In Ngākau Māori research the researcher is close enough to the respondents to know whether or not endorsement is forthcoming and genuine. As part of the endorsing process there is an expectation that researchers will acknowledge the issue of intellectual property with regard to Mātauranga Māori, not in the sense of a commodity, but in the sense of 'belonging to' or 'identifying with'. It entails spiritual ownership, as much as material ownership, and belongs with the people, not academia.

## *Māori Development Research*

The contribution of research to the development of new knowledge can become an end in itself, particularly in Universities, but for Māori academics and for those Māori communities involved in research, more is required. The vitality or worth of the new knowledge will be validated through its contribution to Māori progress and development. While merging Māori research methodologies are evolutionary in nature, the outcomes can be revolutionary in effecting change.

Māori development methodologies based upon a concept of indigenous rights have implications for the kind of state that might develop and the type of education Māori learners might expect. Māori research by Māori researchers for Māori development holds promise for a healthy Māori future.

## *Approaches to Māori Educational Research*

Table 6.1

	<i>Disparity Research</i>	<i>Development Research</i>
Focus	Inequalities between Māori & non-Māori	Māori aspirations
Aim	Reduction of gaps	Advancement within a Māori context
Philosophical base	The egalitarian society	Tino rangatiratanga
Unit of interest	Class	Autonomy
Methodology	Comparative studies	Māori centred frameworks
Analysis	Sectoral investigation	Integrated models
Risks	Assimilatory pathways	Isolated pathways
Application	Promotion of equity	Promotion of social, economic, & cultural development
Measures	Social and economic indicators	Cultural and economic wealth; social cohesion

Often Māori researchers feel a sense of urgency about research and expect that it will have demonstrable benefits to the broad field of Māori development. It is a research burden that can sometimes lead to impatience with fundamental research as opposed to strategic and operational research. But it is also linked to a desire to give voice to community and iwi aspirations and to make research relevant to Māori needs.

Māori development research has several dimensions and covers a range of disciplines. Tribal research may be seen as a variant based upon cultural imperatives arising from discrete classical Māori community formations (Te Ahukaramu Royal in *Te Oru Rangahau*, 1998:79-87). It is a further characteristic of the growing Māori research paradigms.

For the most part tribal research focuses directly on tribal knowledge, the retention and transmission of heritage, and pathways for further development. In contrast, there has been a tendency by many researchers to regard Māori development research as primarily research into the disparities between Māori and non-Māori, the comparative approach. It is an incomplete view since Māori development is not solely, or even mainly, about parity. On the other hand it is certainly about improving the wellbeing of Māori across a broad range of social and economic measures; though not necessarily measured against the relative wellbeing of non-Māori. Māori development is about reaching for Māori goals, defined by Māori. It is about strengthening a belief in being Māori and developing strategies and policies that can lead to Māori advancement. At other times, and for the purpose of emphasising the value of research to the process, Māori development has been referred to as “moving forward to achieve goals identified by Māori for the collective benefit of Māori.” (*Te Oru Rangahau*, 1998: 259-266) One standard for the validity of that knowledge is the degree to which it contributes to Māori progress and development. (ibid:259)

From this point, it is feasible to infer Māori epistemologies and ontological assumptions given the range of material available for Māori research methodologies. But ‘Māori epistemologies’ is not a synonym for Mātauranga Māori. An epistemology is a theory of knowledge and as yet, Mātauranga Māori is a body of knowledge with some inherent assumptions, making it more likely that Māori epistemologies might be an active component of Mātauranga Māori but are not fully

equivalent to Mātauranga Māori. Māori epistemologies can contribute to the body of Māori knowledge referred to as Mātauranga Māori. Researchers who begin to engage in research on Māori terms, are moving beyond the traditional bounds of Mātauranga Māori, building new knowledge drawn from its understandings. If there is agreement on the validity of Māori methodologies then in theory, the notion of Māori epistemology can be applied to research processes guided by the dynamics of Māori thought.

### ***Iringa Korero - Narrative Research***

It will be seen that the interview data presented for this thesis depends to a large extent on the narrative method. Narrative thought is characteristic of traditional Polynesian knowledge production and retention, holding a significance for oral cultures comparable to the written word for others. Narrative for Māori encompasses the spectrum of oracy, the means of sustaining the stories of generations to pass on to descendents.

Among Māori there is a strong convention that mistakes in retention and transmission of oral literature are serious breaches of protocol. Sanctions are such that those who work with more esoteric Māori knowledge are trained to exercise memory skills well beyond the norm. Their skills are distinguished from the skills employed in more mundane personal recollections. Wiremu Parker, a knowledgeable elder, is recorded as having said that ‘Māori do not make any nice distinction...these are all covered by the general term *korero*’. (n.d. *Korero Purakau no te Ao Māori*). He goes on to relate the saying of Māori “ ko te korero te kai a te rangatira....talk is the food of chiefs”. Oral literature is a more formal type of production in the oral tradition, the narrative form of oral tradition can be seen as a personal account or even testimony in a Māori sense. They are not historical narratives of the kind Wiremu Parker refers to as myths and legends. The relegation in translations of Māori narratives that were designed to educate the young, to myths and legends does not do them justice as they carry wisdoms and cultural messages about values that are important world views. Story telling is another form of korero, but is heavily layered with the English meaning of fictional narratives. Storying as a derivative is one alternative to translate the particular form of korero under discussion.

The unlicensed use of oral narratives has some lessons for researchers. Tribal records of genealogy, of music, song and history appropriated by observers, writers, researchers and trans-national companies have been captured through copy-written ownership beyond the tribe. The commodification of indigenous knowledge, images, flora, fauna, technologies and artefacts has forced Māori to attempt to stop cultural piracy. Records of tribal and individual identity, have been appropriated by trans-national company rapacity and captured through copy-written ownership. Māori efforts to prevent piracy may be interpreted as opposition to research, when the more fundamental issue is about retaining ownership over property.

As far as possible, the processes adopted for this research attempted to utilise tikanga Māori as a guide while at the same time, drawing from the strengths of Māori forms of enquiry which have informed a Māori knowledge base predicated upon retention through oral history methods and informing narratives over centuries. Narrative as a form of information gathering and retelling has found a legitimate place in modern research methods as the limitations of skewed methodologies that ignored ‘thick description’<sup>8</sup> became more obvious. Bruner talks about “the landscape of consciousness” (1986:14), and the same is true of research in a Māori context, a search for methodologies that resonate with Māori realities, the multiple nuances of the Māori condition as with the development of Māori research frameworks.

Māori narrative style varies depending on the purpose of the story and the intended audience. Much that is meaningful in Māori contexts, most notably philosophical positions has been transmitted in short memorable succinct statements as whakatauaki, easily remembered and sufficiently tantalising to induce further investigation about the meanings and applications of the thoughts. Whakatauaki are one of many strategies for cultural transmission highly important to an oral culture.

---

<sup>8</sup> A useful concept developed by Geertz (1973) which he defines as description which goes beyond the mere or bare reporting of an act, but probes and describes the intentions, motives, meanings, contexts, situations and circumstances of action. (cited in Glesne and Peshkin, 1992)

The cultural archive for Māori lies in the range of narrative forms adopted in the telling and retelling by knowledgeable elders of significant views, attitudes and theories held by Māori, and of the korero that supports them. These are supplemented by written public or private records in carefully handwritten family documents or in published form. Publications by non-Māori and Māori alike had to be subjected to critical analysis by Māori as to their accuracy when compared to original Māori records of experience held in whānau archives. The dangers of representation of written Māori histories for example collected from one party to the history, lies in its propensity to become received wisdom fixed in nature, rather than exposed to the fluidity of debate that typifies Māori critique.

Processes for the discipline of history presume author objectivity of representation and if an adversarial approach is adopted, presume debate will take place among a community of scholars in an academic sense. The works represent academic interpretations of historical events premised on scholarly debate over time to work through anomalies in the rigour of the argument, inaccuracies of sequencing of events or their interpretations and so forth. Such works act as dislocations for Māori debate and critique. Those who contributed to the historical picture constructed by the historian are affirmed by perceived accuracies of their stories and those who were 'silenced' by non-participation or consultation are diminished by the process.

Publication gives stories the perception of a fixed permanence, a received wisdom that stays on in the public mind as confirmation of the material existence of the happenings of the past. But histories of Māori as devised by academic historians are as much documentations of individual or group recollections of the past as are Māori oral histories except that unless the historian is a Māori historian the history is not theirs. They are the histories of 'others'. To avoid the debates among Māori over the accuracy of views of particular histories, a Māori group can circumvent the role of the marae as a place for Māori scholarly debate and consent to outside authors exercising authority on their behalf through non-Māori arenas specifically book publishing. Thus knowledge of the past that should be continually recreated and rediscovered on the marae, becomes objectified in a written text.

The marae as a debating centre either on the marae atea or within the sanctuary of the house, is relatively open to those whose history is under scrutiny, to put forward a view. An academically authored history that does not canvass the recollections of representatives of the range of players is as liable to bias as any form of recollection.

Debate among Māori has grown as technology has allowed the construction of databases and websites containing sensitive material that can be accessed by non-authorised persons to use as they will. A way has yet to be found to monitor whānau and hapū members activity in database establishment without the appropriate consent of all who have a right to the information posted on it. New processes to prevent the erosion of cultural properties that have been afforded protection because they remained in the oral archive, will be needed as these are drawn off without appropriate consents and placed into the 'free for all' contexts of web technology.

As a form of educational enquiry, narratives allow Māori to tell their own story, to recount it as their personal experience and to give voice to the many factors that have shaped their lives and development.

### *Analysis*

Consequent upon the emphasis on comparative research to understand Māori, research analysis has often focused on the demonstration of racism. When the focus shifts from the individual to the system, the capacity of the modes of analysis to dissect the layers of influence impinging upon the outcomes for Māori also need to alter. Troyna and Hatcher (1992:40) devised a model consisting of a series of concentric circles for the analysis of racist incidents in schools. The model centred on the actual event, the interactional, and expanded through the contextual, the biographical, the sub-cultural, the institutional, the cultural, the political/ideological to the outermost circle, the structural. It provides a framework for uncovering the layers.

Although the model was devised to represent the series of influences that contribute to racist incidents in schools, it has been adapted in this thesis to set out the operationalisation of power in action, by naming the conduits through which power flows either negatively or positively. 'Incidents' such as the inappropriate use of

discipline are not seen simply as moments in time but as indicators of a wider environment with a core or centre that might be robust and healthy or 'toxic' and detrimental. In order to address the 'incident', two types of interventions are necessary. First the incident itself must be confronted but second, the manner in which it is addressed must take into account the wider context, the nature of the core. In analysing the histories of respondents in chapter 7, a particular type of core has not been assumed but the possibility of a wider context to explain incidents has been seriously considered.

Where a centre has become 'toxic' Māori educational interventions can be regarded as efforts to change the centre in order to encourage healthy interactions. This shift, from researching the negative 'incident', to searching for positive change at the centre, is one of the differences between the work of indigenous intellectuals<sup>9</sup> and the focus of the model outlined by Troyna and Hatcher. The difference is between an acceptance that educational behaviour can be understood by an analysis of micro-patterns alone, or recognising that micro-patterns are themselves reflections of macro-influences.

State power for example (a macro-influence) can be used for the Māori good, for the realisation of Māori aspirations with some redress of imbalances of power and rerouting of resources to responsible Māori organisations urban, tribal or otherwise.

On that particular matter an analysis of Māori research requires some appreciation of Māori societal structures and the multiple organisational arrangements that sometimes compete, and sometimes collaborate. Certainly there is no single Māori view and nor is there a single Māori identity. When Māori are constituted as a unitary group across tribal and geographical boundaries, the conceptualisation of a pan-Māori identity is rightfully challenged, on the basis that descent is from specific tribes and places, but not from the whole of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Whakapapa is used as the evidence for discounting a collective identity. On the other hand, whakapapa can also be used to demonstrate links between groups, whānau, and individuals. Tribal identity is more

---

<sup>9</sup> Hemi Hīreme Is working on the concept of an 'Indigenous Intellectual' for his Masters thesis and this notion comes from his work In progress. (pers.con.2001)

relevant in some situations though a Māori identity may be the more useful construct in other contexts including the classroom.

The question comes down to interpretation of the concept of tangata whenua and the issues of comparison. Indigeneity is a comparative concept with close relationships to the notion of tangata whenua. In contrast, in Aotearoa-New Zealand, the antithesis of indigeneity or tangata whenua is the identity of the other, the coloniser, the European, the Englishness of the English, the Treaty partner. Unstated in these descriptors is the subject of whiteness, a distinction that is rarely interrogated. Research carried out among black respondents identifies whiteness as a variable in black people's experience, that despite black respondents expertise demonstrated when engaging with whiteness, the process can still incur psychological costs (Nayak, A.1997:58). Nayak refers to the white norm, that Black people develop multiple strategies to negotiate the exigencies of such a norm. In Frankenburg's view, whiteness is:

A set of normative cultural practices, visible most clearly to those it definitely excludes and to those to whom it does violence. Those who are securely housed within its borders usually do not examine it. (Frankenburg, R.1994:228-229)

There is no reason to think that Māori experience is markedly different to that of the black respondents in the research cited above. Māori today are less likely to be as brown skinned and brown eyed as they were at the time of the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi after the normalisation of intermarriage between Māori and Pakeha in Aotearoa-New Zealand, but colour, as history shows, has played a significant part in privileging the coloniser and descendants of the original colonisers. For research participants in this study, whiteness was also a variable, usually identified as the behaviours, values and attitudes of Pakeha - teachers, pupils, principals, parents, farmers, neighbours, colleagues and friends. In this thesis, the interpretation of data does not avoid the subject of colour.

A related theme, also used in the interpretation of data, is related to control and community expectation. Where Māori have been able to participate in education under their own conditions and control, there has been a greater likelihood of success. For example, on the isolated East Coast of the North Island, where, although the

principals were not necessarily Māori, the school committees, children and communities were, the schools produced graduates who would go on to become national leaders and among the first Māori University graduates. Typically, the pupils were all related, their family members were actively involved in school organisation, and in some communities, the teacher would also be a relative. The core or centre is essentially one where Māori have high influence.

## ***ETHICALITY***

As culturally appropriate Māori research paradigms have gathered momentum, there have been flow-on implications for institutions and professional practices. Ethics committees have been at the forefront of the new paradigms and have needed to take account of a range of variables that were simply ignored before the relevance of culture to research was acknowledged. Personal involvement in a university research ethics committee provided first-hand opportunities for observation of the impacts of Māori research on ethicality and much of the insight for the following discussion comes from active participation in the research ethics debate as a member of the Massey University Human Research Ethics Committee.

### ***Research Ethics Committees***

Human research ethics committees have a responsibility to ensure that proposals to engage in research that involves Māori should be guided by an appropriate set of guidelines to ensure that respondents and their communities will be protected. . Because there were genuine concerns that research should do no cultural harm, Māori concepts of ethicality had to find a place beyond the minimally stated obligation to take into account social or cultural sensitivity. With a rise in Māori research paradigms, ethics committees had to become transparent sites of cultural negotiation. Most ethics proposals come to a committee directly from the discipline sites within a University and assumptions around the debates over the ethicality of a proposal had tended to stay within the traditional bounds of academic discourse.

Ethics committees were established in universities after an enquiry into research conducted from one university brought considerable harm to a number of women.

The enquiry into the behaviour of the researchers and the standards and practices of the research initiated by a media story (*'The Unfortunate Experiment'*), and conducted by Judge Sylvia Cartwright (the *'Cartwright Report'*) generated a need for closer monitoring of research involving people and their lives. Ethicality is about core values and respectful research, modified as need be to do no harm. However, the taken for granted values that had dominated research and ethics had drawn from non-Māori rather than Māori cultural bases, and sometimes overlooked the potential for harm if only because the researcher was ignorant of other views and perspectives. Key ethical values were assumed to have universal applicability.

From 1998 onward research of Māori must be able to demonstrate traditional ethical positions as well as those that meet Māori cultural requirements. The inclusion of a 'Māori voice' in research protocols for research conducted in Aotearoa-New Zealand is appropriate for ensuring safe research proposals where Māori are either researchers or participants or both. Proposals from those with little background in crossing cultural boundaries have had to learn new methods for research conduct. Research *on* Māori rather than *with* Māori implicates the researcher in a process of dominance, an exercise of power over Māori voices relegating them to subjugated voices and leaving the researcher free to re- represent Māori at will.

Interconnections between scholarship and colonialism became most evident during the height of British expansionism into the Pacific in the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century. But what began as colonisation or acts of cultural imperialism has been retained in modern form in the exercise of gate-keeping and ongoing assumptions about power. A Māori co-opted to an ethics committee, for example, may not be afforded space or recognition. The question of 'who' should speak depends on the qualities of the person. Not all Māori can assume a right to speak as 'the Māori voice' when they have done little to create space for it or acknowledge it in their work. Nor can non-Māori claim the right to speak on behalf of Māori, to claim 'the Māori voice' merely because they have learned the language or studied the protocols of engagement and communication. Authenticity comes when people have been involved over time, have demonstrated by their actions a long term commitment to Māori development, can show community endorsement, are sufficiently familiar

with the academic terrain, and from a wealth of experience can articulate a Māori view-point.

Research that is ethically appropriate draws upon Māori cultural values for guidance, upon Māori systems of ethicality and cultural imperatives. Good research takes account of difference in relation to perceptions of appropriate behaviours and rituals of encounter. Research that is ethical in the generally accepted sense adopted by research ethics committees is that which will do no harm. Ethical research accepts that there is no deception, that anonymity and confidentiality can be protected should that be the nature of the agreement between the researcher and participants.

A major difference between Māori ethicality and traditional research ethicality is the difference between collective and individual concepts of good research and harmful research.

From 1998 the Massey University Human Ethics Committee held regular staff development sessions about research ethics, including ethics involved in undertaking Māori research and research with Māori. Although attendance was compulsory for researchers, evaluations of the seminars have shown that the great majority of staff have found them useful and productive. The example is indicative of the relearning that is required as fresh approaches to research find a valid place in the academy. Modifications to existing ethical principles allowed the same set to be canvassed while drawing attention to Māori and other cross cultural concerns. For the ethics committee itself it brought home the realisation that all of ethics was about cultural values, not simply those projects that were demonstrably about cross-cultural research.

### *Ethical Themes*

A number of themes were canvassed for the ethical seminars and the guidelines that accompanied them.

- Access to participants was concerned with more than an expressed desire by non-Māori researchers to find a willing Māori person to take responsibility for the provision of access to the target Māori community. Instead it was

suggested that researchers be able to demonstrate a modicum of cross cultural competence themselves, some understanding of cultural propriety before seeking access to designated research participants. Indigeneity and the question of tangata whenua rights and obligations in any particular region is seen to require negotiated access for Māori and non-Māori researchers alike.

- Informed consent raised the question ‘from whom?’ Until Māori research gained ground, informed consent was sought from individual participants, parents or caregivers if the prospective participant was not old enough to do so on their own, and group consent if the work involved group interviews. From a Māori view, the potential for harm is wider than harm to individual participants if the research goes awry. Wider consent from identified Māori authorities in the research region is sought as a matter of respect for tangata whenua and as a means to provide them with an awareness of the intent of the research activity and the opportunity to comment or suggest modifications. It does not follow that individual participants will then be known to the respective authority because the consent is broad rather than narrow, an exchange of courtesies between institutions. Identified spokespersons, tribal or group leaders may merely need to have the research proposal presented so that they can make a judgement about the likely impact for themselves. Either oral or written consents are accepted, particularly where elders are concerned.
- Potential harm extends to cultural harm and collective harm to take into account tribal position, family reputation and ‘takatakahi mana’ as trampling on the standing and respect accorded individuals, their families or tribal institutions.
- Participants right to decline should take into account group participation such as Hui.
- Uses of information, acceptance of participants right to veto information if they consider the representation inaccurate or change their mind about parts of their information. A feedback loop forms an important aspect of inclusion for Māori participants in research projects and decisions as to preferred processes take into account agreements set out at the outset of the research.
- Conflicts of Interest or of Role can arise for Māori as insiders to research in Māori contexts when the context is known well as are the connections and

histories of prospective participants. Insider networks can be an advantage in gaining access but a disadvantage if information shared or included crosses the boundaries between private knowledge and knowledge that has a place in the public arena.

- Other ethical concerns might relate to questions of intellectual property, who has the right to share certain information and what should a researcher do with it. There should be respect for oral traditions and restraint from taking advantage of orality because of the lack of individual ownership as in acknowledgement of sources in the written word. (Durie, A. E., 1998, Ethics Seminars Material, Massey University)

## *Ngākau Māori Research and Ethicality*

As well as the principles of informed consent, confidentiality, minimizing of harm, truthfulness, and social sensitivity, a Ngākau Māori approach brings with it additional ethical requirements. They are summarised in Table 6.2 below:

Table 6.2 Ngākau Māori Research and Ethicality

<i>Ethical Principles</i>	<i>Implications</i>
Dignity	Respect for individual and group rights and the dignity of persons and peoples.
Safety.	Regard for the physical, mental, personal and cultural wellbeing of the participants and their whānau.
Mutuality	Work for mutual benefit to participants, co researchers and researchers. Look for a win-win scenario for research.
Collaboration	A balance between individual and group perspectives and rights. Utilisation of consensus <i>seeking processes</i> .
Respect	Participants are accorded the respect researchers would wish for themselves.
Intellectual Property	Acknowledgement of the intellectual property of others even when there is not an exchange of written information. Oral information, ideas and insights are just as much intellectual property as written and signed documents. Respect the boundaries between knowledge that may be shared and knowledge that should stay with whānau or hapū. Some knowledge should not be public property.
Outcome Awareness	While research takes place within a background of cultural meanings, the process and the outcomes will shape future meanings. Research reports depend as much for their accuracy on the 'eye' of the researcher as they do on the research method.

### *The Mana Factor*

Another approach to addressing ethical considerations for Māori requires the recognition of mana, an important concept somewhat akin to dignity or standing. Wheturangi Walsh raises what she has referred to as Kaupapa Māori research Issues, drawing on the work of Russell Bishop and Kathie Irwin to inform her ideas. She identifies respect, a face to face approach, use of the senses – look, listen, speak, generosity and a number of precautions as well as invocations. (*Te Oru Rangahau* 1998:255) For her a Kaupapa Māori approach allowed her research cultural legitimacy, an important point as Māori look to address the mis-research of the past. Protection of mana is raised as an important factor in the process, and is used for her

work, in the sense of integrity. The notions of collective interest, benefit and relevance are reiterated (1998:251).

Apart from the matters raised by Walsh there are many other aspects of mana, but the ones that are especially relevant to Māori ethicality are mana tangata, mana whakahaere, mana a iwi, mana whenua.

Table 6.3 *Mana as a guide to Ethicality*

<i>Mana</i>	<i>Focus</i>	<i>Implications</i>
Mana Tangata	Respect	Dignity, safety and mutual benefit to researchers and participants.
Mana Whakahaere	Control	Collaboration in the development and ownership of the research question and the research process.
Mana a Iwi	Research outcomes	Māori should benefit from the research
Mana whenua	Tribal prerogatives	Rights of tangata whenua to be recognised in the research process.

- Mana Tangata, which is about dignity, safety and mutual benefit to researchers and participants.
- Mana Whakahaere: control of decision making over the research questions and the research process.
- Mana a Iwi: acknowledgement that research and processes have the potency to shape meaning and foster action, so outcomes should benefit Māori aspirations for development as Māori and not deny them. (Durie, A. E, 1998:264)
- Mana whenua is a further construction of mana to be taken into account in research; it is an acknowledgement of the rights of tangata whenua, the representatives of those in the tribal region taking part in the investigation. If mana whenua is not recognised there is the potential for cultural harm, since “the collective identity that upholds tribal mana is vulnerable to findings of research reports”. (Durie, A.E.1990:6)

Constructive research methodologies have a far greater role to play in Māori development than do destructive methodologies although the difference between the two is not always recognised. Where invasive research has been carried out on Māori communities the outcomes have often created climates of mistrust of all research. Therefore where researchers have been ignorant of Māori research processes and protocols further training has been necessary, for supervisors and students especially where cultural boundaries have needed to be crossed. The ethics of Māori research paradigms offer a participatory approach to projects from the earliest stages, seeking to modify the poor reputation that research has had in many Māori communities and actively search for positive advantages for Māori. Tribal research initiatives that have arisen out of the community base have contributed to the lessening of mistrust of research and researchers and the growth of Māori research centres has further lessened the divide that so firmly separated researcher and participant in the past.

### ***Benefiting from Research***

An important ethical concern is benefit from research. While it is well accepted that research should do no harm, the corollary is that there should be some benefit from research, either from research that informed the theories, or the actions or non-actions resulting from the enquiry. A frequently expressed Māori concern is that the least likely to benefit are Māori, the most likely to benefit are the theoreticians or researchers in the first instance, and in the second, schools and classroom teachers. To a large extent research findings have presented Māori as mostly at fault for the failings of their children and their lack of participation in post-compulsory education. But conclusions that simply paint negative pictures offer Māori little chance of benefiting from research. The findings may well be logical products of the evidence presented but the narrow frameworks within which the research has been conducted may have actively prevented any conclusion that might be beneficial to Māori. It is not a question of avoiding the facts, or hiding from the issues, but of conducting research that can address the centre as well as the incident i.e. accepting that the classroom does not exist in isolation and any interaction between teacher and student is itself a product of a range of variables many of which have been excluded from the equation.

## *FORTY VOICES*

Chapter 7, the next chapter, draws on the methodological and ethical matters that have been raised in this chapter. It describes the approach taken to obtain a series of narratives from the voices of forty participants and then the findings that can be derived from them. The research approach has features of Kaupapa Māori research, Māori centred research, and Ngākau Māori research and while the findings raise serious concerns about the education system, they also point to avenues for positive interventions so that children and grandchildren might benefit, not only from the research but from an education system that actively promotes success and celebrates culture.

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### MĀORI AT SCHOOL - FORTY VOICES

*Ko te Kai a te Rangatira te Korero*  
*The food of chiefs is discussion*

#### *Stories and Narratives*

This chapter is about the school experiences of forty Māori men and women. It retells their stories within the context of an education sector that has not always been kind or fair to Māori and draws on their experiences as a means of considering educational implications for Māori in modern times. The stories, which introduce a personal dimension to the thesis, were recounted as part of a systematic research undertaking that lent heavily on the utility of narratives and the insights they convey.

Methods employed to conduct this piece of research were qualitative in nature, but not focussed on participant observation in the anthropological manner. Instead they were based on narratives. As a form of educational enquiry, korero, or narrative, allows Māori to tell their own stories, to recount them as personal experiences with the many associations that each brings. These are first hand voices of 'tangata whenua' talking about school. The korero that forms a large component of this section of the project, extends the korero category to include voices from research.

Apart from the interviews described in this chapter, the wider research method included archival research, and public policy analysis. Those aspects of the thesis have already been discussed in other chapters. In addition, the two case studies reported in chapter 4 are taken from the experiences of the Saami in Norway and the Nis'gaa in Canada and highlight similarities or differences in the relationships between school history and experiences and national policies.

The research process can therefore be described as deliberately multimodal, making use of semi-structured interviews with groups and individuals, archival analysis and

policy analysis. The use of multiple-data-collection methods and the multiple sites was considered necessary for the trustworthiness of the data, for although the number of interviews were small, 40 altogether, some of the group interviews were in fact small Hui or gatherings of people.

In this way, rather than following the quantitative norm of generalising from results, the process sought more specific understandings that might catch the notion of 'thick description' for there remain too many unanswered questions in relation to educational outcomes for Māori. The position adopted is not a neutral one for it involves critique of a succession of education policies, of the political processes which gave rise to such policies, of the actions or inactions which followed specific policy developments, and first hand interviews that are individual and group narratives about their school life and its reflection of the educational wellbeing of the participants at that time. An effort to identify key determinants of Māori education policy was undertaken in order to highlight the key areas for change or consolidation.

Māori narrative as a traditional oral means for the transfer of knowledge has a role to play in modern research methods, particularly in the uses of Hui for information transfer, and in its emphasis on 'kanohi ki te kanohi' (Bishop R. & Glynn, T. 1990; Durie, A.E. 1990), priorities for information collection and dissemination. This project adopted that method and emphasising the paramount importance of meaning and interpretation, as distinct from frequency alone. However a thematic approach drawn from a combination of meaning and frequency will be used in the analysis. In this sense, Māori narrative coincides with oral history method and the broad field of qualitative research methodology. Māori oral scholarship demanded accuracy, perfection and context in recounting the past and its connections with the people over time, making it less susceptible to what Myra Jehlen refers to as history being "unavoidably interested fabrication" (Jehlen, M., in Kaplan, E.A. & Levine, G. 1997:127). The problem as it is outlined by Jehlen, comes in moves from historians to reduce what are referred to as "duplicities of empiricism" by "exposing specific representations", yet she states "historians of the colonisation of the New World have more reason than most to see the past in their own way because the traditional accounts have exceptionally little authority in the main" (ibid:127-128).

Māori oracy prescribes levels of scholarship. Oratory is seen as a highly skilled narrational form. Marae scholarship is based upon the oratorical form, partly drama, partly eloquence, mesmerising yet factual with just enough humour to sustain audience attention over time. In some tribal regions, marae oratory is restricted to men, in others it is not. The korero gathered here is not as formal as oratory, it does not have the structure of oratory or the protocol of marae to guide it, but the narratives nonetheless are as factual as the participants see it, and in their own style tell of the drama of school lives. Nor are the narratives story telling, yet the participants are telling their stories, sharing information that will be joined with others to create a picture for those who were not there and who do not know what it was like to be Māori at school. Hawaiians refer to talk-story or storying but they have their own nuances. Māori story telling is the pakiwaitara, telling a tale to draw people in. It is more appropriate to refer to the style of korero gathered for this work as testimony. These are testimonies, putanga korero given by participants to let others understand their experiences and the effects of school on their lives. The testimonies rely on the memory of the teller for their integrity. While each story has a unique quality, a value in its own right, there are commonalities. These commonalities give a different measure of validity, they give the testimonies greater meaning for Māori audiences. Māori listeners or readers can identify with the korero to the extent that they recognise similar notes from their own experiences in the stories.

Interpretation is representation, and the korero of participants traced for this project does not claim otherwise. While it is a structured account, it does not make claims to being an empirical account in the sense that Jehlen uses to uncover the ways in which traditional accounts were stripped of their authority. By resurrecting the 'traditional account' the project is attempting to put 'Māori voices' back into the frame, to add another dimension to the accounts of educational provision for Māori while acknowledging that it is as selective as any histories of the past have been. One difference in method is that the dialogues in this project have, for the most part, been checked by those who produced them.

In its essence the model adopted comprised four simple phases: research design, ethical approval, data collection, then analysis and documentation. The design drew from an indigenous approach to knowledge construction given precedence because it made sense to retain that rationale in a project about voice.

## *Participants*

Two types of participants were recruited for this study. Individuals from known networks were interviewed on a one to one basis and two focus group Hui were arranged for several participants; their contribution was a collective one.

Targeted sites were selected to obtain differentiation between rural, urban and metropolitan dwellers and those who hold more conservative or tribal views of the constitution of appropriate behaviours, values and attitudes as Māori.

Participants came from a range of ages, according to Māori distinguishing criteria of kaumātua, or elders, pakeke, mature adults and rangatahi, younger adults. Rangatahi can extend into later teens but there were no participants in this age group who were still at school. No tamariki (children) were invited to participate, nor was any of the research conducted at schools although teachers are included among the participants. Participants self designated in each category, identifying their own current status, along with name and contact.

Table 7.1 *Participant Characteristics*

	Rangatahi	Pakake	Kaumātua
Total sample	18	12	10
Personal Interviews	5	8	10
Hui participants	13	4	0
Metropolitan schooling	6	2	0
Urban schooling	12	5	10
Rural schooling	0	5	0

There was not a tidy correlation with chronological age especially in the group who self designated as rangatahi. Rangatahi is very much a perspectival position, young in relation to some but old in relation to others. Those who saw themselves as rangatahi covered a range of ages. Participants could identify an age band if they wished.

The individual respondents were essentially a snowball sample, recruited from a known network. A snowball approach to finding participants was used, beginning with three lead elders who wished to tell their story. At one time an intergenerational sample was considered but as the numbers grew it became obvious that it was too complex to follow a whānau through several generations in the time available. The idea can be followed up at another time. Purposive sampling was a further measure used to ensure that Māori members of the teaching profession were included in the interview cohorts or samples as their close career relationship with schools and policies may have meant greater success strategies operating to realise their educational aspirations. Purposive or targeted sampling as an extension of snowball sampling allowed the gathering of stories that in the view of Gall, Bourg & Gall, (1996:218) would be likely to be 'information rich'. (Waitere-Ang, H.,1999: )

The procedures for recruitment were simple at times and at others quite complex. One of the difficulties was recognition of the privileged position of an insider that inevitably occurs in a convenience sample especially in Māori networks. A cautious approach to the use of information gained during an interview with a known respondent was required. A snowball sample is also likely to lessen the chances of a wide spectrum of ideas being forthcoming since participants are all connected in some way.

Hui participants were recruited from notices posted and announcements in areas where Māori gather and explained to those who expressed an interest by a local intermediary. These were followed up by visits to arrange further information, consents, times and dates. All the people who attended Hui came with a friend or in small groups. There were no lone participants at Hui. The evolution of the research paradigm and the adaptation of existing ones to better facilitate appropriate research that involves Māori participants has been an uppermost concern in the development of this research project. Hui were seen as an integral part of the methodology. It raised a range of ethical questions at the time, around issues of anonymity and confidentiality and the potential for harm should those who speak their mind find themselves in disagreement with another person at the Hui. The simple solution was that those who attended were clearly interested in the project and as in any Hui, there would be no obligation to stay the whole time or be obliged to respond to questions should they

choose not to. Hui are not about forcing people into roles they do not want, but rather allowing space for participation as individuals see fit. Two Hui were held and no problems arose for either. One problem that can arise with the Hui model is that there could be participants who have not had much experience in talking about their own life in front of others. The difficulties that arose for Hui participants was the return of transcripts for review as not all contacts were permanent and were being returned over a summer holiday period. Those transcripts that were returned by the Post Office have been destroyed although original tapes remain.

The Hui were the more difficult interviews to conduct because of the number and the potential for impatience to set in if any one person began to dominate the responses or volunteer questions to the rest of the group. Not all questions were tape recorded and not all conversations were transcribable. When there were responses that fired similar recollections from other participants, the words are not always clear. Handwritten notes provided the back up to the tape recordings. Upon reflection it would have been better to have had a recorder for the Hui proceedings, a second person to observe, take notes and check on the tape recorder. Without that support, some important statements could be overlooked. The notes and tapes were locked in a filing cabinet until there was time to transcribe the material and add in the notes. At the start of both kinds of interview, basic agreements were arrived as to speaking order, one person at a time, no speaking over other people.

Every participant had received an information sheet beforehand together with a consent form, although it was made clear that oral consent was acceptable as well as written consent. Those who chose to take part in Hui, brought their forms back with them but their presence was taken to be sufficient consent. All the participants were made aware of their rights before the interview process proceeded. Hui interviews were more difficult to conduct because of the number and the potential for impatience when any one person dominated the responses or asked their own questions.

Where consent to tape record was received, this was the preferred method of data collection during fieldwork; few notes were taken at interviews because of the potential to generate loss of concentration from the participant if the interviewer appeared preoccupied with writing instead of listening.

The interview data was supplemented by written materials with some bearing on the period and issues in question, for example, policies or reports relevant to the topic or institutions or both.

Semi-structured face-to-face interviews were chosen for the fieldwork component of the research, utilising a range of settings chosen by participants. The interviews could not be completely open-ended because there were questions about school life that could prove to be informative. Self-disclosure was used as an equalising strategy so that the participants would get to know something about the interviewer beyond the stylised information on the information sheet given or sent out to all prospective participants. The interview schedule sought to document the recollected experiences of the school life of a range of participants. Initially three interview sites were identified but altered to two to reduce the time needed to carry out the interviews. The interviews asked for opinions, perceptions and recollections of schooling experiences, participation as Māori, and how being Māori might have been recognised at school. The relationship of school to supporting personal goals was a further dimension explored in the interviews.

Some of the respondents volunteered family records to complement their narratives. If the material was not directly relevant to the research, it was returned without further analysis. Any decision to share family archive information more widely than amongst family members was taken to need approval from a wider family forum than solely those with care-taking responsibilities if there was any potential for disharmony.

### *Wāhanga Korero: Hearing the Voices*

The only way to find out what it was like for Māori at school is to listen to those who know the experience first hand; let them tell in their own words what school was like. The risk of non-validity of interviews was not great. In the trial interviews, repeat interviews invariably brought forward the same highlighted experiences as the first, but also more freedom to discuss matters that were unrelated to the task. The

interviews taken were not brief although only excerpts appear here. The interviews were a cross between recollecting and recovering school life history.

The goal was to seek consistency with official stories about school in the designated periods and to gain a better understanding of what day to day school life might have been for Māori students, the thick description that is missing in official accounts, to look for the feelings behind the figures. The statistics tell stories of one kind, they are bald figures about the aggregated results of Māori school life. The figures on Māori educational progress nationally are collected for annual reports and judged as to signs of improvement or not. At the same time there is a great deal of work going on in schools, to observe progress first hand. The interviews for this project were not first hand observations of students in school, on the spot records of happenings being played out before me, they were the narratives people chose to tell about their school life, the good, the bad and the ugly. The official records used were the policies of the times. What else was going on around education at the times when the participants were in school? There is consistency across the interviews themselves as well as with state policies.

The idea that prompted the collecting of school narratives was the intention to give some substance to the effects of policy development by the state on Māori at school, to see if Māori of all ages did have educational aspirations and whether or not they felt that they had realised them. If they had not, what did they see as having intervened or been a barrier to realising their aspirations.

The interviews collected for this project reflect the narrative approach of Māori oral tradition, a mix of testimonies as to what school was like for Māori in general when they were at school, and what it was like for those interviewed. Those in the elder group are recounting stories of schooldays that are in some cases, sixty or more years old. For the purposes of the project, perceptions of schooling and schooldays are important because the perceptions construct the ways in which meaning is attributed to the events recalled. How the participants saw their schooling is of prime importance, it does not matter if others have contradictory opinions, the issue is recording their own perceptions of their personal experiences of school.

## *Analysis –Tāhuhu Iringa Korero*

The narratives were rich and powerful. They reflected the impact of schooling on the lives and ambitions of forty Māori men and women from the vantage point of hindsight and within the context of a changing world. Inevitably their reflections represented their memories, but also the passion, regret, and pragmatism that had shaped their lives.

After several options were explored a manual thematic analysis was undertaken. To some extent the analysis itself can be compared to a whare whakairo. The image of a wharenuī has been used metaphorically many times. Wiremu Kaa used it as a metaphor for Te Reo Māori, and it had been used in the analysis of public submissions to the Royal Commission on Social Policy.<sup>10</sup>

The many voices coalesce to form a tāhuhu—a ridgepole that gives strength and continuity to their collective expression. Emerging from the tāhuhu are the themes – heke –that communicate energy through parallel wavelengths. The pattern on each heke is different, no two are the same, but they come together to form a whole in the tāhuhu. The metaphor of the Tāhuhu iringa korero is that the korero and the kupu, the narratives and words that have been collected contribute to the supporting structures of the metaphorical, in this instance, house, they will not be lost. They take their place in the repository of knowledge that forms the tāhuhu for a Māori education contribution to Māori development, to Māori advancement. The patterns on the heke are created from the lives of the narrators, building histories for the next generation so that they will know the past, know their history so that they can understand their present and in doing so better prepare for their future.

Individual testimonies do not sound the alarm about school in strident ways, they tell more of a resistance-resignation strategy where school has not been fully to their liking or not given support to their ambitions. They tell also of non-recognition, of

---

<sup>10</sup> Frances Goulton also made use of the metaphor in her thesis, *He Huarahi Ako, Pathways to Learning*, 1998

feeling faceless and unseen in the learning environment yet instantly identified in another, the discipline environment.

### *Five Themes*

An examination of key words drawn from the Hui interviews and the individual interviews led to the identification of four themes: readiness for life, being Māori, motivation, diminished horizons and forms of discrimination. While many other themes emerged they were not raised consistently; nor were they represented across all interviews or hui.

### *Readiness for Life*

Acknowledgement that education has two main objectives, preparation for living and preparation for making a living is not new, it was cited for example by Patricia Broadfoot in her keynote address at a conference in New Zealand in 1992 (NZQA Conference Proceedings:150). Snippets of dialogue fit this category. They tell of an introduction to compulsory schooling that asked Māori learners to engage in the acquisition of literacy in English rather than their heritage language, and by making sense of the words and pictures on the page from contexts beyond the experiences of tangata whenua. Children grounded in indigenous histories and tales of people and place were asked to invent a world where other values and depictions held sway. Tangata whenua children were therefore not only expected to make the transition from the culture of the home to the culture of the school, but in addition, to relate to images which afforded them little place except as spectators, onlookers from the margins.

Every child in a New Zealand school is rigorously assessed at age six for competency in reading. The norm or benchmark set for the assessment tasks has been created for children who do not have to cross a cultural divide before they begin. The results of the tests divide learners into those labelled as in need of compensatory support, Reading Recovery, and those who fall into the successful group by meeting the majority norms. While there is no doubt that literacy skills are essential for any learner, part of the problem lies in the bigger question of affirmation of cultural

identity in all aspects of teaching and learning. Readiness for life was all too often not about being able to live that life as Māori

*I knew on day one at school that I was different. My prior knowledge didn't count in the classroom. The pictures were unfamiliar, the personal interactions and protocols were different and strange. I was asked to talk and I couldn't but I survived Primary school life. I enjoyed music, singing, piano, dancing, I went to tap classes.*

*Some children in New Entrant classes were not able to cope. Without prior knowledge they were not able to connect to school culture. The unspoken protocol was 'other' compared to mainstream. Many aspects of school did not respect home life. Parts of the curriculum, especially reading books stereotyped Pakeha western families, nice car, nice family, like 'Sweet Porridge' and Little Red Engine'. We had to take TOSCA and PAT tests, we went into the Hall for those. I did not understand some of the ideas, I could read the words but not relate to the stories, like those about Rome for example. (20 )*

*We had little dark green readers, they were not New Zealand stories, the context was very strange. Our classroom was very regimental. Writing was another thing. We had to stand at the blackboard and write slowly and carefully together, all together, up and down and around. I was good at that, my writing was neat. Because I was so neat and tidy I was asked to stand up and show the Inspector how I could write on the blackboard. The inspector's name was Mr. Goodwin. I can still remember that after all this time.*

*School was about English and learning about it. I remember being told the story of the Ugly Duckling and feeling really sorry for the duck. We learned to read from stories like that, I didn't know what to make of it. Reading was nothing to do with what I knew. (7 )*

Far from adding to a familiar world or confirming the significance of accustomed landmarks, school had other ambitions – to prepare Māori for another kind of life...to remind Māori children that they were not in the mainframe. Worse, the frame Māori were constructed in, was often negative. Māori learners were offered two choices at non-Kaupapa Māori schools, to live as Pakeha, or to accept a deficit view of themselves as Māori. A pattern of exclusion from positive representation and inclusion in negative representation is not uncommon. The messages received by the

children during their daily school life included the use of school rituals to promote certain views of the children including perceptions of cleanliness, and by implication, dirtiness.

*School was not only about teaching us to read and write, it was also about strange things like getting us to clean our teeth with salty water. We didn't have a dental nurse but there must have been something wrong with our teeth for the school to think we should clean them once a day at school. It didn't matter that you did it at home. We were a mostly Māori school and that was one of the daily rituals. Another was looking in our hair to see if we had nits. There were children at school who always seemed to have nits so no doubt they spread. We would stand in line and hold out our hands to check if our finger nails were clean. And a handkerchief check. But I wouldn't go to school with a hanky pinned to my jumper like some children did. It wasn't a good look. I never asked why we had to do those things, they were just part of the strangeness of school. They took up a lot of our time. It was as if we were somehow unclean. So there we were. The teachers in charge were husband and wife and they ruled the school. One thing they didn't do was check our lunches. We could eat what we liked and swap with no worries. No one had no lunch that I can remember but we shared anyway so I suppose you couldn't tell. Probably, now I think about it, they didn't check our lunches 'cause they went home for lunch at lunchtime. The school house was just over the fence. We had lunch, then straight out to play. Then carry on and pretend not to hear the bell when it went for school again. We had to check out the sports gear, balls and things, before lunch if we wanted it then check it was all back in afterwards. The teachers didn't supervise that either. We only ever lost balls, nothing much else. We were good at returning gear. There wasn't much. I don't know why we were so trusted with the sports gear, but not trusted for our personal hygiene. If there was anything gross about anyone at school I would remember. I remember who had the kutus ( nits) but not why we had the rest of the carry-on. It was Māoris who were given the TB injections first too. We were the trials, a bit like the hepatitis injection programme now. I don't know anyone from then who had TB. but hepatitis is seen as the big problem here now.*

*Maybe the District Nurses asked the schools to do all that. Maybe they wanted it done. They always turned up to check on us and wrote their reports on brown cards in the office. We didn't see what they wrote. Later on, in my fifth form, I decided to go*

nursing. I was always thinking about what to do. I dreamed my way through the boring classes, it kept me quiet. You only had to have a health check and have gone through fifth form. I didn't have any ideas about it before that although my aunty was a nurse, and one of our neighbours. I remember aunty's photos of her training days; line ups of smiling girls in white uniforms, white shoes and white caps. My photos look the same. I trained in the local hospital. It had a big nurses home that stayed open until the beginning of the eighties I think it was. Now it's used by our community health programmes. (12 )

Primary School was O.K.. Our teachers weren't so bad and we did learn a lot. It was after that, when I went to Intermediate School that I began to feel pushed around. I went in on the bus on the first day with some others from our school and we were looking forward to it. We had heard about cooking and woodwork that I liked the sound of. When I got to class it was like all tests. The Maths test time went by so fast that I didn't finish it. I was too slow. Others were quick at the work and they seemed used to it. I knew how to do the Maths I just didn't know how to do tests; finish in time. I didn't get a good start that day. Intermediate school was like that, always in a hurry, always getting the bell and no time. I liked the cooking and eating what we made or take the rest home. The woodwork wasn't too bad. I made a pencil case, and we had neat school camps. I was a camp leader. Our group did all the challenges properly. When we got back to school and had to write it up, it showed. We won the prize for our work. We got more out of teachers at camp, they changed. Everyone had a say about what they thought should be in the programme, about who would be the team leaders and about who went in what team. Back at school it was different. The camp was one chance for us to have a say.

By High School I was thinking that I would probably be quite good as a PE teacher. I knew that I was a good leader, kids listened. I was quite good at sport, and I volunteered to coach junior school softball. I wasn't so sure what I had to do to be a PE teacher. It looked easy. Our careers advisor suggested that I join the army even though I asked about PE teaching. I took her seriously and checked it out. My Mum wasn't happy, Dad didn't say much. But I filled out the forms and I would have joined up except that I saw an ad. on T.V. about teaching and sent away for those forms. By then I was in the sixth form and thinking about Bursary. You didn't have to sit every subject, you could just sit one if you liked. I took English, Māori,

*Geography, P.E. Got enough marks for Teachers' College so I went. I'm having this year off for study leave. I might do something else. I see Māori students do well in PE but flunk the end of the year in other subjects. It's time for a huge change in careers advice, get people who know Māori; even better, get Māori careers advisors. Get the kids on track early. If kids get too many knock backs they will believe they are going nowhere, taking second string. Trying to patch up their school lives after they get a shredding is hard. I'll do more study. Find some way of getting some changes in schools from the outside.(14 )*

*My family didn't have any particular thoughts about school one way or the other. I didn't miss having Māori at school. I was to go to school to learn what the school wanted to teach me and I did. That was what it was all about. I went to school to learn and there wasn't a place for anything Māori. Although I am Māori I didn't notice anything missing because I wasn't expecting it to be any different. School was for learning about Pakeha things not Māori things, that's the way it always had been and that's the way it was. We didn't have anything about Māori in our classes that I can recall. Everyone knew that I was Māori, but I wasn't alone in the class. I grew up in a timber town and there were all the workers families at the school. A lot were Māori The managers children were the teachers pets, they were always well treated. The teachers watched out for them.. They were expected to do well. My parents never asked me if I learned anything about Māori at school but they did expect me to do well. I took it for granted. They couldn't teach me Māori but they didn't expect the school to either. Now that I have a job and some life experience, I know that I want to learn Māori, that's why I am back studying. I don't begrudge not having had the chance to learn Māori at school. There were other things that have been useful to me in getting a job. I could have carried on with study, but I took the first job I saw. It was that pay packet in the end. I worked in the Post Office, made it to a supervisors position then when Post Offices closed down I looked around for other work. I had enough money to put down on a house and set myself up. I had a flatmate and that helped the kitty. I'm not sure what I want to do when I finish this course. I might even find a job here. It's quite a good place to be, always something happening, people coming in and out looking for help. Some have to be here but mostly they're here because they want to be. I have my house I could sell if I had to move to another town for work. I go home now and then, and I see the life in our town going on. It's*

*not so big but they can all study Māori at school if they want. They know more than we did. (21 )*

Participants had views on what readiness for life was, what they had in mind for themselves or what their parents wanted, but the school also had a significant role in shaping those aspirations. One participant felt the role of careers advisor in secondary school to be crucial for Māori students there. Although he did not use the word, those who serve as careers advisors clearly act as gatekeepers for the aspirations Māori have for the future. By chance, rather than by guidance, he was able to follow the career he had sought when he was at school. Without that chance opportunity, he would have joined the many many Māori who serve in the armed forces. There are those who actively seek a career in the forces, but Māori should not have to limit their choices because it has been a popular career choice for others.

Whatever else had been accomplished, it was not readiness for a real life, for a Māori life. The life in the dark green readers was someone else's life, different homes, different clothes, different colours, and different ways of looking at the world. A child's first school lesson, that whatever was going on in school, it was not to do with her story.

### ***Being Māori***

*Development of the whanau is the key to Māori education. If we strengthen our families and support their aspirations, they will have more confidence to go to the schools and talk with the teachers about their childrens learning. It's a bottom up process, we start with the families and they go on to do better with the schools. If they need us, we will go to the schools for them. We need to have groups whose job it is to look after the family's interests with the schools. I didn't go to school here, I went to school in another city. We owned the ground under the school and that had an effect on the way we were treated at school. Our tipuna had gifted the land to the school generations ago and it was in the school records. I went on to Boarding School after Primary, with two others from my school. My mother was an old girl of the school so the first thing I noticed was her class photo on the wall when we arrived. It made me feel welcome. Our Headmistress was quite strict and she believed in standards. If we*

went on to the sixth form we had to study at another school but we could stay on as boarders in our own. I did the commercial course and have some background in business now. It has served me well. Typing was not a professional subject but it has been a useful one for me in all my work. It was shorthand-typing in those days. I only came here after I was married. We lived just out of town where my husband had a farm. I have had to look after my family on my own since he died and we lease the farm out. I am fortunate that I can understand the farm figures and know what is a good deal and what is not, if I didn't have that knowledge we would not have done very well on our own.

Everything we did at school had a Māori flavour. We were proud of our Kapa Haka and gave many performances. We had a wonderful teacher of Māori and had a very good grounding in it. I didn't have many opportunities to use it after school but I need it now. Our teachers were dedicated and were proud of us, they supported us in our dreams for the future by giving us the teaching we needed. The friends I made then are still my friends now. They came when my husband died and stayed with me. They call in when they can and we visit them. ( 5 )

We can take what is good for today if we are willing to share it, if we don't want to do that, the values of being Māori will disappear even if my children can now learn Māori at school. If they learn the language without the values it will be meaningless, saying English ideas in Māori words. Others cannot fulfil our needs, and school can only provide part of what we need. Teachers don't yet have the competence to provide the strong leadership and good direction for our children unless they themselves have a strong background in Māori values. Our elders have a responsibility to bring back the disaffected, to go out and talk to their people. If they have been damaged at school we have to heal them. If they are unemployed we have to rehabilitate them. If we do not carry out these obligations, what will it mean to be Māori? My work here is strengthening our whanaungatanga, looking after our people, finding programmes that work for them, doing, not talking. ( 9 )

School was a hurdle I had to leap to be able to do what I wanted to in life. Our problem is that we have convinced ourselves that others have to provide for us, that we can expect to be looked after. My parents equipped their children to be self-reliant in all its connotations. I could look after myself in the bush hunting, as well as I could

look after myself at school. Whānau self reliance is not the same as individual self reliance, whanaungatanga is the middle ground. We look after each other in what ever we do. School success asks for a distinction, a division in self, to seem confident as an individual rather than express that confidence by helping others. The whānau concept is about obligation, not "do as I please". If we believe things Māori we have no option. School starts separating us from these values, asking us to go for individual success even when we can see whānau who need our time and help.(4)

I went to school here. I was the first in our family to go. My father encouraged me to go. He wanted me to get school knowledge. He didn't come with me because he couldn't speak English, but he asked everyday as soon as I got home, what I had learned that day. I learned to speak English at school. It was different in those days. We studied grammar and the teacher was very strict, only the best English would do. My father wanted me to speak the best English too, no pidgin, no half and half. Our writing had to be correct, we couldn't make mistakes. At home our Maori had to be perfect and at school our English had to be perfect. We had high standards but no Maori at school. It wasn't thought to be good for us to speak Maori at school, it would interfere with our learning. We only spoke Maori at home, no English and it is still my preferred language. That's why I support the Kohanga Reo movement. Our children should have the best of both languages, not just English. We established a Kohanga here and we had a great committee. Everyone was dedicated to getting it ready. It was an exciting time. Now those parents have moved on with their children the next generation are not as involved. They want to use it like a daycare centre, drop off their children before work and collect them straight afterwards, no korero, no fundraising, no whānau meetings. Schools and Kohanga have changed. We have worked to get our local school designated as an Immersion Primary school so our Kohanga children have somewhere to go. We would have to have a bus service as it is too far to walk and families work these days. The Principal there is due to retire soon so we are hoping that after that we can change the school over. There is some white flight at the school because people have heard of our plan. Most of the Trustees were not Māori. They were from Pakeha families who have been here a long time. They were good at looking after the buildings and the grounds but they didn't want change. Most take their children into town to school now so the roll has dropped. The Principal has supported us at the Board meetings. School Trustees today need to

*be accountable back to the people, the Māori ones as well as the Pakeha ones. If their responsibility is to represent then they should be prepared. It is a simple skill. Trustees should have to have meetings on local marae where Māori families are comfortable and can hear about burning issues. Māori need to be able to say what they want, as family and as a collective. We are losing the art of talking, of talk until issues are resolved, the old way, where there was no time limit and problems were resolved. The mechanics are there for parents to be involved. It works for Kohanga, so schools should build on that model. We need to have confidence in ourselves, in our Reo and Tikanga. Schools should be fostering that confidence not undermining it. Schools have their responsibility to extend a hand to families, and families to reach back. We want a school for our Kohanga children that can do that. (10 )*

*The Immersion concept should be extended into secondary schools. The children who have been to Kura lose their Reo at Secondary level otherwise. After the war years Māori language and stories came into favour in some schools. They were not there before. Most children had Māori as their first language, not English and had to work hard to grasp English at school so that they could pick up the skills they needed to read, write and do their sums. It wasn't easy when you didn't know what the teacher was saying. The Reo should always be together with Tikanga, not separated out as different subjects. ( 6 )*

*In our little town, we were nearly all Māori, the teachers weren't though. I loved school. We didn't have any books at home just the newspaper to read. My Dad would go to the shop every day to buy the paper, bring it home, spread it out on the table then get us to tell him what was in it. He couldn't speak English, just a few words. I was spoilt. My brothers had to go out to milk cows and help my Dad around the farm before they went to school. I just took my time, my older sisters did the housework with Mum. We had the Janet and John books at school. Look Janet look, jump John jump. We didn't take them home, but we could say the words. When we had a school concert, all the parents came. They were so proud of their children reciting the English words. They were saying in Māori " look my child is speaking English". My parents sent me to Boarding School. We learned to do housework as well as our studies. There was some Māori but not so much, even though it was a Māori Boarding School. I decided to be a teacher so I applied to go teaching at the*

end of my fifth form. I was accepted. I didn't know that I had to arrange my own place to live, I thought it would be like Boarding School and there would be a Hostel. When I arrived there on the first day, I went to enrol, and when that was finished I said 'please, where am I to stay'? Well, what a surprise. They took me to the YWCA to stay and I was happy to have a bed. I was lonely and miserable. I had bought myself some new clothes to start my city life. I had been really excited about going, then when I found out I had made such a silly mistake I wanted to go home. When classes started, I met up with a girl who had been ahead of me at school. She seemed to know what to do. Then I met up with some girls from another boarding school. We looked after each other and it was good to have support. I would not have stayed if I hadn't found some friends. We got to know the town, we joined the local Māori Club. In class there was nothing to suggest that any of us might be working with Māori children when we completed our training. The curriculum was as mainstream Pākeha as the rest of College life. I was offered Board at a house in return for looking after their children after my classes were over. I had full board, I didn't have to cook and looking after the children was just being there after school until their parents came home. I learned a lot about Pakeha households boarding there. What their manners were, what they liked to read, what their hobbies were; how they entertained, and what made them laugh. I was happy not to cook and to be able to save my money. Anyway I became very much like a Pakeha, I think I did it consciously. When I went out to my first school, I didn't make much of being Māori. I put it aside for a long time. I was happy just to teach the curriculum without any Māori in it. Yet there were Māori children in my class. I don't know what kind of example I was. Even when I got married, I was still living more or less as a Pakeha. I hardly went to the marae. It wasn't until I took a job at a Secondary school, when we moved back to my husband's area that I began to remember my Māori side and who I was. I had to learn fast, just because I was Māori I was supposed to know everything there was to know about teaching Māori students. It was my job to make them more interested in school. Well, the Reo was so far back in my memory that I didn't have enough to help them with that. I was supposed to help them catch up with their subjects and keep them at school. I was desperate to find something that would work. It was a Pakeha teacher who came to my aid and we worked together. We made quite a difference. When we got them through the fourth form, we had to develop a senior programme for them. Without his help I would have been unable to

*do the work. The school couldn't believe that what we were doing was working, that they were still there. We didn't have much in the way of resources, just our own initiative. Anyway, that's what started me getting back my Reo and my identity as a Māori woman and Māori teacher. I think I was just trying to survive in the big world away from my home. I thought the best thing to do was to be like the Pakeha, not to make waves. I have put that experience to good use as I work with Māori teachers who may be making the same mistakes that I did. I understand the pressures and what it takes to resist them. Now I do all that I can to help Māori get access to their Reo and Tikanga. That is my job and my life. I want my moko to take being Māori for granted, not to have to give it a second thought; not to have to deny being Māori. He visits me and I talk to him every day. We korero in Māori to each other. I want the world to be a better place for him when he goes to school. (8)*

*I had to travel from the Pā every day to go to High School. The Primary school at the Pā was comfortable because we were all whānau. My brothers and I were encouraged by our father to study and to succeed. We did not all go to the same secondary school, but we did all make careers for ourselves. I went to a state secondary school, some of my brothers went to Māori Boarding schools. There was nothing in the curriculum of my High School that I can remember, that included anything about Māori, either language or culture. It was just invisible, not like our Primary School life. My home was Māori and that was to be enough. We were all expected to go as far as we could with our education and careers. You could say that I succeeded at school because I went on to higher studies and a good profession. But unlike, some of my brothers I was not able to converse in Māori. I have a pretty good idea of what is being said, but I do not speak Māori even now. That was something I had to sacrifice in order to further my education. There was not the opportunity to have both. My brothers who went to Māori schools have both.*

*In spite of all our education, we have all experienced racism, the colour bar. Not in the commonplace school comments so much as in the ways our social and working lives were restricted where others who worked with us were not. I didn't let the school comments affect my progress. I had work to do but as an adult making my way in the world, the comments turned into actions. There were clubs we could not belong to, and hotels that did not serve Māori either as guests or patrons. At work those*

*already established in professions did not necessarily open their doors to Māori, so we could work with people during the day but never be invited to their gatherings after work. It was the out of work socialising that was where decisions were made. Even life insurance was denied to us. Travel was a risk if there was no accommodation. Lodgings of any kind away from home could be difficult to find. I was fortunate to belong to a large family and have the support of many brothers. Life is very different for this generation, so many more doors are open to them. Māori professionals were few in our day, so we did not have the extensive relationships that the young ones have now, even their own professional organisation and look at the numbers. It could be quite a lonely life for a Māori at work. It wasn't so pleasant for my wife either. It wasn't so easy to tell whether she was Māori or not, and there were times when we would have to resort to subterfuge to get a place to live. There was a colour bar all right. (19)*

The korero from this group of participants, painted a picture of Māori management of change. The necessity of the English language as a workplace language is brought out as a background to the necessity of the Māori language as a basis for identity.

Learners bring their own identity with them. If that identity is not endorsed within the classroom then there is a risk that a sense of personal integrity will be lost. Not only will the classroom be experienced as a foreign experience but doubts about personal beliefs and values will be introduced.

The first encounter between Māori and school is a critical transition point, not only because adjustment to school is a determinant of educational success but also because there are obligations for cultural protection and maintenance. Recognition of this fact has seen a number of schools attempt to acknowledge cultural difference and modify the generally rugged monoculturalism of the New Zealand school system by developing components of a curriculum that recognises Māori language and culture. Activities such as Māori Club, that is, performing arts or Kapa Haka or, depending on the capacity of the classroom teacher, a component of Māori language could also be included in the programme of work.

*We lived in a state housing area and I went to Primary and Intermediate school in the same area. We had Māori language in class and we had a club. Our Māori language*

teacher had been at the school a long time and began the club. Other teachers came and went but she was the mainstay of the programme and the club. She encouraged all of us Māoris to join the club and to enjoy ourselves. She was a senior teacher and had a lot of respect from the other teachers in the school and in the community. Some children there were the children of people she had taught earlier on. She was a very good example for us and gave us confidence. She would teach the teachers and the pupils. I think she was the oldest teacher at the school, older than the Principal. (18)

I didn't like it when certain teachers only taught the students they liked, not even knowing what I was like and how much I liked the subject, or what I was interested in. I could only think that I was excluded from the teachers teaching because I was Māori. I wanted to be a District Planner and I needed to do well in those subjects. I had to choose the sciences for my career and I couldn't take Māori at the same time because it wouldn't fit in my timetable. I could only take it for the first two years at High School, the third and fourth form. I had to struggle to get through my subjects without the teacher's help. I thought I would like to go and join my mates in the Māori language class where I would be seen and heard but I didn't give in. I still want to make up for my lost study. (34 )

I liked typing and computers at school, English and spelling too. I couldn't understand Maths but I couldn't change my subjects at the start of the fifth form year so I sat it for School C. anyway, but no use. I wanted to change to Geography. I applied to join the navy but I missed out so I went back to school and completed sixth form. I went out of the district then, down to Christchurch. School wasn't too bad, I had some good friends. I work in a Kohanga Reo now and I am always improving my Reo. It wasn't my first job, I have been a typist, worked in a factory, just to earn some money, but now I can learn more Māori as well as earn money. My parents spoke some Māori and I had two years of it at High School. Being at the Kohanga means I am close to our whanau and the marae. Whenever there is anything on there the Kohanga is part of it. It's a long way from study at school. Māori wasn't one of my subjects after the fourth form. I was trying to take the right subjects to get into the armed forces but I didn't make it. I went to a coed. school and we had a Kapa Haka group, mainly to do the powhiri for visitors to the school and to travel with our students for the Māori Speech competitions. The language and the Kapa Haka were

*about the only things that were Māori at school apart from us, all the students. They were not everyday things, just put on now and then. Everyday things were Maths, Spelling, English, those subjects. It was up to us to keep ourselves going as Māori.* (26)

The commitment of the school to recognising Māori cultural components and their significance for identity formation was often judged by the time in which the Māori Club was scheduled. If it was in class time, the school commitment was perceived to be greater than if it were scheduled at ‘lunchtime’ or ‘after school time’ as a ‘Club’ activity and therefore an extracurricular event not worthy of curriculum status.

The intention of programmes such as the Taha Māori policy of 1984 was to reduce the cultural divide. A similar aim was associated with the aspirations of at least one Māori community and the establishment of Ruatoki School in a Tuhoe tribal community - the first of a number of bilingual Māori–English schools.<sup>11</sup> Despite the Bilingual schools initiatives and Taha Māori programmes, Māori were not convinced that the system had fully realised that the goal was to have schools that installed the Māori learner and Māori ways of going to school, at the centre. The testimonies provided in the narratives are clear in their recollections of being cast as ‘other’. Those who had ‘Māori Club’ or Māori language appreciated the recognition of being included. Singling out for a Māori child can be devastating, especially if it is intended to parody rather than affirm a cultural identity. For one participant, the request to pronounce Māori names was not to affirm her cultural identity but to place her on the outside, use her difference as differentiation. In her life, this setting apart strengthened her resolve to succeed in education in spite of what she calls ‘cultural putdowns’.

*I was the only Māori in my class. I would be asked to pronounce Māori words in front of the class and I would be asked for my opinion about anything Māori but otherwise there was no acknowledgement of my Māori identity. It was really a cultural putdown.*(3)

---

<sup>11</sup> See discussion in earlier chapters for more detail on Taha Māori and Bilingual schools, classrooms and units.

This participant went on to become runner-up to dux at a large public Girls' School in the South Island, beaten only, she says, by the girl who was teacher's pet and whose name and description she could provide in detail. Another had aspirations that went unrealised in the formal sense, but that were able to be a hobby at least.

*I wanted to be a photographer, but I ended up working in a shop. Not many Māori got to work in a shop, I was the first. We weren't to be trusted with money that's why. I only got the job because I could speak Māori and the customers only spoke Māori, the ones from out of town. I bought a camera with the pay as soon as I could. I was the only one who owned a camera and I took photos of all the old people. I called it my 'suitcase'. I loved taking photos. It cost 1/6 for a roll of film, 8 shots per film. I was always interested in people, Māori at gatherings, weddings, tangihanga. Kai (food) was served on cloths on the ground, on the ground, not on dishes, just on the cloth, meat, chicken, pork and beef. They would korero to me about the Hui, what was happening, who was who, all in Māori. I should have been a photographer, I still think about it and I still have all those photos. I have my first camera, I have had a lot since then. I didn't write down the korero. It could make a book. I baked as well. I learnt a lot about cooking and baking at school. We all had to learn. But I didn't get married. We learned how to cook and sew the nuns said because we would all get married but I didn't. I had the whānau and my photo family. Never got married so I have no children of my own. There were always lots of children in the whānau so I looked after them. They would stay with me for a while and then go home again. I made all the panekoti (petticoats) for the kuia (elderly women) at the Pā. We had Christmas together, everyone at the Pā. Christmas at the Pā was a big occasion. I did a lot of the cooking because everyone knew I could cook. My sister wasn't so good but we both learnt at school. She was interested in other things. There was a tennis club there and the court was just in from the Wharenui. The club members wore maroon blazers. (2 )*

A number of participants identified a determination to complete school well, to take advantage of their classes and do well in spite of the way they felt they were treated either by their peers, by their teachers or both.

*I made an effort to do well, first for the sake of my family, to make them proud. I persevered. I loved Social Studies. I found out about other countries and books became an area to explore. My grandparents helped as they could, my parent were Christian and*

*very strict. I developed a passion for science, from studying the lifecycle of a Monarch butterfly and the Swan plants. (20)*

The secondary school level offered more chance for Māori learners to study their own language and a number of participants discussed this opportunity. After the Māori language was introduced as a subject in its own right, schools were still cautious about its inclusion in curricular offerings. Those like the District High Schools with large numbers of Māori learners, welcomed the introduction of Te Reo Māori as a subject, but others, as participants show, offered it only to fifth form level, thereby restricting Māori students from gaining it as a subject pass for University Entrance.

*I took Māori at High School, up until form 5. There wasn't anyone to teach it after that but I still wouldn't have been able to take it because the subjects I needed didn't leave me any time. (25)*

*Some Māori was spoken in the Intermediate playground as we had three Māori teachers. We had Māori commands in class. Māori waiata, haka and the poi had to be done properly. We had kapa haka in class time. (20)*

*There was not much about Māori in the curriculum. We learned that Māori were cannibals and that they lost the war. Not much to know. Not much to be. (39)*

*I remember that not a week went by without someone being suspended or expelled. It was a rough school. I had to keep my head down and my mouth shut or it would be me next, same for every Māori. One time ten of my mates got the boot. The teachers didn't like them eh. Too big, too smart mouthed, they talked back. I reckon the teachers were scared of them, just waited for a chance to put the boot in. They just went over to another school, didn't come back. That's why I kept quiet. My Dad would have got into me if I got expelled. That's what being Māori was about at school. Waiting for your turn to get the hard word, not the hard work. I don't think we were supposed to work. We were just a nuisance, taking up space. We had a Māori teacher who had been there for years, we didn't learn much, but we were safe in his class. We could relax, no one picking on us. What did I want to do after school? Ah, play rugby or league, something like that. I do, I could have had a chance in league. I worked at the Works for a while till all these jobs came up. I*

*made a bit of money at the Works, more than I do here but this is easier. Good hours, not so tough. Time to get to Touch and do my Polytech. Course. (37)*

Others were just deprived of the opportunity to learn the Māori language or anything of the culture altogether, at either primary or secondary school. A pattern is emerging of Māori finding ways and means to learn what is culturally important to them through means other than school. Even those who may have had some Māori classes at school look for more. Night classes, tertiary study, marae bases studies, and wananga on home marae are all options that Māori are seeking in order to consolidate a Māori identity that re-centres te reo Māori in their lives.

*There was no Māori at school, no culture, school was the pits. I had to get out of there. I told my Mum that I wanted to go to another school. They didn't wait for the bus to get in 'at this school' so I was always late. Our school was closed down so I had to go to town to school. I should have gone to 'the other school' with my mates, but it was the whānau and Mum and Dad, they thought that boys who went to 'this school' would have a better chance of doing well. They had Māori 'over there' and a good teacher but not here. I wasn't sure what I wanted to be but I had always done well before. No Māori learning but we had Māori teachers, they kept us in touch with our Māori side. One thing that was the same, I liked sport, I wasn't late for PE but that's only because it wasn't first period. The other teachers didn't listen and didn't wait. They were rude about two of us who were always late. 'Where's your note', well, I had a note at first but not all the time, it was too much trouble. Everyone knew we came all the way in from 'out of town' anyway. They picked on us, said things in jokey voices that put us down. But it wasn't a joke and we couldn't say anything back or we'd be in trouble. We thought 'what's your problem, get a life'. Mum and Dad came in to talk to the Headmaster. He told them I was doing well so they thought it couldn't be too bad. When I made it into the second fifteen, the teachers took some notice. They used to mumble about bringing my note tomorrow and not to forget. You could tell they really wanted to bag me again, but other teachers thought I was O.K. It was that that stopped me changing schools and got those bent teachers off my back. I didn't get any respect until then from some teachers. I thought stuff them they're not messing up my life so I played hard at rugby and picked up my homework. When I became a senior I watched out for our whānau who still came on the buses,*

*made sure they weren't being picked on. They thought that if the school was alright for me it must be safe for them so they came. Mum and Dad had told them yeah, it's a good school! I went into officer training straight out of school, after getting Bursary. Our children have to bus to school now, sometimes we drive them but schools have changed. There is a system for bus pupils. I don't think they are picked on but I still watch out in case. They had Māori at Primary school and they have it at Intermediate. I have the opportunity to study Māori myself, an adult learner, and I go home when I can to the wānanga, but I can't do that very often yet. The whole whānau goes if it is in the summer, there is plenty to do there for all ages. No, it would've been a lot easier when I was younger, but we'll get there. Who are we if we don't have these things? What will I tell my grandchildren when they come along? I've seen how other people live, what war can do. We have our own kind of war and it's up to us to win it.(14)*

Another group did not see that their non-representation was unjust. School was different and that was the expectation. The heavy emphasis on English cultural capital did not appear to leave the participants feeling disaffected. There was a resignation in the tone of acceptance, a can't fight City Hall' belief that the way things are determines what they always will be. At the same time the feeling of alienation, of not being in the picture was concerning enough for it to be raised. There was an awareness of the marginalisation that occurs for a group of people who do not find a place in the school curriculum frame but expect that there should be.

*But school was different. I liked school but it was not about Māori; that was for home. It was English we were supposed to be learning, and everything that went with that, stories that were about English people, their language, fairy stories, customs, habits and history. We were not in the picture. Nobody questioned it. That was the way it was, school was about English and learning about it.' (27)*

*I loved going to school. Once I learned to read I read everything I could get my hands on. I would read in bed by torchlight at night when I was supposed to be going to sleep. We had a teacher who used to encourage us to do well and praise us when we did. He made a big thing about encouragement. He would throw sixpences at us to catch when we got our lessons right. He would send us to the Headmaster when we*

*had done really well. He would write a note and say ' the Headmaster will want to see how well you have done' and off we would go with the note to wait outside the Headmaster's office feeling good about ourselves. I wasn't very good at Art and PE but I tried hard. It didn't matter because I did well at everything else. I used to read the dictionary to learn new words so that I could use them in school. I would make myself learn at least ten new words every week. I liked using my words in my school work. I didn't like being singled out as the only Māori in my class. There was one teacher who would refer anything that came up about Māori to me as if I knew everything. Of course I knew that I was Māori but at school I wasn't sure what that was supposed to be. Māori at school was outlandish, not like Māori at home. She taught us that Māori were cannibals and that the missionaries came to New Zealand to teach us how to be civilised. I was sure my whole class was looking at me and I used to squirm and try to block out her voice. In her class I used to imagine that I was white so she wouldn't pick on me. It felt like a punishment when I didn't do anything wrong. I was always on edge waiting for her to start again. The good classes made up for the bad ones. I used to spend my sixpences on lollies on the way home, I never thought of saving them.(3)*

Where the cultural orientation of the home was strongly Māori, the cultural marginalizing of the school was not seen as a major concern although it was not seen constructively either. School was for something else other than affirmation of a Māori cultural identity, or recognition that Māori might have something positive to contribute to school studies. Māoritanga, Māori culture was not seen as a missing part of the education that took them to school. There is a wariness of the education bundle, of the potential for assimilation, the potential to do harm, but confidence in the strong culture of the home marae to restore the balance of exposure to a school education.

*We went to school to get an education. To be honest it didn't do too much harm. We had our culture, our Māoritanga at home in the marae. (22)*

*I learned a lot at school. We had books around at home and my Mum and Dad encouraged me to do well with my schoolwork. My Dad made sure I was involved in sport as well. I expect that I was good at sport as well as study*

*because of them. I liked school but nothing about it was Māori. I went through school without ever knowing much about where I came from. It is only now that I am older that I realised I was missing something so I came here, to find myself. I have taken a year off work to take this course, to make the connections with being Māori. My goal is to become a fluent speaker of Māori and to know the history of my hapu and iwi. I have been with whānau back to the town that my father is from, that's what led me to enrol in this course. Living where we did in the South Island, we didn't go there much at all when I was growing up. I didn't know the history, where I came from on my Māori side. Dad didn't say much about it. I had to be interested I think. After finishing tertiary study, I went overseas. I went all around the world, finding out about people everywhere but not knowing much about my own. It was a great thing to do though and I always had work. I worked in Australia too, but I'm pleased that I decided to come home. I'd like to think that I could do something to help young people find themselves as Māori. When I have a family I want them to be confident about their Māori side. (28)*

The marae was seen as an equalising force to the power of the school, exerting a cultural counter force to the culture of the school. Others went along with the technicalities of learning to read and write from the material on offer but pondered the meaning of the stories and their relevance.

A Māori tradition of passing over the first grandchild to be brought up by grandparents did not always mean spoilt grandchildren. Grandparents might spoil their eldest 'mokopuna' but for the 'moko' at times like starting school, grandparents may just have seemed a little out of touch. They were at least two steps removed from the new world of the school for the mokopuna.

*I can still picture, I can still see in my mind being taken to school by my Grandmother. My parents weren't there, one thing I missed most was having a mother.(7)*

### *Māori at Home*

There was a difference between the confidence of those who were able to benefit from a strong culturally Māori home and those from homes where cultural strengths were waning. For the first group, Māori on the one hand was taken for granted, every aspect of home life was steeped in a strong Māori cultural identity.

*We didn't think Māori because everything was Māori, our lives were just all Māori, we spoke Māori, we looked Māori I suppose.(7)*

For others there was a consciousness of missing components to the feeling of being securely Māori. The home still had cultural operatives in place and parents who participated in a local Kapa Haka group but the language, the heart of the culture was missing.

*We did have some tikanga at home. My parents were in the local performing group, but we had no Reo at home.(25)*

### *Motivation*

Determination to succeed depended on both internal and external motivation. Teachers for example made a difference to every aspect of school life. Teachers had the power to control the lives of the Māori students but not all of it was good. The remembered teachers were the ones who inspired or nurtured the students at their school, and the ones who made life a misery. Participants spoke of the influence of teachers who kept them on the learning path.

None of the participants came from home backgrounds that were materially well off. Those who grew up in the city grew up in the suburbs that were purpose built for the Māori workforce moving from the country to town. The strengths mentioned by participants were not material goods, they were about the quality of relationships not the value of goods:

*Our settlement was a happy place for us. There was no beer in our house, or even any arguing. But they set up a tribal committee later, to set up some rules about*

*drinking for some people. To a certain extent, the old man, how can I say, although he was Māori tuturu, he was a very independent man and he didn't like asking for help. We were brought up that way.(7)*

*I played softball in the summer and rugby in the winter but it didn't affect my schoolwork because my father was watching to see that I was doing my homework anyway. He would come down on Saturdays to watch me play when he could and would find some money for the many trips away that we took, not just for sport but also for culture. Mum worked nights and on the weekends so she didn't get to see me play much. (32)*

*Auty E.being educated-well educated, helped my grandfather decide what should happen to me. So, when I failed School Certificate the first year, she worked hard to get me into another school.(7)*

*I enjoyed school and never had any difficulty with any schoolwork. I did well as school and thought that I would go to Medical School. (28)*

*You know I think I did fairly well at school considering, I had no books at home, my grandfather couldn't help me any bit, because, you know, he couldn't read English.(7)*

*I got a scholarship to go to Boarding School, my parents were really proud of me. (8)*

*My parents were supportive, they encouraged me to succeed.(12)*

*My Uncles and Aunties thought I should join the Department of Māori Affairs so I joinea as a cadet.(25)*

*I made an effort to do well, first for the sake of my family, to make them proud, so i persevered. (20)*

*Te Reo wasn't really encouraged by my parents, they just wanted us to succeed at school and get a good job. My father remembers being hit for speaking Māori so he hasn't really spoken Māori in the house until recently. Schools ought to affirm Māoriness for personal development not just concentrate on career options. (25)*

*I loved sport and excelled at netball. It gave me confidence. (20)*

*If you were brown you were automatically supposed to be good at sport. I was in every team going for a while.( 28)*

*Māori teachers were good role models. (27)*

*There was no Māori spoken at school although the Headmaster and his wife were both Māori. She taught the primer classes. We did have action songs and haka and our school teams did well at sport.(30)*

Teacher qualities of āroha and patience and goodwill were factors that participants found helped them to get on with their work without feeling threatened. They also noticed when their teachers involved themselves in community life. Good community links was an additional strong point about good teachers.

*They (the Māori teachers) were seen in the community. There was an open door policy in classrooms. (31)*

Respect in school is another factor mentioned by participants as being important to their decisions to go on in school.

*After I got University Entrance I went to Teachers' College. I like teaching. The teachers who do best with Māori are those who treat them with the most respect.(18)*

*I went to school in the South Island and did quite well. I was good as sport too, that came from my Dad. If you are good at sport its one way to get respect from the teachers and your classmates. (28)*

There were strong opinions about the need for access to second chance education. Many participants felt they hadn't done as well as they might at High School but, given the chance, could do better when they were more mature.

Those who chose to go teaching often did so because they felt they were needed in schools to make them more welcoming for Māori, to make sure that there were people who could be there for the students. At the same time, they recognised that work of that nature could be demanding and lead to burn out.

### *Diminished Horizons*

Without exception all members of the group aspired to greater things for themselves. But other priorities often prevented realisation of those dreams; their horizons contracted. For some the need to find work was pressing and meant that school was prematurely abandoned; for others school itself had done little to nurture aspirations. For two, school had been a haven, a refuge from a home life that exposed them to excessive work and heavy discipline. But having left school prematurely, for one reason or another, second chance educational opportunities for these two was integral to their plans for the future. Each saw that the opportunity for second chance education offered opportunities not present in earlier school days.

Two groups could be identified in this theme, those who felt their aspirations had been thwarted in some way, and those who were able to realise their aspirations, either because they persevered despite barriers, or because they were encouraged and were committed to reaching a goal. A range of factors conspired to diminish or enhance aspirations:

*I was the eldest in the family and I had to leave school as soon as I turned 15 and go out to work. When Mum died I took on the responsibility for the younger ones especially my youngest sister. I had only been at High School for two years and I was good at sewing, making clothes and all that. (2)*

*I went away to Boarding school for two years. I wasn't certain about what I might do afterwards, I was just happy to be away. We only went home once a year in the middle of the year, otherwise it cost too much. It wasn't long before I was out to work. I wasn't the only one looking to get a job, I didn't want to have to go back to school at home, ah. They'd 've given me a hard time. (33)*

*We were expected to go to school when we turned five and stay until we turned 15. There was trouble if anyone chose to be different.(31)*

*The Kura movement has exposed the true history of Māori at school, showing up schools bad side, the side that drove Māori out as soon as they turned 15. Without Kura we might have gone on thinking that what we had was all we could expect. (38)*

*Teachers need to listen more, they get on your back for nothing, don't let you work at your own pace. I had a paper run after school, I had to go straight there from school. They didn't understand that. If I stayed I wouldn't have kept my job. (29)*

*How can we get ahead when Principals and senior teachers are still in the Dark Ages when it comes to teaching Māori kids. They don't know who we are or what we want. I kept thinking that I had to prove that I could do better even though I was shy. My father remembers being hit at school for speaking Māori so he hasn't really spoken Māori in the house until recently. (35)*

*You had to wear the dunce hat if you didn't know the right answers to the teachers questions.*

There were those who told of unhappy family times for many reasons, of looking to school as a safe haven. One had been brought up away from her parents who had a full house at home, and could not contain her delight on being sent to Boarding School for her secondary education and finding how pleasant it was compared to her home life.

For another, understanding teachers helped her to hold her life together until she could leave home. Her ambition was simply to get away from home, leave it far behind. When she came to the Hui as a participant, she had taken charge of her life and spoke of her confidence in choosing a new future, of second chance education and the promise of a career.

*Boarding School was my salvation, it was like another world. I recovered my pride and confidence and I was determined that I would not go back home ever again. I*

*had had to work like a slave under extreme circumstances. I went straight out into office work as soon as I could, I became independent and I liked it that way. I have made my own way in the world. (12 )*

*I wasn't happy at home and was glad I had to go to school. School was my safe place, anything to get away from home. I was knocked around a lot at home. It's still hard to say that without tears. I found a job as soon as I could and left home and school behind. My jobs weren't much, just scum jobs, hard work, enough money for me. Now I want to be more. It has taken me all this time to think of my Māori side, of who I am as a Māori person without thinking that it was something to do with being beaten, with being pushed around. I want to do something more with my life so here I am back at school studying. I hope that when I finish this, that I can go to Teachers' College and become a teacher myself. ( 29)*

Parents wished the best for their children and encouraged them to do well, but it seems that where there had not been experiences of success by the parents, then there was a restricted understanding of the actions needed to support their children to succeed. The legal school leaving age was fifteen at the time that most of the participants went to school.

*Nannie Pahi couldn't read or write but she nurtured us. She wasn't afraid to come to school to talk to the teacher. Usually it was when we had done something wrong, but not all the time. (12)*

For the kaumātua group, secondary school was not compulsory but over half of them went on to secondary school however briefly. There had been a tradition in New Zealand schooling of holding students back if they did not meet the standards required to go up to the next school grade. The requirement had its greatest effect on Māori boys, so a boy leaving school in Form 3 would still have had to have been fifteen years old.

*My parents were supportive, they encouraged me to succeed but they did not know much about choices to make. Dad left school in Form 3 and Mum in Form 5 (25)*

*Parents have to give strong directions. The whānau concept is obligation, not 'do as I please'. If you believe Māori things you have no option. You have to take what is good for today. If you pass on a double message it mixes up children. (4)*

The expectations of the community at large seemed to be governed by a view of what was possible, closely connected to the received educational policies of the time. Individual aspirations though were not necessarily bound by the norms of the time. The participant speaking below makes a point of saying that she did not concur with this pattern, she wanted to stay on at school and have a career.

*Girls were supposed to leave school at 15 and find work in the District until we got married. Apart from nursing or teaching there was nothing else for women. Boys could do trade training, become carpenters, that sort of thing. (31)*

In contrast, in another part of the country where Māori had been hit hard by land confiscation, there was a belief in the power of education to increase the life chances of the children.

*The land had been taken away and the people had nothing. They said 'haere ki te kimi mātauranga' so we did, we went to look for education. I went off to Boarding School until the money ran out, I had a scholarship from the Presbyterian Church. (1)*

### ***Forms of Discrimination***

The majority of the participants identified the contrast between the culture of their homes and that of the school. Because the participants were Māori, this was seen to be to do with the strong Pakeha influence of school. The teachers were not always Pakeha, but the curriculum was certainly not inclusive of Māori knowledge and Māori language especially at Primary School.

*There was no Māori spoken at school although we all spoke Māori at home.( 33 )*

*Everyone should be able to learn Māori who wants to, schools should not be able to deny people the opportunity to learn Māori and yet they do.*

*We have always had to put in our own local knowledge for our school, yet the standard curriculum statements like the History one for example, give histories from all over the country for every school to teach. Our history is a fascinating one but it isn't in the curriculum.(36 )*

*I encourage my children to learn Māori so that they don't feel as I did, that there was something missing in my overall personality.(25 )*

*It was hard work to keep from going off the rails, joining in with sports made a difference, Rugby and Swimming.( 18 )*

*Schools ought to affirm Māoriness for personal development not just concentrate on career options.(19)*

*Not all schools liked what we did in Māori language class so I was glad to be able to spend some time in a mainly Māori school where our efforts were appreciated. That kind of school gave you confidence, the others made you wonder what planet you came from. (20)*

Racism in its overt form is not as distinguishable as it has been in the past. The setting up of the Race Relations Office was a response to evidence of the racist nature of much of the interaction between Pakeha and Māori over time. It was identified in the school narratives and in post-school narratives told by the participants. The Kaumātua group used the term 'colour bar' with the familiarity of the known. Younger participants spoke outright of racism in their schools.

*"When I started school I discovered racism....many aspects of school did not respect home life". ( 40 )*

*Going to High School was different. I was very conscious of being Māori, I was made to feel unclean, ashamed of being Māori. I used to launder my uniform every night to make sure I was clean. I only had one uniform. (36)*

One of the kaumātua group spoke of the distinction they were made to feel existed between Māori and Pakeha. There were '*rich pakehas all around, they had taken all the land*'.(1) Land ownership or holding equated with wealth. Land that did remain was worked by the whole marae community. Another spoke of leaving home to study and sending less Māori looking friends to sign up the flat for the year. If he didn't do that, the flat would mysteriously have gone to someone else before he got there. Very matter of factly, one kaumātua said that when she was young, travelling Māori could not stay in hotels, they would be turned away.

*We went on the train to Auckland, to go to Waitangi for the hundred year celebration, 1940. We couldn't stay in hotels. Māoris weren't welcome. Apirana Ngata had gone to teach the Ngapuhis how to haka. We stayed in a Hostel for Māoris only. Each hapu was given a room, and had to get straw to sleep on. You couldn't even get accommodation in ordinary Boarding houses if you were Māori. The pakeha who looked after the hostel just threw in the straw and said "there's your bed". ( 1 )*

There are '*standard tricks of the trade*' that schools use to avoid having to provide Māori for those who want it. Schools will say that they cannot find a teacher, or that there are not enough students wanting to learn Māori to warrant the cost of getting a teacher.

*I had one Pakeha teacher at intermediate who had a real racist attitude. He believed in corporal punishment but only for Māori and Polynesians. He did not hit white children. He would say 'hold out your hand right now', he would hit males and females, it didn't matter. I did not know what racism was until later on in life, only then I recognised what we had experienced at school as racism.(20)*

Māori were considered secondary citizens. Although this was not referred to in specific terms in the examples given, it could be as subtle as the use of colour to align good with bad. This was not only bad, it was ugly, massaging the children's perceptions at a subliminal level of communication. However, for Māori it was obvious the moment it was spoken.

*Once a week we had a half hour of religious instruction. Outsiders used to take the classes, they weren't proper teachers and they weren't Māori. We were given coloured cards with values associated with each colour, so we were taught that black represents evil and white purity. We were taught that Jesus Christ was white. All the pictures of him showed him as a white man with long blond hair. The pictures of Judas showed him as a black man, with black curly hair and a dark face. Among all the faces of the disciples at the last supper, only Judas is painted as black haired and dark skinned, everybody else looks Pakeha. (38)*

*The lack of student numbers was used against the implementation of Māori language as a subject for some High Schools. This practice was partially derailed when the government brought in extra money for the numbers of Māori in each school. The funding, initially called the Māori Language Funding Factor, was allocated to each school in the bulk grant on the basis of the numbers of students in the school who identified as Māori in the school records. The funding although allocated depending on the numbers in each school who are Māori, was supposed to be in support of the teaching of the Māori language and culture, but once in the school bulk grant, there were not strong enough procedures in place to ensure that the schools did not spend it in other school areas. After evidence that schools did not always spend the money on the language and culture programmes, the grant allocation model was altered to the percentage of Reo Māori taught in a regular class.( 23)*

*At High School where the Principal and senior teachers don't want Māori they just make sure that the timetable keeps those students from making a proper choice. (24)*

It was only when the school agenda as agents of the state, of wiping out all that stood for being Māori began to have its effect on Māori homes, on marae all down the line, on Māori families, that the full import of the risk to being Māori at school was felt. Māori learners in school were not only feeling bad about speaking Māori, they were being made to feel bad about being Māori. Without a strong home culture to counter the attacks at school, Māori learners were increasingly at risk. Good teachers could counter the bad ones, if they were significant, extended family could support Māori learners if there was someone who knew what school should be about. Peers could support their friends if they were of a mind and had enough knowledge of good

teachers in good schools to be encouraging. Strength of mind helped many Māori learners through toxic school environments, a determination to succeed in spite of negative school experiences. Those that came through school with a measure of success, tell of their determination not to let negative teachers get them down, even though they saw their friends fall by the wayside. One participant shared his ideas about some of the changes schools could implement to improve their services to Māori.

One participant told of the school ditties told in her class as part of her daily lessons in her Primers class in 1922.

*Dirty little blackamoor,*

*Not fit to be seen*

*Rub and scrub the dirty boy*

*Make him white and clean.*

*I'm King of the Cannibal Islands,*

*I'm King of the Cannibal Islands*

*No longer unerved at the thought of being served*

*Up for lunch at a young tender age.*

(3)

Racist overtones are obvious with black associated with uncleanliness and white with cleanliness. The stories have a distinct purpose, colonial ideologies strike at every level of the school and seemingly simple rhymes have a more serious intent. They are part of the cultural discourse that relegates the non-European to a secondary racial, cultural ontological status but it is one that is essential to the privileging of the European. While the rhymes are not about Maori, the association is made in the selections of history told in the school. A five year old Maori child learns of her secondary status very early in life. One history is valorised the other is villainised.

*There are three threads to a tangata whenua policy. Service to Māori, by Māori, in Māori. There have been some attempts to establish some centres where this can happen. If the service is provided by Pakeha, there needs to be Māori alongside, even a Kaitakawaenga can carry it but it is an uphill struggle to upskill and train pakeha staff. The issue is to have a critical mass of Māori staff. Once there is that mass, the service to schools goes up several notches, so does the demonstration of*

*accountability in return from schools. There seems to be an inability to attract appropriate Māori staff in schools here. The clientele is 60-80% Māori, but only 7.2% of the staff are Māori. There is a Māori Advisory Committee. Criteria for policy for Māori should have the following:*

*Is it an effective approach?*

*Is it better than the existing one?*

*Does it take account of Māori kaupapa?*

*Is it holistic?*

*Is it whanau centred?*

*Are there Māori staff?*

*What training is in place to upskill and enskill Māori staff?*

*If schools took these criteria into account, then Māori learners in their schools should get a better deal. (11)*

His views still have purchase even though the interview is now several years old.

### ***Catching The Tide***

There are critical institutions and events that provide opportunity for positive growth and development. School is one of them. The Forty Voices offer cause for both celebration and despair. For some school was indeed the wave that carried hopes and dreams to realisation. For many, the tide of success did not flow past the school. For another group, the school simply swamped hope and opportunity.

There is no simple formula. Respondents in this research demonstrated the significance of interacting factors upon the school lives of Māori learners. In the actions of the teachers, in the reactions of the learners, in the aspirations they hold, in unrealised aspirations, the impact of the colonial upon the indigenous leaves its mark.

In the next chapter attention is given to some of the policy factors that shaped the way schools provided for Māori learners. These policies comprised the official stories that sit alongside the hopes and dreams of Māori at school.

**PART THREE**

**EDUCATIONAL POLICY  
AND  
CULTURAL IDENTITY**

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### POLICY DISCOURSE IN MĀORI EDUCATION

Toi te kupu  
Toi te whenua  
Toi te mana

*Hold fast to the language,  
Hold fast to the land,  
Hold fast to dignity and rights*

#### *In Search of a School*

The 1986 Finding of the Waitangi Tribunal regarding a claim in respect of Te Reo Māori, (1986:46) stated that:

The education system in New Zealand is operating unsuccessfully because too many Māori children are not reaching an acceptable standard of education. For some reason they do not or cannot take full advantage of it. Their language is not adequately protected and their scholastic achievements fall far short of what they should be.

The Tribunal suggested there was a flaw in the education system because Māori learners were not reaching their full potential. But Māori participation rates at school can be seen as symptomatic of either a system in crisis, that is, an ailing system or alternatively, a system that is extremely effective at sorting learners along predetermined lines. The outcomes evidenced for Māori learners, namely that their scholastic achievements fall far short of what they should be, are not necessarily the result of flawed policy or practice but possible further evidence of a dominated colonial relationship within the state.

After Māori schools were closed in 1969 Māori who had not moved with their families to cities and towns were to experience a new form of cultural dislocation.

Since the establishment of the Native School system in 1867, Māori had been educated at Primary school level in a system in which they were ostensibly the main focus. The new relationships brought Māori into close contact with the actual Pākehā world and the children who inhabited that world. They were no longer at the centre of the schools activities and teachers had not necessarily been prepared for their presence. Although Māori had been prevented from speaking in Māori at Māori schools, the culture of their peers was still the familiar culture of their homes. At public schools it would be different. Openshaw, Lee & Lee consider that the closure of the Māori schools was also a result of a “growing awareness of the need for a national, uniform system of educational administration” (1993: 77). The schools were amalgamated with the Board school system on February 1 1969 (AJHR 1968 E-1:27).

Māori were moved from Māori schools to public schools, Māori language was banned, Māori learners were offered a curriculum for manual rather than mind skills and children faced prejudice and scorn in their daily life in their new schools.

Lack of school success is as much a form of marginalisation as are policies that discount Māori learners to such an extent that they were destined to occupy the background not the centre in their new schools. Over time policies did shift to accommodate bilingual classrooms and bicultural approaches to learning in a small way, but still Māori scholastic achievement was problematic.

The Māori solution to the dilemma was to move outside the state system, to side-step the supremacy of Pākehā values and return to core Māori educational values by establishing schools especially designed for Māori learners. Kura Kaupapa Māori were a creative solution to an intractable situation and they left policy makers and their policies stranded.

The Waitangi Tribunal Report goes on to note the promises in the Treaty of Waitangi of equality in education as in all other human rights, as well as the comment about failure in respect of the education system’s own standards to see that Māori children are successfully taught. In the Tribunal’s view, this has given rise to a sense of injustice and discontent, which spells out a recipe for social unrest. Their prediction, at this point in time, has not been wrong. Franz Fanon in *The Wretched of the Earth*

provides analyses to illuminate the effects of colonisation upon colonised peoples and their cultures that have a bearing upon Māori responses to avowed humanist intent.

The violence with which the supremacy of white values is affirmed and the aggressiveness which has permeated the victory of these values over the ways of life and of thought of the native mean that, in revenge, the native laughs in mockery when Western values are mentioned in front of him. (Fanon, 1961:33)

The disregard has grown to such proportions that it encompasses societal values in general and all of society pays a price. Citizenship for many Māori is nominal. There is a right to vote but it is not taken up. There is a right to education but it is not fully utilised. These are self-excluding activities of racialised subjects, the native revenge as Fanon perceives it. In a perverse way, Māori have, in excluding themselves, chosen to play in a different game, one where the excluded decide the rules, choosing freedom without equality. Māori scepticism about post-colonialism turns on the fact that colonial discourses are ever present, that they have not come to an end. Post-colonialism discourse acts as a new agent of colonisation.

Without a strong economic base, Māori have eventually to return to the Crown for funding, to negotiate a position that allows for a discretionary measure of autonomy in the relationship but having asserted an independence however briefly, the reality of a legitimisation crisis for the state should Māori leave again, is omnipresent.

### *Policy Directions*

Four major policy directions have been discerned over a period of time that are germane to the thrust of Māori education policy and implementation. These are: assimilation, integration, biculturalism and autonomy. Apart from autonomy, these themes have been well documented in the educational literature although with different emphases.

Assimilation and integration are clearly aims of colonisation, modified over time as concerns over human rights come to the fore. Biculturalism reflects the results of increased politicisation of Māori expectations of education and concerns expressed by agents of the state, as the state itself, through the school system and government

departments, attempts a measure of concession to Māori claims. In biculturalism, the hand of a colonial state and the hegemony of the West is still present.

Biculturalism has been a move to establish some equality for Māori at school, a form of cultural inclusion in a school system that was already problematic. Autonomy on the other hand, is about a Māori agenda for the realisation of Māori educational aspirations. Most recently, Government agencies and their Ministers have attempted to listen to Māori discuss these views, accepting invitations to participate in Hui Taumata Mātauranga, 2001 Māori education summit meetings. The debates range around pathways to Māori futures and strategies for their realisation. Both Hui accept the premise that there is no one way of being Māori and that Māori need to be able to choose an educational pathway that meets their needs.

Of course Māori had a system of education before the arrival of Pākehā and elements of that remain discernible today. Classical Māori education was selective, sequential and served to transfer bodies of knowledge that were considered to be important to new generations of learners and to Māori survival. Policy in this chapter leaves aside classical Māori education, to focus on the Māori interface with western systems. The precursor to these schools, the early mission schools are a further area of influence that is not rehearsed in this chapter even though elements of it remain in the Māori Church Boarding Schools and though, in their christianising mission, the first elements for assimilation were set down.

### *Assimilation*

The first policy direction, assimilation, saw schools instrumental in the subjugation of Māori language and culture through a monocultural focus on the promotion of the English language and culture to the exclusion of the heritage language of the pupils. At the very least, Māori cultural values and behaviours were frowned upon by school authorities, thus assimilation meant the Europeanisation of Māori (Sinclair, 1961:80). While schools of the time were instruments of assimilation, they were significant but not the only instrument used to suppress Māori cultural and economic identities and aspirations. Dakin (1973:71) is one writer who identifies the general policy for this period of the latter decades of the nineteenth century as being one of assimilation.

His analysis of the times was that the policy built on the view that the Māori race would not survive so absorption seemed the practical solution. Although the majority of Māori pupils were receiving their education in Māori schools rather than Public schools, the role of the schools was to work towards the assimilation of Māori children into the general New Zealand population insofar as language, attitudes, values and behaviour were concerned. Full assimilation was not the goal, for although Māori were to all intents and purposes, to become indistinguishable from Pākehā, only cultural assimilation was intended, not structural assimilation. Māori were to know their place and it was not as equals with Pākehā. There was little or no recognition of the Māori language and culture in Māori schools. Nor was there any recognition in any schools, of the fact that there was at one time, a strong Māori economy and that Māori had led the way in the development of Aotearoa-New Zealand as a nation until they were deprived of their economic base. Māori were not to be part of what Colin James refers to as a social consensus, a “prosperity consensus” that he saw lasting until the 1970’s (1992:9). James uses consensus rather than contract for specific reasons, for example, consensus is voluntary and contract can be seen as coercive (ibid:327). In making his choice, James unwittingly chooses a form of voluntary consent as a decision making device that forms the basis of Māori decision making processes for the maintenance of social cohesion. However, in the formulation of this consensus, Māori were neither participants nor beneficiaries.

James explains this absence by describing the population as homogeneous, more than 90% of British descent and “all but 1% of the rest were Māori, but most Māori lived out of sight and out of mind in the countryside...” (ibid:10). So, in the last hurrah of overt British colonialism, peace and prosperity, the rationale for the ‘prosperity consensus’ reigned for the British descended 90% of the population at least until 1974, when external economic decisions over oil shortages began to upset the New Zealand political and economic equilibrium.

Barrington and Beaglehole(1974)see the assimilationist period of education policy as being between 1880 and 1930, some fifty years of concentrated assimilation of Māori to a simulated European way of life. The use of the Māori Boarding Schools to inculcate colonial values was one example, another the work conducted in the native

village schools to bring about community as well as educational change. Harker, cites Will as contending that:

the assimilation policy was really governed by an inability on the part of the Pākehā to allow differences to exist between the two ethnic groups. (Harker, 1985:59)

This statement is a somewhat benevolent view of the rationale for assimilation as the major difference between the two groups was one of power, the decision making rights that it allocated and the right to use that power to bring about favourable changes. There were no concessions to Māori in this regard for the difference was crucial to the existence of a Pākehā state. Instead of equality for Māori, assimilation was about the domestication of Māori and the reduction of any threat Māori might pose to Pākehā not only as a former foe, but also as peoples with an economic and nation building agenda of their own.

D.G.Ball sees the Māori schools as having been *in* the pa (Māori village) but not *of* the pa (1940:278). More latterly, Linda Smith described them as Trojan horses because they were there not merely to educate, but also to subjugate through assimilation (Smith, L.T. 1985:3-10).

### ***Integration***

Although it was not until the Hunn Report of 1960 that integration was deemed to be an official policy, clearly, the efforts by Pākehā administrators to see some inclusion in schools of Māori curricula was a precursor to the Hunn statements about integration. None of the stages have specific beginnings and endings as there is overlap for all of them. Assimilation did not end when administrators spoke of integration, nor did it end with biculturalism, and certainly, it is ever present as a reminder of the alternative to autonomy should that fail.

Under Ball, a review of the Native Schools resulted in a statement of principles which included one in particular that represented a major change: That the school be definitely interested in one or more of the Māori crafts or studies (AJHR, 1935, E-3:1). Harker saw the Post Second World War period as the one when the official

policy of assimilation began to change (1985:61). Māori themselves had raised concerns over the lack of support for Māori cultural heritage in schools and there was change abroad in attitudes towards the purpose of schooling in the existing or former British colonies. An Advisory Committee on African Education set up by the British Colonial Secretary, and adopted by the British Government in 1925, promoted a policy for education that would:

Be adapted to the traditions and mentality of the people and should aim at improving and conserving what was best in their institutions ...to replace the servile imitation by adaptation to his own development of what is best in foreign culture. (cited in Barrington & Beaglehole, 1974:202)

Although the policy was adopted by the British Government in 1925, it would take time for D.G.Ball and his team of inspectors to be able to create the same willingness to change among New Zealand authorities. By the 1940's the education policy at least in development if not in practice, came to emphasise the treatment of Māori as Māori and not as brown Europeans. Ramsay cites the Education Gazette of 1941 as stating that:

Instead of trying to make the native people like themselves (European), the better plan might be to recognise the social realities of the Māori and then to assist him to make the necessary adaptations to the new conditions. This completely new conception acknowledges the values inherent in the native culture, and the right and need for any people to be actively cooperative in adjustments to new conditions. (1972:69)

There is evidence that some policy makers and educationalists were thinking about Māori realities and were not entirely content with the assimilationist position. A thesis developed by H. M. Jennings (1950:28-29) was that Māori parents complained if the inclusions of Māori activities in the curriculum took up too much time, that they saw the important business of the school as being the teaching of English. In Jennings time it was still not evident in Māori rural strongholds that their taken for granted ability to live as Māori was under threat outside of their immediate environment. It was not until members of these communities left for cities and towns to find employment that the sharp end of assimilation would become apparent.

A further point argued by Jennings was that the artificial environment of the school for the teaching of Māori Arts and Crafts precluded Māori learners from participation where the law of tapu prevailed. If the selections of Māori Arts and Crafts for the schools were not made with care, with a clear idea that what was to be taught would be age appropriate for learners in schools, Jennings had a strong point.

Even in 1976, some 26 years later, a similar point was made by Ngoi Pewhairangi that teaching in classrooms could become mechanical, that teaching and learning of anything Māori had to be taken seriously because of the involvement of the laws of tapu<sup>1</sup>. For Ngoi Pewhairangi, tapu is a restriction, one that teaches learners how to respect the whole of nature but at the same time, in her view, young people should not be expected to carry out the rules when they have been told rather than selected to participate (1976:8-9).

The inclusion of Māori Arts and Crafts then, was not without controversy, as is the debate today over the ownership of Māori knowledge once it is included in a school curriculum. Still controversial also, is the inclusion of the Māori language into the school curriculum. Māori language was excluded from the curriculum for Native schools, but it was a policy not without some criticism. In the view of Patrick Smyth, Principal of St. Stephens School in Auckland at the time:

The inclusion of the Māori language in the Native school curriculum would be merely granting the Māori what is his right...We all agree that the Māori child must learn English, but that is surely no reason why the Māori language should be allowed to die. (1930:239)

Smyth was not alone in his view as an unnamed European said to have 21 years of teaching experience in Native schools was of the opinion that the exclusion of the Māori language from the native schools was perhaps the greatest crime of European civilisation in these lands (anonymous 1930:240).

---

<sup>1</sup> Tapu is a socio-cultural convention that places objects, places, activities outside normal access. Sometimes described as 'sacred' it essentially acts as a warning to be cautious in the face of potentially harmful material.

Smyth was well supported in his ideas that Native schools and a Māori renaissance needed Māori teachers in greater numbers, as well as the Māori language and traditions as school subjects. He also thought that the Māori language was a necessary qualification for all Native school teachers and that it would “give a new, and a wide confident outlook to the Māori Race” (ibid:242).

The editor of the text arrived at the view that the subject that writers differed most about, was the teaching of the native tongue in the primary schools. Three options were raised, first, to teach in Māori only, next, to teach in English only, and last, that both languages be taught. According to Jackson, all three had their champions (Jackson,P.1931:xxiii).

By 1939, D.G.Ball was able to review the progress of the policy, and while those aspects of Māori Arts and Crafts most likely to involve tapu, such as carving or weaving were not so prominent, the popularity and entrenchment of “Māori song and dance” in the Native Schools was noted:

I have frequently been amazed at the immediate transformation in the children when I have suggested that they sing a Māori song or perform a Māori haka or poi. (cited in Barrington and Beaglehole, 1974:204)

Although Ball had pressed for the policy changes that allowed for the inclusion of Māori Arts and Crafts at least, he later noted that it had been implemented in a rather limited and superficial manner because it overlooked the deeper cultural drives of Māoritanga. (Ball.D.G.1963: 5)

By the time Ball left the Native School Service in 1940, he was acutely aware of the problems associated with his attempts to blend the cultural and spiritual values of Māori and Pākehā in the Native schools. The major obstacle in his view was the long history of deliberate Europeanisation associated with the Native School (1935-38:2). Nevertheless, Ball had made some progress, not the least, the efforts to modify the ruggedly assimilative culture of the Native schools by some adaptation to Māori children rather than forced assimilation into the Pākehā world.

In 1939, C.E.Beeby had taken up the position of Assistant Director of Education, second in command to the Director, N.T.Lambourne, who would be replaced by

Beeby at the beginning of 1940. For the next decade, Beeby would work very closely with Peter Fraser on educational policy and its implementation although for most of this period Mason was Minister of Education with Fraser as Prime Minister. In 1938, Beeby had written an objective for education that, in his opinion, reflected the Government's views on the subject. Although attributed to the Minister Peter Fraser, Beeby had expressed in this statement his own idea of education at the time and would become the lodestone by which he tested the direction of every change.

The Government's objective, broadly expressed, is that every person, whatever his level of academic ability, whether he be rich or poor, whether he live in town or country, has a right, as a citizen, to a free education of the kind for which he is best fitted, and to the fullest extent of his powers. (cited in Beeby, 1992:124)

In Beeby's view, it was necessary to convert a school system constructed originally on a basis of selection and privilege, to a truly democratic form where it could cater for the needs of the whole population over as long a period of their lives as is possible and desirable (ibid:125). But Beeby does not have Māori learners in mind here for he makes his own decisions about the kind of education for which Māori might be best fitted at a later date. Imperceptibly, Beeby moves from what has been referred to as the 'dominant' phase of colonialism, to the 'hegemonic' phase, comprising an ideological control over Māori, but colonialism nonetheless (Mohammed, 1985:61-2).

As Director-General of Education in New Zealand in 1940, Beeby prided himself on his achievements with Māori (Native) schools. Under his direction, a 'bold new experiment' outlined by the Minister of Education, the Hon.H.G.R.Mason, in 1941, was implemented.

Beeby was responsible for having created the separate curriculum for Māori District High Schools that he thought would allow for those students who did not qualify for scholarships to study at a Māori Boarding School. The Minister's official report signalled a new curriculum for Māori schools that would be practical rather than academic. Those who did not gain scholarships would be prepared for occupations such as building for the boys and for girls, cooking, sewing and homemaking. Boys would be taught subjects that would prepare them for the building trade and girls would learn homemaking skills.

The shift was some recognition of the movement of Māori to towns and cities in that young men at least gained employability skills. The curriculum offered Māori girls, on the other hand, restricted them to employment as housemaids, housekeepers or similar servant like positions. Either way, the policy prepared young Māori for a future as members of the serving class. Māori were caught in a downward spiral of life chances.

Beeby was not immediately aware of the extent of the grievances Māori communities had about the curriculum he had imposed upon them. He records his attendance at a meeting in Te Araroa where he could hear objections to the new technical curriculum. After attempting to convince the meeting of the values of a practical curriculum, Beeby says that the leading elder asked “Did you take Latin at school Dr.Beeby?” After replying in the affirmative, Beeby says the elder concluded his argument with “and look where you got to” (Beeby, 1992:209-210). Although Beeby was convinced of the usefulness of his technical curriculum for schools like Te Araroa District High School, he underestimated the community view of the worth of an academic education. Māori were not going to be relegated so decisively to becoming servants of the Pākehā and said so.

I rongo tonu au ki a Dr. Beeby te upoko o nga kura, e kia ana ko te tino kura ma nga tamariki Māori he whakaako i o ratou ringaringa; ka totoro whakarunga ano ona ringaringa. Ko te tikanga o enei kupu, heoi ano he mahi ma taua ana te Māori he pera me ta nga tangata o Kipaeono e korerotia nei i te Kawenata Tawhito ara he ‘tata wahie, he utuutu wai’ ara he pononga mo te Pākehā. (R.T.Kohere, unpublished manuscript, Rangiata, East Cape)

Beeby’s views are criticised for relegating young Māori of Te Araroa to the same status as the Kephirah people of the old Testament, hewers of wood and bearers of water, that is, servants not of the Israelites but of the Pākehā (my translation).

In Beeby’s own writing, he has missed this important view, treating the problem lightly in his retelling of the story about learning Latin, rather than the basis of the community concerns. In his view, they were limited to the unskilled work their isolated communities could provide unless they had land (Beeby, 1992:209). Te Araroa was one of three Native schools reclassified as a District High School in 1941. In the Māori view voiced in Māori, the technical curriculum devised by Beeby is unduly restrictive, forcing Māori into servitude.

Barrington and Beaglehole note the changing nature of the Māori population from largely rural to increasingly urban, providing figures that show that in 1936 the urban Māori population was 9% and by 1966 it had increased fivefold to 50%. They conclude that the rapid population explosion and limited economic opportunities made the trend inevitable (1974:248).

This direction put the Māori school system, mainly located in tribal rural heartlands, at risk and by 1955, the primary teachers organisation, the New Zealand Educational Institute and the Education Boards Association were lobbying the Minister of Education to have the Māori schools transferred from the Department of Education to the Boards. Beeby, who was still Director of Education, established a committee to review policy in Māori education. Barrington and Beaglehole observe that there were six Māori on the committee and that it was the first time that Māori had been members of an official national committee to discuss the education of Māori children (1974:251). The landless state of Māori was becoming more and more commonplace as control over the major economic resource dwindled forcing a dependency on schooling for later access to employment. It was Beeby's conception of the landless state that generated his ideas for a technical curriculum in the first place. Māori land losses were not his concern. It was taken for granted that Māori lands were better in Pākehā hands, that Māori land meant unprofitable land.

For Māori, a better solution would have been legislation to curtail the loss of Māori land, to retain Māori estates in Māori hands. Instead, educational strategies collude with the transfer of Māori estates to Pākehā and Crown ownership, offering no opposition, suggesting instead schooling options that take Māori landlessness for granted. Loss of land for Māori was not merely the loss of an economic asset. Land held an even greater significance than its role in the Māori economy. Ahikaa, the unbroken relationship with ancestral land, is part of the wellspring of Māori identity. Connections between genealogy and land together form the basis of a Māori cultural identity. The more landless Māori became, the more identity as Māori was threatened. At the same time agents of the state were pressing a new identity upon Māori, a subjugated identity. Māori were left with the spirit of the land not the substance and a future in the hands of inept policy makers. Asher and Naulls, cite Ranginui Walker, saying that: "The mana of a tribe was associated with a clearly defined territory". (1987:6)

*Whatu ngarongaro te tangata*  
*Toitu te whenua*  
People perish but the land is permanent.

There was no way that the appropriation of Māori land by the Crown could be compensated for by an education for manual labour. The curriculum for District High Schools was the equivalent of the beads and blankets offered by Crown agents in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in exchange for Māori land. At a time when Māori urgently needed graduates to challenge policies of the state, school sights were set on carpentry and housework.

The role of education in preparing learners for a place in the workforce is clearly present in the policies for Māori education. Māori positioning as manual labourers saw to it that the needs of industry would be served while the agenda of the state in keeping Māori from understanding their position would also be met.

Ramsay (1972:68) questions whether the new experiment could be seen as an advance on the 1930's policy found in T.B.Strong's statement that the type of schooling made available to Māori children should lead "the lad to be a good farmer and the Māori girl to be a good farmers wife". Although Māori are framed as manual workers, they were, at that time, also the owners of the land to be farmed.

At least, in Strong's statement, the educational focus still took Māori land ownership for granted. There was no assumption at that stage, that the Māori future was a landless future. While it was a heavily genderised statement, Māori relationships could withstand the interpretation and work on the land was not likely to be influenced greatly by Strong's view of a woman's role. On the East Coast, women were equally involved in breaking in the land, taking packhorses up steep hillsides to bring fencing materials to worksites, clearing scrub, ploughing and sowing fields alongside the menfolk (Goldsmith, I. personal communication).

The Strong statement coincides with the efforts made by Ngata to see Māori settled and working on their own lands. Māori economic independence was a more likely outcome of the nineteen thirties policy than it would be from the 1941 change in emphasis. Whereas D.G.Ball was instrumental in seeking inclusion for aspects of

Māori knowledge in a standard curriculum, Beeby took a quite different view and relegated Māori to a future in manual labour.

The very strong influence of government educational policy directions on the representation and framing of Māori positioning in the economy can be seen in the kinds of knowledge considered of most worth to young Māori in the school curricula. Ngata, as a Māori parliamentarian sought to implement policy and strategies that allowed Māori as landowners, not only to retain their assets, but also to compete economically with Pākehā, to revive the entrepreneurship evident in the days before and immediately after the signing of the Treaty of Waitangi. Beeby on the other hand, in fostering a technical curriculum for Māori, had taken the decimation of Māori assets for granted and in his debate with Te Araroa elders, did not appear to realise that his vision for Māori children was that they should submit to a lower station in life and that the elders objected to that.

In thinking about the future of Māori culture at that time, one writer expressed it this way:

In studying Māori culture we study the mind as well as the body of the Māori people during the hundreds of years of its development: its thoughts, its philosophy, customs, arts and crafts, foods, in fact, its history. It necessarily follows that culture is not a stationary thing; it progresses and advances with the times. All true Māoris must therefore know the culture of their own people. They will find that foreign elements have been introduced or imbibed into Māori culture. This renders the study a fascinating one. Future generations will have to exercise discretion and discernment as to what foreign elements are desirable or not, but fusion is inevitable. (Rangiata Library Notes, anonymous)

Growing numbers of Māori in towns and cities made it more obvious that some accommodation had to be made for Māori needs as an urban population and this intention was signalled by Hunn in a report to the Minister presented in 1960. His report was the first major analysis of the position of Māori as urban dwellers and contained statistics on health status, educational levels, housing, and offending as well as recommendations for government action to reduce hardship and social problems.

A formal statement about integration as a policy direction was outlined in the Hunn Report (1960:15). It was supposed to be a fusion of the best of both Māori and

English language and culture, in Hunn's words, "to combine the Māori and Pākehā elements to form one nation wherein Māori culture remains distinct...". This notion of integration was roundly criticised in later years for being a synonym for assimilation as no significant changes were made to allow Māori knowledge a place in the curriculum or to accommodate Māori cultural practices in the day to day running of the schools. For there to be a fusion of the best of both worlds, as Hunn defined it, school curriculum and practice would reflect some acknowledgement of the policy.

According to Beeby (1992:208) Hunn had prefaced his recommendations on education with the observation that:

School is the nursery of integration. Children mix naturally where their less adaptable elders stand apart. The cause of race relations would, therefore, be best served by absorbing as many Māori children as possible into board schools. (cited in Beeby, 1992:208)

Hunn put his thinking into practice with his suburban policy of 'pepper potting' Māori amongst Pākehā homeowners in suburbia or in new homes especially built to take the new city dwellers. Māori homes were to be sprinkled among Pākehā ones and in this way, sow the seeds of integration. Māori children were expected to make the transition to Board schools to serve the cause of race relations and to be housed among Pākehā neighbours in the interests of integration. In this guise, integration was about meeting a societal need not an educational one. The assumption was that integration was an inevitable process and therefore should be facilitated rather than hindered. Fusion, as Hunn had outlined it in his report, was overtaken by his version of integration, of Māori moving to merge with Pākehā, to be rendered invisible in their pepper potted homes and their scattered presence at school.

### ***Biculturalism***

Bilingualism and biculturalism, as the third major policy direction, reflect a particular movement with its beginnings in the 1970's which sought to establish a place in the school curriculum for the Māori language and culture. The periods are arbitrary, and for Māori, distinctions between each focus are blurred rather than clear as regardless

of the policy, there remained a negative attitude to Te Reo Māori in schools. A negativity that was the catalyst for the case to the Waitangi Tribunal reported on in 1986. Official policies and adaptations signalled by the changes implemented by D. G. Ball from 1930, had suffered setbacks with the onset of the depression, and were slow to improve after the Second World War. There was no leadership at the policy level so initiatives were still largely dependent upon community input. There were few resources provided to schools to support the implementation of Māori Arts and Crafts in schools, the project depended on Māori input. In 1961 the Department of Education published a small text titled '*The Arts of the Māori*', for use in Primary Schools. The book was prepared by A. G. Tovey, Supervisor of Art and Crafts in the Department of Education. Under his leadership, Māori had latterly been able to become specialist teachers of Arts and Crafts, and the text was an extension of his commitment to development of the field for Māori.

The advisory committee for the project included: Marewa McConnell, Maud Isaacs, Mere Kururangi, Sidney Mead, Whare Isaacs, Pine Taiapa and Murray Gilbert. These names are written into Māori education history and their contribution to and beyond the task of the advisory committee, was immeasurable. The publication was highly symbolic; it legitimated Māori curriculum content as deserving of publication. It was as close as Māori had come to textbook control.

The Director of Education at the time, A. E. Campbell, said in the foreword to the book:

If Māori and Pākehā are to understand each other more fully our children must have experience of the traditional arts of both races so that they can use them to express their own thoughts and to create their own art. (1961)

Art was a safe place to begin to implement further components of the Māori cultural archive into schools.

In the same period, a Commission on Education, chaired by Sir George Currie, had been established to report on a wide range of educational matters. While the terms of reference made no mention of Māori education, the Commission stated that:

it steadily emerged throughout its deliberations as one that did require very special attention in itself. All the individual items had reference to it in one way or another and the Commission has, therefore, devoted to it a separate section of its Report. (1962:401)<sup>2</sup>

The Currie Commission has been widely cited for a set of lines in the report that refer to the role of the school in regard to the needs of Māori learners. The lines referred to are as follows: “It is not, nor can it ever be, the prime agency in conserving the Māori cultural heritage;” (1962:415). These lines have lent credence to arguments that absolve the school from responsibility for any part in the conservation of a Māori cultural heritage. Past arguments have shown that schools do conserve cultural heritage, the cultural heritage of Pākehā learners through the medium of their heritage language and within the context of their histories. But the Currie report did not entirely dismiss a Māori cultural heritage as the selective quote may imply. It went on to identify the main task of schools as being to “provide the Māori pupil with the educational equipment to enable him to play his part in the modern world and to this end the Māori pupil has the same body of knowledge to master as the non-Māori” (ibid:415). Then the Commission goes on to say:

But such elements of his Māori background must be included in his schooling as will give him still the sense of belonging to a race of known and respected culture. The Māori pupil will then have a surer basis on which to build the scholastic achievement of which he has such need. (ibid:415-16)

This prerogative, much in keeping with the sentiments of aforementioned writers, could have made quite a difference to Māori in schools if it had not been so selectively edited out of consideration. The Currie Report even reinforced the notion by going on to state:

Although there is no retreat from the belief that the Māori child must be equipped to take his place on terms of equality as a New Zealand citizen, there is a belief now that, in addition, the dignity and pride of race which are his heritage must be safeguarded to him. (ibid:415)

---

<sup>2</sup> The Commission, headed by Sir George Currie, was established in 1960 at the behest of the then Minister of Education, the Hon. P.O.S. Skoglund, and presented its final report to government in 1962, when the Hon. W. Blair-Tennent had become Minister. There were no Māori on the Commission and no Māori evident in the individual submissions. The Department of Māori Affairs and small numbers of Māori schools made submissions to the commission. The Secretary of the Commission was W.L. Renwick, who was later to become Director-General of Education.

The statements confirm the fact that policy development was moving steadily towards the recognition of a Māori cultural identity and its legitimate place in Aotearoa-New Zealand. But little changed for Māori in that generation. The aspirations may have been present but the means to realise them remained restricted.

Sixteen years later the Government convened a committee to examine the conditions under which healthy growth and development could be fostered in schools. While the focus was on lifestyle, issues of biculturalism in the school system were raised. The Garfield Johnson *Committee on Health and Social Education* (1977) emphasised a need to establish a living bicultural system, stating that:

the Māori people must be able to expect a solid Māori side of language, values and expressive arts throughout the system and not just in schools with a large percentage of Māori pupils...the Māori people as tangata whenua (indigenous people) of our country have the same rights to the promotion of their cultural heritage in our schools as the dominant Pākehā majority. (Department of Education, 1977:16)

The Johnson Report clearly espoused bicultural values and the need for schools to acknowledge tangata whenua rights in respect of the school system in all its facets. Garfield Johnson, like D.G.Ball before him, recommended that the school curriculum promote a Māori cultural heritage. It was a recommendation for equity in school that meant Māori learners could go to school as Māori.

Increasing pressure from Māori communities saw bilingual schools established in Māori language heartlands, schools that in the 1960's would automatically have been Māori schools although not necessarily inclusive of Te Reo Māori. Bilingual units and classrooms were established in some schools and although their quality was uneven, Māori language had returned to school. After a National government initiated a Taha Māori policy for Primary Schools, all classrooms had introductory Māori language and culture as an option. The Taha Māori initiatives were taken up wholeheartedly in some schools, whether for Māori or Pākehā learners.

## *Autonomy*

The movement towards Māori autonomy represents the fourth and most recent policy direction. The lack of responsiveness of schools to the needs of Māori learners was not because Māori or officials had not tried to bring about positive change, but too often the political will to implement sound, well resourced initiatives, was absent. Numerous Māori, or officials, or advisory groups had over time reported their findings as to what was needed to consecutive governments, and gestures were made towards their implementation. In regard to Te Reo Māori, warnings were sounded about the decline of the language with the publication of 1970's research findings on the subject by Richard Benton for the New Zealand Council for Education Research, suggesting that there were some 70,000 native speakers of Māori left, the majority of whom were in the over 45 age group<sup>3</sup>. Māori ran out of patience and set about establishing Māori focussed alternatives to state provision.

The first Kohanga Reo, a Māori centre for under five year olds, was opened at Pukeatea near Wellington in 1982. Kohanga Reo are child care centres dedicated to the survival and revival of the Māori language, Te Reo Māori. Kathie Irwin describes the aims of Kohanga Reo as follows:

1. children will learn the Māori language and culture through immersion;
2. language and cultural learning will be fostered and supported for all members of the whānau;
3. members of the Kohanga Reo whānau will learn a range of other skills, e.g. administration, within the whānau setting;
4. collective responsibility for the administration and operations of kohanga will be fostered;
5. all involved will feel the sense of belonging and being accepted which is crucial for their empowerment;
6. the content, context and control of learning will be Māori (Irwin, K.1990: 117).

---

<sup>3</sup> Richard Benton presented his findings of a national survey of the state of Te Reo Māori in 1979, in a paper titled *The Māori Language in the 1970's*.

The initiative was the first in a series of educational developments undertaken by Māori outside of state provision. Besides the emphasis on benefits for the under fives, the Kohanga Reo ideals show a clear focus on strengthening families. The family or whānau concept is translated into an organisational model for the operation of Kohanga Reo, a flat rather than hierarchical decision-making structure designed for maximum participation and ownership. Kohanga Reo was designed to take Māori pre schoolers and their whānau back culturally to Māori first principles in childcare and lifelong learning<sup>4</sup>.

From its inception in 1982, Kohanga Reo have grown to include 704 licensed Kohanga in 1999, catering for over 13,000 children. Oversight of Kohanga Reo is the responsibility of the Kohanga Reo Trust, which now contracts with the Ministry of Education for funds to administer, train and provide services for Kohanga Reo (Nga Haeata Mātauranga, 1999:17).

Kaupapa Māori schools evolved as an extension of the immersion contexts of Kohanga Reo, working to harness the potential of Māori learners and bringing it to the fore. Many factors contribute to Kura Kaupapa Māori success, but apart from that, as Graham Smith (1992:96-7) has stated, Kaupapa Māori schools focus on the learning needs of Māori children, who are at the centre of all of the schools activities. In Smith's view, Kura Kaupapa Māori "take for granted the validity of Māori knowledge, pedagogy and cultural practice through the medium of Te Reo Māori" (1992:96-97).

After the first Kura Kaupapa was established in 1986 at Hoani Waititi marae in Auckland, the challenge to the state to provide appropriate educational choices for Māori learners was undeniable. At the same time, the issue of control over the Kaupapa Māori initiatives was important if the future of the Kura and Kohanga was not to be compromised by inappropriate modification by the state. Kura Kaupapa Māori are administered by whānau structures as with Kohanga Reo, and oversight is

---

<sup>4</sup> that Māori children should be totally immersed in Māori language and values from birth, something that majority cultures can take for granted.

maintained by the Runanganui o nga Kura Kaupapa Māori o Aotearoa, a national body representative of Kura whānau.

In 1998, at the time of a review of the establishment process for Kura Kaupapa Māori, there were 59 Kura and some 4000 students enrolled in them. While not all Kohanga Reo graduates choose the Kura Kaupapa option for their Primary schooling, with 59 Kura, to over 700 Kohanga, some Kohanga graduates do not have access to Kura Kaupapa schooling at all. For others, alternative forms of immersion Māori education may be available, bilingual units are still an integral part of state English immersion schools where there is a large enough Māori community interested in such an option.

While Kohanga and Kura Kaupapa may have reached a hiatus at the present moment, the children of the first generation Kohanga graduates will be the test group for long term viability of the movement. If the whānau of those graduates choose Kaupapa Māori schooling for their children, the pattern will begin to be embedded. There will always be new converts to the movement, but its long term future will depend upon intergenerational loyalty and commitment. Government funding for Kaupapa Māori initiatives came after the fact and came haltingly, forcing Māori to submit to a pilot scheme before being granted state funding subsidies.

From the evidence it is clear that moves by Māori towards political and educational autonomy cannot be attributed to Crown policy. Autonomy is a theme in the lives of Māori but politically, it has no recognition from Government. Whereas the directions for assimilation, integration and biculturalism can all be traced in official policy statements, the case for autonomy is not the same. The differences lie between a Māori agenda for education and Government policies for Māori education, and unfortunately they are not the same. They represent inherently conflicting ideological positions, one an assimilative state and the other a vision of self-determination.

While Māori were talking about Māori control over Māori education, the majority of state schools, English language schools, were talking about something else. The concerns in these schools were the extent to which economic rationalism and the

---

creation of education markets would affect their capacity to deliver the quality of education expected by their communities, and how much it would cost.

### *Māori in Mainstream English Schools*

The neoliberal era of market reform began with the election of the fourth Labour Government in 1984 but during its first term there was little change to the direction of education policy. After the 1987 election, the Prime Minister David Lange took over the role of Minister of Education, clear evidence of the importance to the portfolio of the changes to come. In 1988, parents received newsletters summarising the directions to be taken under four main points. The first of these made clear the expectations that parents would have a greater voice in the education of their children, “parents and teachers will work together through a board of trustees”. Transparency was promised through the establishments of a charter in which the goals of the schools would be set out and agreed to by the board of trustees and the Ministry of Education.

If parents had held concerns about the monopoly of the teaching profession over the direction of schooling, the charter would see that the schools goals were the result of collaboration between all the stakeholders of the school. While school charters would meet national standards, an undertaking was given that there would be freedom to adapt to local needs. Parents with immediate concerns received this assurance and were invited to talk about the change with other parents and to help if they wanted to by offering to stand for election to the board of trustees. What is needed, parents were told, were people with common sense and a care for their children, schools can employ expert advisers.

Economic rationalism has engendered new forms of accountability and surveillance in John Codd’s (1994) view. In educational evaluation, the effects, Codd argues, have led to contradictory discourses of professionalism and technocratic reductionism (1994:42). Manifestations of these changes, in Codd’s view, are evidenced in assurance auditing and school effectiveness reviews. A further clue to the extent of the ideological changes is the emphasis on public choice, promised to parents and caregivers as a positive outcome of planned reforms in education. Initially the

reforms of the education system were presaged as administrative changes needed to improve the delivery of education. The reforms were revolutionary in regard to the new ideologies of the school they brought with them, but alongside them were vestiges of a concern for Māori education.

*The Picot Report, Administering for Excellence* (1988) the Report that proposed the major administrative changes to the school system undergone over the last decade, was the precursor to the policy implementation document *Tomorrows' Schools*. Given its centrality to the restructuring of schools, it would have been opportune to address the concerns of the Waitangi Tribunal Report of 1986 and in some ways an attempt was made. However, the major emphasis was on economic reform and choice for consumers from among the range of schools available to them. Schools were distracted as they reinvented themselves to look to market opportunities in an education market-place. Moreover where there were funds for Te Reo Māori (Māori Language) but there was uncertainty about how they should be allocated, they were often used for activities other than Māori language. The result was a lost opportunity to cement into New Zealand schools a set of values, Māori values that were eagerly sought by Māori - and for that matter by many other New Zealanders - alongside the more conventional educational values derived from the western tradition. The impetus of Taha Māori and Bilingual options in English language mainstream schools was weakened by the reforms.

*Tomorrow's Schools* allowed for community partnerships with schools, for schools to be able to set their own objectives, but they did not go so far as to agree with Wally Penetito in his statement (1988:106):

There ought to be no doubt in the minds of teachers - whether they are involved in an 'education in or about Māori, that children need to acquire in the first instance the relevant knowledge for their wellbeing. For children who wish to shape their own reality, who wish to understand their own cultural context, who wish to have control over their learning, teachers must facilitate and empower them, and there are no short cuts to that.

A Māori language syllabus was produced in 1990 after some ten years in preparation, and an implementation process with staff development for teachers undertaken by the Ministry of Education to support the release of the document to schools. An

evaluation of the programme showed that commitment to Taha Māori in schools, even those participating in the staff development, was uneven and sometimes negligible.<sup>5</sup> While individual staff might show commitment, school leadership was imperative to school-wide acceptance of the new curriculum and its successful implementation but it was not always forthcoming.

*Tomorrow's Schools* also promoted equity objectives that included a reference to Māori as one of a number of identified groups that had less equity:

To ensure that a new system of education administration promotes and progressively achieves greater equity for women, Māori, Pacific Island, other groups with minority status; and for working class, rural and disabled student, teachers and communities. (Minister of Education, 1998:25)

A series of incongruous threads began appearing in the early years of the reforms, indicative of the struggle over the heart of the educational process. A new ideology with its own language emerged, loosely described as the language of managerialism. Much has been written on the topic but the key words in the managerialist vocabulary were effectiveness and efficiency, devolution, accountability, outputs and equity of a particular kind. Teachers in schools were encouraged to attend seminars and workshops held around the country by proponents of the self-managing school, Brian Caldwell and Jim Spinks. For Caldwell and Spinks, the self-managing school is: "One for which there has been significant and consistent delegation to the school level of authority to make decisions related to the allocation of resources; knowledge, technology, power, material, people, time and finance"( 1988:vii).

The authors hold the view that the validation for self-management of schools comes from studies of school effectiveness. They see a mix of centralisation and decentralisation as helpful, so that the broad goals and purposes of education might be determined centrally, but that the decisions as to how these are achieved can be decided at each learning site. At the same time, accountability to the centre remains in place (1988:7). The new emphasis broke apart old alliances for a time and made school management more transparent. Caldwell and Spinks provided schools with a

---

<sup>5</sup> For a full report see Durie, A.E. 1993.

model with which to implement the administrative requirements placed upon them by the reforms with their model of *The Collaborative School Management Cycle*. This approach was helpful to schools in that it provided a place for schools to begin in an otherwise barren field. What it did not do, was question why schools as part of a public education system should be driven into market competition with each other.

School Boards of Trustees would govern the school and ensure that managers were meeting the objectives of the reform policies. It was this shift that was at the top of the political agenda for the reform of education. School leaders were hard pressed to implement workable systems to keep abreast of the pace of change around them and they took whatever help was on offer. Teachers and school leaders were used to having the power to define the basis of educational provision within their spheres of influence. Teacher unions had been a powerful influence on the state in respect to issues of schooling such as curriculum content. Teachers as professionals held a position of respect and authority. The change to a market economy for schooling altered the influence of teachers and was designed to do so. 1989 was signalled to school communities as a year of change by the Government of the day.

Māori have educational and economic objectives for the future and have made the key strategy for the accomplishment of those objectives, the exercise of autonomy, tino rangatiratanga, Māori control over Māori initiatives. Pākehā surveillance or the Pākehā gaze has restricted Māori development to try to retain it within the bounds that are acceptable to Pākehā. Māori recognise this in the many forms that it takes and endeavour to amend the influence by recommending Aotearoa-New Zealand as a bi-national state, where Māori as the Treaty Partners, have an appropriate representative voice in the decision making corridors of power. Without it, even the initiatives developed outside state control, eventually require state support to continue and while the state remains a tokenistic bi-national state, Māori will not have the opportunity to exercise political power to the extent that the population would suggest.

### ***Policy Platforms***

It will have been evident so far that a number of policies, often competing and usually driven from different political perspectives have contributed to Māori educational

endeavour. The Government's strategic objectives and goals for Māori are largely set out in a policy document produced by the Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet in 1997. Although produced in the term of the previous coalition government, the general direction has not substantially changed. Strategic Result Area 8 requires evidence of:

Significant progress towards negotiating and implementing fair and affordable settlements to well founded grievances arising under the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi; and, consistent with the Crown as a Treaty partner, development of policies and processes that lead towards closing the economic and social gaps between Māori and non-Māori. (Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet: 1997)

Some figures of interest that bear reiterating are that the Māori population is a young population with approximately 24% of the compulsory school age group being Māori, around 42% of the total Māori population. These figures alone will signal the degree of interest that should be displayed in securing positive educational outcomes for Māori. The future of 42% of the Māori population lies in the hands of teachers in the compulsory education sector and their schools. That is a huge responsibility and one which is not without uncertainties. Schools and teachers hold a large part of the solution in their hands.

In order to provide greater detail the discussion below highlights the origins and implications of the policies surrounding the 1984 Hui Taumata; the policy *Ka Awatea, Te Urupare Rangapu*, devolution, re-centralisation, a Māori education authority, Ministry of Education initiatives, and policy directed at 'closing the gaps'.

### *Hui Taumata*

A keen desire to bring about reform in economic as well as social policy brought the economy to the fore within the new Labour Government. It took some sabre rattling from Māori, to ensure access to a Hui Taumata that would allow Māori present to raise all the issues of economic development. In 1984, the Labour government had called an economic summit at Parliament, but did not include Māori. After remonstrations from iwi Māori, a Hui Taumata, Māori Economic Development

Conference to bring Māori together was called. The Minister of Māori Affairs, Koro Wetere, set the objectives for the Hui Taumata as follows:

- to examine the economic situation of New Zealand as it affects Māori people;
- to assess the economic strengths and weaknesses of Māori people in New Zealand;
- to obtain a commitment from those attending the Conference;
- to support policy changes necessary to obtain socio-economic parity between Māori and non Māori.

The Conference noted that:

There is a fundamental and urgent requirement to devise policies which will ensure growth by the use of all possible resources. The consequence of delay and inaction will inevitably lead to racial violence.

There was solid support for the objectives identified at the Conference and participants went on to note that:

The gap between Māori and non Māori people in educational and income attainment, has not been closing, Māori infant mortality, crime, morbidity and unemployment are at unacceptability high levels. They point to one conclusion: Māori people are in a state of severe stress. Policies to date have resulted in the Māori people becoming secondary citizens in their own land. (ibid:5)

The economic summit was indicative of the extent to which policy would shift from an emphasis on the social to the economic right. Economic growth driven by a philosophy of market liberalism was to become the key focus of policy change for much of the ensuing fifteen years. At the end of the century, little modification of the sharp turn to the right and the adoption of 'New Right' ideology has taken place. Gerald Grace makes reference to an "ideological manoeuvre" in policy discourse (1990:33). His reference in this instance, was to the language used by the Treasury in repositioning education as a commodity rather than as a public good. This is evident, he stated, in the application of economic concepts, language and discourse to education, the ultimate purpose being to subvert the prevailing ideology of education as a public good "mediated through a publicly provided service" and to replace it with the idea that education is a tradeable commodity (ibid:30). If education can be shown

to have “the main characteristics of other commodities traded in the market place”, the Treasury argument holds, then its social functions can be pared down, and educational energy can be reigned in to serve the needs of a nation-state attempting an economic recovery.

### *Te Urupare Rangapu*

Before *Ka Awatea*, and the National Government Minister for whom the report was compiled, the previous Labour Government had released a policy document, *Te Urupare Rangapu*, which was a move towards greater Māori independence. It signalled the beginning of a ‘Development Decade’, a timeframe for the state through the Department of Māori Affairs, to devolve responsibility for Māori programmes to Māori themselves. *Te Urupare Rangapu* built on the suggestions set out in a discussion document, *He Tirohanga Rangapu* (1988) wherein the Government proposed a new structure for the way in which Māori issues and responsibilities were handled in the State Sector (1988:9). *Te Urupare Rangapu* put the new objectives into policy for action. The objectives raised by the Minister of Māori Affairs, Koro Wetere, at the 1984 Hui Taumata, were being given effect with this new policy statement<sup>6</sup>. Māori had long been asking for the resourcing to provide programmes to Māori for themselves, and *Te Urupare Rangapu*, by fostering devolution to Māori, was lessening dependency on the state and strengthening efforts to increase economic self sufficiency and tribal resources. Māori were seeking control over the resource base, citing a combination of government agency failure to utilise state funding effectively for Māori purposes, and next, as an exercise in Māori control over the Māori economy. At the conclusion of the Hui Taumata, a communiqué was issued stating that

the government pursue a consistent policy framework that encompasses all the interrelated elements of the economy... that Māori and their resources continue to be under-utilised and under-developed. To reverse this will

<sup>6</sup>

These have already been noted. In brief they were:

- a. to reach an understanding of the nature and extent of the economic problems facing N.Z.as they affect the Māori people;
- b. to examine the strengths and weaknesses of the Māori people in the current position;
- c. to discuss policies for Māori equality in the economic and social life of New Zealand;
- d. to obtain commitment to advancing Māori interests. (Wetere, K. (1984).

require positive initiatives for consultation with Māori communities about their future, policies to deal with Māori unemployment and self help. (1984:21-22)

*He Tirohanga Rangapu* represented a continuation of Government consultations to see, as Koro Wetere put it, “ how we can better put the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi into practice” (1988:1). The establishment of the Māori Development Corporation was seen as a direct result of the Hui Taumata recommendations, a corporation to foster Māori economic initiatives from a Māori base.

Koro Wetere, as Minister of Māori Affairs, progressed into legislation, the Runanga Iwi Act, 1990. The Act was intended to give iwi organisations a legal personality in order to register as the authorised voice of that iwi. It came into force in September 1990, shortly before the elections that would see a National government come to power. There were many objections to the Runanga Iwi Act, as Māori saw it as bringing iwi identities under Crown control, that the state could reserve to itself the power to decide who and who was not an iwi. For the Crown, and the Labour government that spawned the idea, there had to be a legal personality for iwi organisations before state funds could be devolved to those organisations as required by the Public Finance Act.

After *Te Urupare Rangapu*, the restructuring of the Department of Māori Affairs resulted in a division into an interim operational section, Te Tira Ahu Iwi, and a policy Ministry, Manatu Māori. The government’s view of its Māori policy as expressed in *Te Urupare Rangapu*, was that it would emphasise the development, restoration and strengthening of the iwi operational base.

### ***Devolution***

In the devolution period, other Māori organisations grew, both tribal and non-tribal, and were able to contract with the Crown for the delivery of services to Māori. These arrangements further strengthened the development of the Māori economy with a drive towards an autonomous future. It was not so much that Māori were supportive

---

of government reforms so much as the realisation that these could be coopted to realise Māori or iwi aims. Much of the restructuring of the economy was detrimental to Māori employment options as industries retrenched or disappeared altogether without government support, or in the face of rising competition after subsidies and protections were removed. But devolution and community control, though illusory at times, was nonetheless a refreshing change after the suffocation of state dependency.

### *Ka Awatea*

In January 1991, the Minister of Māori Affairs at the time, Winston Peters, established a Ministerial Planning Group to provide information that could be used as the basis for policy recommendations for Māori; it was to set out a long term strategy for Māori development. A 1991 Report, *Ka Awatea*, (discussed in more detail later in this chapter) endorsed Māori development as the key issue for Māori social, cultural and economic wellbeing, citing under-development as having been fundamental to creating the present state of deprivation for Māori people (1991:9). For the authors of *Ka Awatea*, the solutions to those problems lay doubly in the improvement of the New Zealand economy and in special policy initiatives directed to ensuring Māori are able to participate equitably in the social and economic life of New Zealand (ibid). The National Party had come to power after the 1990 election, inheriting the aftermath of the major state restructuring undertaken during the two term Labour Government that it replaced. The previous government, under Labour, had reviewed the Department of Māori Affairs and found it an anachronism after the change to 'policy only' Departments effected in other sectors. The programme aspects of the work of the Department were 'mainstreamed' into other ministries, leaving the Department of Māori Affairs to be responsible for policy advice. The planning group was led by Māori for a Māori Minister holding a Māori portfolio. As such, the group was a rarity. Their findings were to present a strategy for Māori policy that more closely reflected Māori aspirations than had been recommended before. *Ka Awatea* recommended a strengthening of the Department of Māori Affairs, arguing that the division of policy and operations in this instance, had resulted in the mainstreaming of aspects of Māori development that left them in a secondary position to the thrust of policies in those respective ministries for the majority population. The mainstreaming

policy itself had come from the same department under a former Minister of Māori Affairs, Koro Wetere.

In contrast to the assimilative philosophy underlining the Hunn Report, *Ka Awatea* attempted to make the shift towards policies to foster Māori self determination.

The mainstreaming of programmes to Departments or Ministries outside the Department of Māori Affairs meant that policy for Māori was clearly an adaptation of the mainstream policies added in an ad hoc manner after those policies were set in place. Policies for Māori could not meet Māori needs if they were not developed with Māori needs and interests in mind.

*Ka Awatea* differed from the *Hunn Report* in respect of the approach taken in that it was an attempt to establish a Māori policy approach that stepped back from mainstreaming and sought instead a structure that would “shift the focus from a department servicing a dependent people to a ministry facilitating their development” (Henare, D. 1995:54). While the recommendations of the *Hunn Report* were made in a review of the work of the Department of Māori Affairs, portfolio responsibilities meant implications for all the Departments, particularly, Health, Education and Housing.

The 1960 *Hunn Report* was produced in a Welfare State environment with a strong view of Māori as a dependent people who had some distance to cover before reaching standards set for Pākehā as acceptable benchmarks. Māori mobilisation from tribal heartlands to urban centres in search of greater financial security, came at a price. Industrial growth led to a high demand for labour in the towns and cities, and Māori were ready to work. During this time Building companies such as Fletchers and Keith Hay homes had grown into major businesses by working in an alliance with Government to provide a decent standard of housing for the needy. Māori migration meant more demands on housing stock and whole new suburbs such as Porirua and Wainuiomata were built to house the exodus of Māori from their rural homes. But Māori families were larger than those of their European counterparts, not only were there on average more children in Māori families, there was also the extended family to consider. Family members were not just the nuclear family and state houses built

with the Pākehā nuclear family in mind did not meet Māori needs. If there was an extended family unit, or a family with more than the standard three children typical of Pākehā family units, housing for Māori was problematic.

Overcrowding of homes was seen to be a Māori problem, rather than the result of flawed Government policy decisions. Overcrowding led on to health complications, and employment demands to complications for children at school. While the Pākehā community underwent a 'baby boom' after the second world war, according to Ian Pool, Pākehā natality rates were still well below Māori (1991:141). Up until 1960, Māori natality had remained high and twice that of Pākehā, the Māori growth rate was in the order of 4% per annum, compared to that of the Pākehā, which Pool states as "barely exceeding 2% even with heavy net migration gains and a baby boom" (ibid:141).

For urbanising Māori, whānau wellbeing was put at risk. In suburbia there was a far different culture than the one left behind in the kainga. The state house had to be furnished and maintained in similar manner to the neighbours, or it was quickly derisively labelled 'a Māori house'. Rents or mortgages had to be paid, and children at school had to wear the correct uniforms. Lunches could not be too different from those that the other children brought to school or the children with the lunch made up of Māori foods, would soon be disparaged. The transition from whānau at home in the care of the kainga to family units in western style suburbia was not made easily. The outcomes cited by Hunn were the first indication of the downside of urbanisation for Māori. At home in the kainga, families who remained had heard wondrous tales of large pay packets, of bright shiny new cars, and increasing sophistication in a western sense, so the lure of the cities grew.

During the Post War transition from rural to urban environments, the infrastructure of the State grew to accommodate the new demands. The Māori Affairs Department drew on the leadership of those who had served with distinction in the Second World War, and employed them to deliver programmes to Māori in guises such as Māori Welfare Officers and managers of sections within the Department of Māori Affairs. Urban Māori and Kainga Māori turned increasingly to the state for the support given traditionally from the kainga hapū and whānau. The state had coopted Kainga and

hapū leadership by employing surviving war leaders as agents of the Crown and Māori did not always see the difference between the two roles, one as Māori war heroes and the other as Crown agents.

By 1998, fourteen years and several governments after the Hui Taumata, there had been some improvement in Māori economic status, but these improvements were shifting and unstable. For example, a 1987-1997 Household Economic Survey shows some rise in the yearly household income average for Māori, but at the same time, no indication of the relative buying power of the dollar between the first sample and the last. When compared with non-Māori, disparities between the two groups have grown since 1987 and in 1997 appeared to be widening. Māori household incomes did increase between 1987 and 1997 by some 40%, from an average income of \$26,000 to \$37,000, but the relationship of this rise to a concomitant rise in economic wellbeing cannot be presumed.

Jane Kelsey saw a contradiction between the government's position and that of Māori, noting the Māori preference for collectivity and integrated goals, while capitalism as she saw it, "was dependent on individualism, self-interest and the capture and exploitation of resources for profit" (1993:249).

For Māori, the resourcing of the initiatives was the key, how Māori set about utilising them could still be dictated by Māori preferences. State dependency could be turned into iwi and hapū entrepreneurialism once sufficient capital was injected into the Māori economy.

### *Re-centralisation*

*Ka Awatea* too sought to intervene in the cycle of dependency and disadvantage but recommended calling back some of the responsibility earlier devolved to iwi by suggesting a 'super ministry', a ministry that would concentrate on Māori Development, on promoting Māori strengths to overcome disadvantage. *Ka Awatea* examined the immediate post-reform position of Māori and concluded that:

Māori people as a group have borne a disproportionate brunt of the reform process and the downturn of the New Zealand economy since the mid-1980's....The medium term, they said, continues to look bleak. (1991:12)

The mainstreaming of Māori programmes to other government sectors would have been overturned if *Ka Awatea* had become policy. Mainstreaming was partly intended to ensure that all government sectors acknowledged responsibilities to Māori, but *Ka Awatea* sought to re-establish a strong centralised Department with oversight of all Māori initiatives.

In affirming the role of education in Māori development through strong policy recommendations, the Planning Group considered that stronger measures were needed to ensure meaningful change and equitable educational outcomes. A discrete well resourced policy function was essential and the establishment of a Māori Education Commission could be the mechanism needed to carry out this role. The reforms had not seen increased responsiveness to Māori from government in the Planning Groups view but worse was the acquiescence in an unacceptable status quo. *Ka Awatea* raised an issue that had received a great deal of attention since it was suggested at a Hui Rangatiratanga held in Rotorua in 1989, which was that a Māori Education Authority be established (1991:48). While *Ka Awatea* acknowledged this call, it went on itself to recommend a Māori specialist agency, the 'super ministry' that would provide specialist policy advice to Government and take back an operations function to develop, resource and deliver specific Māori initiatives (1991:66). The functions of such a ministry would include policy development, operations, auditing and strategic planning, a reversal of the existing neoliberal separation of policy development from the provision of services. According to Denese Henare, *Ka Awatea* could "provide the step away from assimilationist policies towards a true bicultural partnership" (1991:57).

An interesting view of biculturalism was promoted in a commentary by Henare in which she said:

If the politics of difference means a political commitment to achieve not just Pākehā biculturalism – that is, being sensitive about how you treat Māori – but Māori biculturalism, which requires a real partnership in terms of a trust to control

resources and development, then this commitment has not yet been achieved. (ibid:57)

The meaning of true Māori biculturalism is unclear here as it appears to require action by Pākehā to devolve resources to a Māori partner, but how that creates Māori biculturalism is not explained. A taken-for-granted view of Māori biculturalism has been the notion that Māori have no choice but to become bicultural, that Māori must engage in the wider world effectively to make their way in it, but retain what is important in the Māori world in order to sustain a Māori identity. That is, that the retention of a Māori identity is a private matter, whereas participation in the wider world is a public matter. Genuine biculturalism could extend this position, arguing that a further dimension, being Māori in a public arena, for example, by controlling resources for development, combines the public and the private spheres of Māori life and to be truly bicultural is to be able to engage as Māori in both. The same would be true for Pākehā engagement. These ideas are not taken up in Henare's writing. Assimilation on the other hand, saw Māori required to forsake a Māori identity in order to engage in the wider world effectively, and state policies have been deliberate in this aim.

The 'super ministry' did not eventuate, but the establishment of a Ministry for Māori Development, Te Puni Kokiri, by its very title, showed a shift in mindset about Māori policy that may be attributed to the directions signalled in *Ka Awatea* or even well before then at the 1984 Hui Taumata. Consistent with the new theme of development, Māori communities were also intent on establishing mechanisms for more direct and positive action. Restructuring was not to be entirely a government prerogative.

### *Gaps or Spaces*

The 1998 Report, titled *Progress Towards Closing Social and Economic Gaps between Māori and non-Māori*, set out to demonstrate the position of Māori across a range of sectors, to demonstrate once again, the degree of disparity that exists between Māori and non Māori. It was intended, it said, to provide the Minister of Māori Affairs with an assessment of the current state of disparities. Unfortunately, the disparity approach led not to Māori defined futures as the benchmark, but to the performance of others, mainly Pākehā, as the appropriate benchmark for Māori

aspirations and progress. Like the Hunn Report before it, the Gaps Report as it came to be called, examined progress across the education, employment, economic and health sectors, and progress for Māori was once again premised upon Pākehā benchmarks. Despite initial acclaim from some quarters, the report went on to become publicly vilified by Māori as a return to assimilationist policies rather than a Māori developmental approach.

The most important benchmark for Māori is progress over time, that is, where Māori are at any given point in time, compared to where they may have been say a decade earlier. Factors that affect progress in that period of time should be examined carefully for their usefulness in further prediction and contribution towards appropriate policy development. This form of gap analysis is more meaningful in planning for Māori futures. Māori and Pākehā New Zealanders do not lead lives similar enough to be able to draw conclusions about Māori based on non-Māori data. The report states that:

Overall, the evidence presented in this report does not provide assurance that the economic and social gaps between Māori and non-Māori are closing. Of greater concern is that the statistics do not provide any signals that there is an impending change in the situation. (1998:1)

The Gaps Report was prepared by Māori employed by the Crown as policy advisors; it was not the result of policy being made by non-Māori assumptions that the non-Māori benchmark was the only valid one. Unlike the Hunn Report or *Ka Awatea*, there is no acknowledgement of the authors of the Report except that it is prepared by the Ministry of Māori Development, Te Puni Kokiri.

A commissioned Report, *Māori Participation and Performance in Education A Literature Review & Research Programme* (May 1997), prepared by Simon Chapple from the New Zealand Institute of Economic Research, a non-Māori, Richard Jefferies, a private consultant and Rita Walker from Waikato University both of whom were Māori, preceded the Gaps Report and probably was part of the sequence of events that led to its compilation. The latter report is an attempt to provide data to serve one of the Government's strategic objectives for Māori development, "to make significant progress towards closing the economic and social gaps between Māori and

non-Māori” (cited in the report as a reference to Strategic Result area 8). In the executive summary to the Chapple Report, the first statement says that:

The education gap in participation and performance between Māori and non-Māori is multidimensional. Māori as a group perform less well on average than the rest of society on almost all measurable dimensions. (1997:x)

The relationship between the two reports is clear; both signify a trend towards assimilationist policies for Māori and a move away from Māori development as the priority. Although the Gaps Report uses the phrase ‘Māori development’ in discussion, by utilising a non-Māori benchmark as a measure rather than a Māori one, the concept is negated, for Māori development is not about being more like non-Māori, but about enjoying social and economic wellbeing while retaining a strong Māori cultural identity.

A deficit approach to Māori development is a contradiction in terms and a gaps analysis may well be intended to reduce disparities but for Māori a social levelling exercise is not the same as Māori development. While improvements in living standards are about the basics of survival, Māori development for a secure Māori future has to be much more than survival. Of course improvements in educational outcomes will support Māori development, as will improvements in standards of health, but Māori futures are not about becoming indistinguishable from non-Māori neighbours in middle class suburbs. Māori who wish to live as Māori yet still become citizens of the world, are seeking the means to achieve both these goals.

The Chapple Report identified possible explanations for differences between Māori and non-Māori in education participation and performance, citing differences in tastes and preferences for education, rational under-investment (due to labour market discrimination, a lack of labour market networks, or limited information), a relative shortfall in family resources, or peer pressure factors. In their view, these all operate on the relative demand for education (ibid:1).

Little credence was given to any cited factor except the relative family resource position as a significant and substantial cause of educational disparities. The Report states that there is a residual negative effect on educational performance on average

from being Māori, when, in some studies, socio-economic factors are controlled for. The Report further concludes that “the evidence in favour of the supply-side barriers argument is not overwhelming (ibid:xi)”. In the view of the authors of the report, the studies carried out in the area do not facilitate generalisation beyond the studies in question, although they acknowledge that the school system, because it has attracted attention as the primary source of disadvantage, may represent barriers that need investigation. Because other minority groups experience success in the education system, the authors see a contradiction for the hypothesis that school barriers can be a cause of Māori educational disadvantage. The Chapple Report minimises the effects of being Māori at school and the barriers against attempting to succeed while there.

In contrast, Māori narratives consistently identify a discontinuity between the culture of their homes and the culture of the schools they attend unless these are Kaupapa Māori schools, or schools that operate from a Māori philosophical base. For Māori, there are two distinct counter veiling forces, one pressing them into assimilation, the other resistance for survival as Māori. Getting an education requires Māori to forsake their cultural identity or to store it for a time in order to take advantage of school life. The price of an education has all too often been the erosion of a Māori cultural identity and while appropriate measures of Māori identity have yet to be applied, the strength of Māori testimony to this reality in their lives, outweighs a view that the effects are residual. The struggle to gain fair access to education from a Māori viewpoint, sets up a tension between staying Māori and benefiting from education. This is clearly portrayed in the experiences of participants portrayed in the previous chapter of this thesis.

The incoming Labour Government of 1999 set great store by furthering policy for Māori. The Gaps initiatives were continued with force and a special committee was established within the Department of the Prime Minister, to see that projects were put in place to eliminate ‘gaps’ between Māori and non-Māori. After media criticism of the speed and cost of programmes developed to eliminate ‘gaps’, the government conceded to criticism that non-Māori were entitled to as much attention to resourcing for ‘gaps’ that may exist for them as were Māori. The government played down the “Gaps initiatives” and bowed to political pressure to reduce the promotion of Māori advancement by eliminating ‘gaps’.

To the extent that Māori have participated in the development of recommendations for policy, a distinction emerges between Pākehā thinking about what appropriate policy for Māori might be and Māori thinking about policy for Māori.

### *A Māori Education Authority*

A gathering of teachers, parents and communities with Bilingual classes or schools, was held at Matawaia in 1988, Te Hui Reo Rua o Aotearoa ki Matawaia. The Hui proposed that an independent Māori Education authority be established. The Authority was to be fully funded and was intended to “establish Māori control and autonomy of Kaupapa Māori education from pre-school to adult education”. The authority was needed, it was said, to return to Māori “the control of our futures and destinies” (1988:1). Fifteen principles were set out, addressing a range of concerns that Māori have, including Tangata Whenua status, accessibility of the Māori language and culture to Māori learners in schools, and the return of mana, autonomy and control to Māori parents and community. There were to be three levels to the Authority, a local authority, tribal or regional authority and then a national authority supported by the tribal or regional authorities. The principles were modified in further drafts but the intentions of the Declaration did not change: first, that Māori education should be in Māori control; second, that the children have access in their schools to Māori language and culture; and lastly, that Māori retain the choice to join such schools or not as the case may be.

At another Hui on education for Māori educators held in Rotorua in 1989, the idea of a Māori Education Authority was once again supported, although the details as to how such an authority might work out in practice was still to be thought through. The Education Committee of the Māori Congress, debated the possibilities and presented Congress with a motion to support the concept in principle. The Māori Congress membership was largely made up of iwi (tribes) from across the country, and as iwi establish Education Plans for their own regions, the idea of a national body with some

authority over education was not going to be popular.<sup>7</sup> Iwi chose to take the suggestion home to their Runanga (administrative body) to discuss (NMC minutes, May 1993).

The idea has a measure of support from educators, in particular, from Māori branches of the Teacher Unions, the New Zealand Education Institute (NZEI) the Primary sector union, and the Post Primary Teachers Association (PPTA).

Some iwi have developed direct relationships with the Crown in their own educational interests such as the Whaia te Iti Kahurangi initiative between the Crown and Ngati Porou, designed to improve education outcomes in Ngati Porou East Coast communities, and Nga Tapuae o Rehu, who are part of another agreement between tertiary institutions and Ngai Tahu. As iwi become better organised over time, it is likely that similar arrangements will be more acceptable to them than a body to act as an agent between the Crown and Iwi or Māori.

However, a discussion paper re-presenting the concept of a Māori Education Authority was put again to a Hui held in Taupo in February 2001, suggesting that the purpose of such an authority would be to support and strengthen whānau (families), hapū (extended families), iwi (tribes) and Māori organisations in their endeavours to achieve excellence for Māori. The paper was presented by representatives of a working party, Te Roopu Whaiti, established in August 2000, to address the issue of Māori control of Māori education (Te Manatu Mātauranga Māori, February 2000:1). In the view of the working group, Te Manatu Mātauranga Māori would have three key functions:

- relationship building and alliance creation by Māori for Māori, nationally and internationally;
- strategic Planning by Māori for Māori and New Zealand;
- audit and Monitoring in accord with Kaupapa Māori. (ibid:6).

---

<sup>7</sup> There are exceptions to iwi membership, Te Iwi Morehu, which is not a tribe in the classical sense, but an association of members of the Ratana faith, holds membership in the Māori Congress.

The core ideas of an education authority have clearly altered over time, but the catch cry remains. The idea of a Māori Education Authority, and of greater Māori involvement in policy development for Māori, have retained their potency for Māori groups and continues to generate discussion and debate in Māori forums. Without Kotahitanga or unity, the issue of authority as it is expressed in the notions of a Māori Education Authority, could be but is not yet, part of an integrated thrust to the development of policies across all sectors for Māori.

### *The Ministry of Education*

The two Ministries with major responsibilities for policies for Māori education are the Ministry of Education in the first instance, and Te Puni Kokiri, the Ministry for Māori Development second. Te Puni Kokiri has a control function and is largely concerned with monitoring policies developed in the other sectors, including education but it does make a contribution to policy development as well. It has worked effectively with the Ministry of Education in the past, for example with the development of additions to the National Education Guidelines which the Ministry of Education publishes as an annual report in which it sets out accomplishments to date and plans for the future for Māori education. The government of the day purchases from the Ministry an agreement that the Ministry will meet government needs for policy advice and implementation. The document, *Nga Haeata Mātauranga*, claims to present “the main focus of policy effort over a 12 month period, from Early Childhood to Tertiary Education, including an emphasis on Kaupapa Māori education” (2000:3). The election of a Labour Government in 1999 altered the emphasis of policy development within the Ministry of Education. Although there had been a large consultation exercise carried out in 1997, in regard to a discussion document *Making Education Work for Māori*, the framing of the questions kept the discussion within narrowed parameters, rather than addressing the burning questions brought to the Hui by expectant Māori constituencies. A summary of the resulting report was sent to all who attended the consultations, and listed a range of issues rather than solutions.

The Labour Government’s stated emphasis on closing gaps and expectations of performance from all its ministries led to a higher profile for Māori education in the Ministry of Education than had been seen at any time previously as the Prime

Minister had chosen to chair a committee within her own department that would examine the performance of respective ministries in regard to progress on meeting government policy expectations. The 1998/99 document signalled a change from earlier years in that it was at last moving away from the flawed ten point plan policy of earlier years. Instead, in the documents own words: “The Māori Education Strategy framework is the starting point for reporting on progress.” It goes on to identify three themes of the strategy, supporting and strengthening the growth of Kaupapa Māori education, providing for greater Māori involvement and authority in education; and raising the success of Māori in the general school system (2000:8). These themes provide the strategy focus in the first instance, the document points out. At the same time, the Ministry has also chosen to develop a Māori Language Strategy of its own and lists five key objectives in this regard. The Ministry charges itself with increasing its own responsiveness to Māori, through responsive research and through principles for engagement and consultation with Māori (2000:42-43). The policy development framework adopted by the Ministry of Education for its work is as follows:

All policy advice: Must be consistent with Government’s objectives and commitment to Māori. Must be consistent with the Ministry of Education’s objectives and commitment to Māori. Needs to be responsive to the diversity within the Māori population. Must analyse issues and impact on Māori through the use of reliable and valid information. (Ministry of Education, 2000:44)

The Ministry has set itself an agenda to raise understanding of Māori Education issues within the Ministry, referring to a need to understand the Treaty of Waitangi and tikanga Māori as a necessary foundation to analyse Māori education issues.

It is possible to read the agenda and applaud the efforts to upskill staff at the Ministry in regard to Māori education issues and that is important. At the same time, it is also clear that the Ministry is staffed by people who do not have these essential skills to begin with, nor is it clear how the desired skills will be developed, apart from occasional activities such as noho marae. If that is the case it must be of utmost concern for Māori because the key issues in the development of effective educational policies for Māori will depend less on cultural sensitivity than on a sound appreciation of the Māori policy environment, of catalysts and barriers in the context of Māori

educational aspirations. Cultural awareness programmes resemble Taha Māori programmes of the past, designed to benefit Pākehā not Māori. Pākehā development does not have a direct connection to Māori development. Instead, such development in the name of Māori education can lead to Pākehā capture of Māori education initiatives and research. An in depth understanding of Māori policy development and analysis should be a professional requirement for employment in the Ministry at the outset. Without it, there will not be integrated policy development across government sectors to meet Māori demands. Without it, government policy will continue to 'miss the bus' to coin a popular phrase. While well intentioned, the policies appear piecemeal and lacking in cohesive force despite a Māori Education Strategy and a Policy Development Framework. Parallel policy advice streams are going to be important if the Ministry of Education is to develop effective policies for Māori education.

To some extent the two *Hui Taumata Mātauranga* held in 2001 have begun the process, but the need for consistent substantive appropriate policy advice has yet to emerge. Māori Reference Groups are another positive initiative, but once again, the focus is on one piece of a policy rather than seeking to establish cohesiveness across the whole sector. A fragmented approach disguises flawed policy as few people will see the spaces as significant except those most closely involved with Māori education and effective policies.

### ***The Broad Strategies***

Māori dispossession required Māori thinkers to develop survival strategies and these have been evident in the history of Māori nationhood. The Young Māori Party, established in 1892 by a group of students from Te Aute College in Hawkes Bay is one example. A group of students took it upon themselves to spend their summer vacation travelling to small communities to bring messages of new ways of life, education, health and hygiene for people who had been forced into crowded conditions after their multiple land losses. The Young Māori Party sought to recreate pride in Māori identity and all that a cultural identity meant, while accessing the best of new technology and education. Originally formed in 1891 as 'The Association for the Amelioration of the Condition of the Māori Race' it was a form of mission by

rangatahi Māori (young Māori) to exhort whānau (family) to adopt some changes to ensure a greater chance of survival. The Māori population had been debilitated by dispossession and disease. From having been owners and guardians of some 66 and a half million acres of land, by 1896 only 11 thousand acres remained in Māori hands. The fall in land ownership was mirrored by declining health until at the time of the emergence of the Young Māori Party, the Māori population had declined to less than 43,000, causing a perception from Government that policies should be directed towards Māori disappearance rather than survival. At the same time, tribal leaders, also aware of looming disaster and dissatisfaction with the status quo, were gathering to form a Māori Parliament. The key to their strategy was the retention of a strong Māori cultural identity at the same time as encouragement to adapt to a western society. Professional Māori leadership would be important to this strategy and government would be expected to accommodate Māori interests. That did not happen in Ngata's time, but a strategy that builds on that view is gaining ground as a compromise between the sovereigntists and the assimilationists looks for a way forward for Māori development.

A second strategy also focussed on the acquisition of new knowledge and skills but was not as ready to accept government goodwill without some modification as part of the solution. The marginalisation of the Māori power base after minimal parliamentary representation was all too evident after the confiscation of large tracts of Māori land in the years following the Land Wars of the 1860's. Instead, Māori control and autonomy was the better means of survival. The answer to Māori dispossession was Māori sovereignty. In 1892 at an inter-tribal meeting held at Te Tiriti o Waitangi marae, it was decided to unify the tribes under the Treaty of Waitangi, Kotahitanga mo te Tiriti o Waitangi (Walker, R.1990:165). An agenda arranged by Heta Te Haara sought debate on a number of issues: the unification of the Māori people; an examination of the Treaty of Waitangi to discover which parts of it deprived Māori of mana to determine matters pertaining to Māori lands; and an examination of s71 of the N.Z. Constitution Act to identify any clause that would enable Māori to establish a council for themselves. The fourth and final item on the agenda related to maintaining goodwill between the two peoples of New Zealand (Kotahitanga Centenary Booklet, Waipatu, 1992). The Māori Parliament that arose in that year is an example of a form of binationalism sought by the Assembly. There

was not a fundamentalist view of sovereignty as held in British thought or in Māori protest thought that regards sovereignty as indivisible. The Māori Parliament did not conclude that sovereignty was indivisible and by doing so exclude the potential for a power sharing option. The Māori Assembly continued to honour the Treaty of Waitangi and the articles of the agreement.

These two themes are found consistently in Māori strategic planning; the ‘protestors and radicals’ may be categorised as fundamentalist Māori sovereigntists. An alternative, the biculturalists, were those who believed it possible to retain a secure Māori identity while taking on western values and beliefs such as democracy and religions. Although the biculturalists in Ngata’s time did not claim autonomy, the bicultural strategy has been absorbed into one that addresses issues of a bi-national state and autonomy, Māori control over Māori policy and a range of alternatives to realise that goal were raised at the *Building the Constitution Conference* in Wellington in 2000. The notion of a Māori Education Authority lies outside the directions currently favoured by Māori in the press towards iwi authority rather than cession once more of a degree of power to a pan-Māori group for an indeterminate goal.

Ngata and his colleagues had not expected government rejection of Māori language and culture, but their approach was sabotaged by the government of the day. Today, after the findings of the Waitangi Tribunal in regard to Te Reo Māori, new forms of the strategy are gaining ground. Options raised by Māori at the *Building of the Constitution Conference* in 2000 provided a range of strategies for Māori progress. Māori have consistently resisted assimilation and rejected integration as another form of assimilation despite the force of Government policy and resourcing to convince Māori to capitulate.

Their resolute stance has led to some accommodation from the Crown, first as strategies for biculturalism, and next as participation in the development of policies for Māori. Autonomy is a distant goal but Māori have it in sight.

In a National Radio series publicised earlier this year, James K. Baxter is said to have remarked, in relation to a Māori protest group, Nga Tamatoa, that it was “the back of a fish rising in the water. It is not the back of a terakihi or barracuda. It is the back of a whale. Māori militancy is here to stay” (cited by Paul Diamond, April 2, 2001,

Media Release). Although the remark was made about Nga Tamatoa, it is as appropriate to apply the metaphor to the agency of Māori intellectuals who have constructed the parameters of the debate around Māori policy made by Māori for Māori, as it is, to describe protest groups, there is truly the back of a whale rising in the water.

## CHAPTER NINE

# MĀORI EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS: CONTRADICTIONS AND COMPROMISES

*E kore au e ngaro  
he kakano i ruia mai i Rangiatea*

*A seed that is sown from Rangiatea will never be lost*

### *Contexts and Compromises*

Inclusions of indigenous knowledge in school curricula have had a chequered history, not merely because of a distinction in western eyes between knowledges that are worthy of study and those that are folklore and on that basis denied a place in the school curriculum. Distinctions and generalisations have arisen largely because the prevailing view is about which learners are of most worth and who should have access to privileged learning opportunities, about who should have access as well as what it is they might learn. Values are placed on learners in schools, sorting them into hierarchies, those who might best meet the school's needs and those who might resist compliance with the agenda of the school, the troublemakers, the free thinkers, the outsiders and the odd.

Schooling as a new form of education to Māori, meant that at the outset, families and learners were strongly motivated to attend. Through attendance they would discover the knowledge of the school, learn of thoughts, people and places that were beyond the collective Māori experience. According to Jackson (1975:47)

One of the most striking contributions to Māori social change in the early nineteenth century is the extent to which individual Māori chose to appropriate and use new technological possibilities, especially literacy.

While Māori controlled the extent to which schooling and literacy were brought into Māori communities in the early nineteenth century, the hard edge of change that accompanied school remained hidden. Māori were exposed not only to the teachings

of Christianity, but also to a politicised curriculum. Through school, Māori could be converted to Christianity; through school, Māori could be coopted into the agenda of a developing industrial society. The three R's of the school curriculum, Reading, Writing and Arithmetic, were, for the majority of people, the tools that were needed in a growing marketplace. But mission schools taught Māori more about heaven than earth and less about the technology that took their interest than the values of Christianity. What Māori would come to realise almost too late, was that the earth on Māori land was the far greater attraction to Pākehā than whether or not the souls of Māori went to heaven.

Jackson cites Wiremu Tamihana as having said, in regard to literacy and education,

Listen, the most important work the Europeans have in hand is education...Already they have given us three great benefits – the Gospel, schools and laws of the Queen. How are we to know how to perform all these things? I think my friends, that we must turn to schooling, that we may be equal to the Europeans and be able to join them in all their enterprises. (ibid:43)

Some Māori were convinced that schools had a contribution to make to the realisation of their own aspirations, keen, as Jackson noted, “to gain access to what they judged to be a superior technology” (ibid:28). Others were wary of the excess value that came with them and preferred to observe from afar. From earliest contact, Māori had engaged in trade with passing European traders and had increased the scale of production to meet the growth in demand. What they sought from school was access to further technology to enhance their powers of production.

Missionary power was manageable, trader power was controlled and Māori power remained intact, but schools would become the instruments of colonial power in ways that leaders at that time could not predict. From mild mannered missionaries, Pākehā power would be transformed into a full colonial force, re-ordering the Māori world in ways from which there would be no retreat. The treaty as an international instrument was the mechanism for this change.

The 1840 Treaty of Waitangi signalled a powershift from Māori to the British Crown of immense proportions. As argued in other contexts “ it began a path to political,

cultural and economic oppression for Māori” (Durie, A.E.1994). At that point in time, Māori were seen as sufficiently human to be able to be party to a Treaty, but not sufficiently so subsequently to participate in the affairs of government. Over a quarter of a century would pass before Māori received the vote. Denied political power, Māori were still able to exercise economic power for a time. In the years between the signing of the Treaty and the passing of the 1852 Constitution Act, Māori continued to exercise economic sovereignty to their advantage for the Pākehā minority were dependent on Māori trade for survival. The in-between years were the years of high Māori entrepreneurialism, of trade with Australia, of flax and timber trade, of growing Auckland markets and of cooperative crop production up and down the country, all Māori owned and managed (RCSP.1987:6). Māori prosperity was not to last long, for the base of the Māori economy was the asset that a new Settler government wanted, land. Māori entrepreneurialism was brought to a halt, as without political power, Māori were not longer able to shape economic decisions for themselves. Capable Māori, as Sinclair showed, were being excluded from the private European sector. (1952:119). While Māori learners were still choosing school to gain knowledge for their own advantage, schools had a different agenda. The alienating pattern of coloniser and colonised was entrenching itself into the fabric of the new nation of Aotearoa-New Zealand and schools would be at the centre of that change.

### *Inequality*

Māori inequality however, derives as much from modern versions of colonialism as it does from the colonial past, where inequality was attributable to a forced dependence upon an imposed economic infrastructure initiated in the first instance to alienate Māori proprietors from their existing economic base. In such a context, efforts to increase educational success rates for Māori learners must first address the elements of a social, political and economic history that has defined educational provision and cultural wellbeing for Māori. Colonisation casts a long shadow. Māori inequality, like any educational inequality may be evidenced by educational outcomes but inequality for Māori has somewhat different contours than that experienced by others. In quoting Adams, Openshaw, Lee & Lee cite him as having noted that:

Not all Māoris are disadvantaged and not all the disadvantaged are Māoris. Māoris do not have an exclusive monopoly on the low educational streams, educational failure is not their sole prerogative nor is educational success the sole prerogative of the Pākehā. The Māori, in this sense, is not a special case. (1993:80)

In following up this quote, Openshaw Lee & Lee refocus the question, arguing that it is not so much about asking why Māori are disadvantaged as to why anyone should be disadvantaged. The move supports the notions contained in the quote in regard to Māori and disadvantage. The end result is that Pākehā inequality takes up the space occupied only by Māori until this point. Yet Māori inequality is too complex to be assimilated in this way. While there can be no single solution to the complex problem of educational inequality, Māori inequality has different contours to Pākehā inequality. Māori have an inequality of conditions that will not change. Whether individual Pākehā are disadvantaged or not, the Pākehā reality is one of dominance and power. Pākehā outnumber Māori by 3:1 and numbers are power in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Regardless of inequality at school, all Pākehā form part of the Pākehā veto, the three to one power of the majority to control Māori futures. It is at the hands of this majority that Māori inequalities arise and with whom decisions as to solutions are made.

A quote used by Maud Blair to introduce a chapter about research, states: “ Privilege keeps the terms of your privilege invisible” (Blair, M. in Connolly P.& Troyna, B.1998:12). While Blair is discussing research, such is the case with Pākehā. Māori have an inequality of rights. Pākehā enjoy all the rights promised to them in the Treaty of Waitangi, individual, cultural and collective while Māori have only partial rights as collective and cultural rights commonly referred to as Article two rights, have yet to be realised. Article three of the Treaty bestowed individual rights to individual Māori, specifically citizenship rights. Based upon Māori expectations of the Treaty of Waitangi, the cultural and collective rights for which Māori were guaranteed protection, are still to be realised. In regard to Chomsky’s three equalities, without equality of rights leading to equality of condition, for Māori equality of endowment is at risk.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Chomsky’s three equalities are the basis for this discussion, equality of rights, equality of condition and equality of endowment (1987:183)

This third inequality is brought about by living conditions, diet, reasonable shelter, good health and good care. Inequality in any of these will generate a lessened capacity at school. Indicators for Māori across these three conditions of inequality demonstrate some of the differences in disadvantage between Māori and Pākehā.

When Māori at school display the effects of their inequitable condition, the indicators are too often put down to disadvantage from a Pākehā perspective where people are equally disadvantaged and Māori are simply part of the greater group of disadvantage; or, the symptoms are taken to be a natural part of a Māori persona. Māori underperformance at school is not seen as being out of place but normal for a Māori student. In time, Māori students themselves have come to believe that positioning to such an extent that those Māori who actively seek to achieve, can be ridiculed for behaving in an un-Māori fashion.<sup>9</sup> Even without more traditional traits of disadvantage, simply being Māori in a majority non-Māori environment can be used by majority member staff and students to treat Māori as somewhat lesser beings, as culturally deficient. Māori cultural difference is still interpreted at some schools to be a cultural deficit. A culturalist explanation can have its drawbacks if it is interpreted to mean the attachment of cultural deficit labels to some learners. Equality, whether of rights, condition or endowment, has also to be about the right for Māori to be as equally Māori as Pākehā are able to be Pākehā at school and beyond school.

Lukes (1973) refers to epistemological and methodological individualism. In this view, only individuals are the bases of any analyses of societies and data must be individual data (cited in Triandis 1995). Triandis interprets this to mean that there are no cultural-level or societal-level phenomena to be explained by cultural-level variables. (1995:29)

But for Māori in schools there are cultural phenomena that do need explanation if schools are to have a greater role in supporting Māori to realise their educational aspirations.

---

<sup>9</sup> See Mitchell & Mitchell (1988) for a detailed discussion on this phenomenon.

Because of the history of Māori experience in the colonial education system, Māori may have an ambivalent relationship with schools. Schools have the power to support or prevent the realisation of the aspirations of individual Māori learners. Whether Māori have done well at school in the past or not, Māori students are acutely aware of the need to make the best of school while protecting their cultural identity. This contradiction is the daily reality for Māori at school, an additional inequality that is about survival as Māori in a dominated relationship.

The Treaty of Waitangi is seen as a covenant, a social compact devoid of the most violent histories of colonisation and perhaps, by comparison it did allow Māori to avoid the worst faces of colonisation. But conquest was legal conquest and through it cultural conquest and servitude became a reality for Māori.

Noam Chomsky raises the question of manufactured consent in regard to the means by which democratic systems:

control not only what people do, but also what they think....To achieve respectability, to be admitted to the debate, they must accept without question or inquiry the fundamental doctrine that the state is benevolent, governed by the loftiest intentions, adopting a defensive stance. (1987:132)

Chomsky is talking about the role of intellectuals, of people who might be expected to provide critique of oppressive systems. He concludes with the following:

For those who stubbornly seek freedom, there can be no more urgent task than to come to understand the mechanisms and practices of indoctrination. These are easy to perceive in the totalitarian societies, much less so in the system of 'brainwashing under freedom' to which we are subjected and which all too often we serve as willing or unwitting instruments. (ibid:136)

For Māori, the Treaty is a covenant, a kawenata and as such has more than a legal connotation. But for the Crown, the Māori Treaty partner, it has no obligation in law until it has been fully ratified. Ratification was restricted to those sections of the Treaty that gave rights to the Crown. Any rights presumed to be reserved to Māori as a result, depend upon the whim of the state to honour them. Certainly there are no entrenched rights. The Crown as the Māori Treaty partner enacted laws to ratify the aspects of the Treaty that were rights bearing in their favour, but did nothing to ratify

those aspects that reserved rights to Māori, including Article Two where reference was made to cultural and collective rights for Māori, a set of rights beyond the individual rights spelled out in Article Three of the Treaty.

Without recognition of the most basic right, the right to be recognised as human, Māori began a new life under colonial rule. In a political system where Māori have no immediate likelihood of becoming the majority population in Aotearoa-New Zealand, the Treaty of Waitangi and the ratification of Article Two, holds promise for Māori as one significant way forward to overcoming entrenched disadvantage.

The emergence of a core of well informed Māori critics of government policy into the public arena has been a welcome development. Until this eventuality, advocates for Māori views of policy direction for Māori education had drawn from well intended Pākehā voices, the four representative Māori Parliamentarians, Māori organisations such as the *Māori Womens' Welfare League*, and Māori protest groups. Each of these had made a substantive contribution towards the amelioration of harsh policies and the advocacy of more Māori friendly policies in the past, but the addition of a strong Māori critical voice could only benefit the Māori position<sup>10</sup>. The critiques were placed in the academic and professional arena where they had the greatest chance of engendering informed debate and winning support for Māori views of education policy.

There is no single causative explanation for Māori educational participation and performance rates, instead they are the result of a range of interacting determinants. Government policies establish the parameters within which families will live out their lives and are a key determinant of cultural and economic wellbeing. It is not appropriate to attribute full responsibility for educational success solely to families and students for too many variables fall outside their control. Arguments about the role of the family have a point to make, but are a deceptive perception in the light of

---

<sup>10</sup> For example see: Penetito, W., 1984, Taha Māori and the Core Curriculum, in *Delta* 34, pp. 35-43

Smith, G. H. 1986, Taha Māori: A Pākehā Privilege, in *Delta* 37, pp 11-23; Walker, R. 1985, Cultural Domination of Taha Māori: The Potential for Radical Transformation, in Codd, J. et al (eds). *Political Issues in New Zealand Education*, Palmerston North, Dunmore Press, pp. 73- 82.

true determinants of educational power. Māori families advocate as they can on behalf of their children, all too often working against the tide given the school histories of so many.

When families drop back and their children drop out of the education equation, it reflects a break down in relationships between the school and the Māori learner or the school and the family. Studies that examine this relationship tend to focus on the Māori learner or the Māori family as the unit in need of change, not the school, but there are three parties to the relationship and not only is the school one of them, it is a powerful agent of the state.

### *Kāwanatanga Kura and Kainga*

Government policies control the state of Māori education and the state has the resources and the power to bring about change. Schools act as agents of the state to implement government policy while at the same time assuring families of their commitment to act in the best interests of each child. The goals do not always coincide. Jerome Bruner raises the question of contradictions as antinomies, “pairs of large truths, which, though both may be true, nonetheless contradict each other” (1996:66). Māori learners are caught in the headlights of such a contradiction, to do well at school without compromising a Māori cultural identity. For those Māori learners who do not have a secure Māori identity, the dilemma is even stronger; how to gain a strong Māori cultural identity and still do well at school.

School life in non-Kaupapa Māori schools is full of contradictions for Māori. The regimented life of a learner in school is designed for ease of administration rather than for optimising learning, another antimony. For Māori, the question about curriculum, what knowledge is of most worth, and why is subsumed under a more important question, what learners are of most worth; which learners are worthy. Knowledge does not sit out in the curriculum without a perception as to who will benefit from it. Teachers in schools make decisions about the worthiness of learners every day as they engage with the curriculum and not all learners get to be included.

There is no comparison between the power available to the state to enforce its wishes, and those available to a Māori family or its children. The state is a structure of institutionalised power comprising the legislative, executive and judicial institutions of government, a combined force of political, economic and legal power, each powerful enough in its own right to form the basis of external treaties and agreements between nations. It should not be forgotten that this is the same state that controls its national borders and it is not always a benign state or a generous state. Within national borders the state is all-powerful. Although within a democratic state there are checks and balances on the absolute power of the state, in Aotearoa-New Zealand, there is a unicameral Parliament and a dominant executive within the House. The major counter to this power therefore, is the vote of electoral majorities and they are not Māori.

Influential policies are not merely those that are developed for education. Instead, those that affect families, communities, jobs, decent homes, schools that value children, reliable transport, health, access to goods and services, safety and security, are all brought to bear on the quality of educational provision and educational outcomes. The integrated components of cultural, social, economic and political factors coalesce around households, kainga noho and whānau, those places at the heart of the wellbeing of the Māori learner.

There are effects on individual pursuits and life chances on educational fronts as a result of the influence of the kainga, but to what extent this is, whether kainga should be the focus rather than the individual is a Māori issue. In the traditional sense, collectivism typified the Māori cultural base but an assumption either way of the pre-eminence of either an individualistic or collectivist position cannot be taken for granted. Multiple pathways for Māori development offer the best chance for all Māori to participate.

Clearly school attributes are not solely responsible for educational outcomes but there are many ways for schools to ration what they consider to be their best, that is, to ration quality educational provision. Justification for the rationing can be based on concepts of merit, of desert, of worthiness, or of ability. Whatever the rationale, the basis for schools to sort students, to allocate school resources unevenly, to create

winner and loser in a system supposedly universally accessible is a further form of hegemony. All students in schools do not have access to the best that a school can offer yet no objection is made, no rights are seen to be breached and no claims of injustice heard. Māori learners who feel the slights respond in ways that see them carry the burden of responsibility for negative outcomes. The expulsion and suspension rate for Māori learners is three times that of Pākehā. The complex relationships between Māori learners, Māori groups and wider society further complicates the educational scene. Policies of the state have their outcomes demonstrated in the everyday lives of Māori children at school. If there has been no demonstrable change for the better for Māori, then accountability must lie in the first instance with those who receive funding from the public purse to implement government policy. Agencies of the state should be accountable to those whom they are funded to support as well as to those who provide the funding.

Hekia Parata puts the challenge this way:

Either Māori are genetically inferior or, Public sector managers are perpetrating and/or perpetuating gross negligence in the performance of their duties. (Parata, H.1995:137)

The principle applies as much to schools and their core business as it does to the rest of the public sector. For arguments sake, even were Māori found to be genetically inferior, the responsibility of schools is not diminished. The future of 25% of the school age population cannot be dismissed on such an irrational basis.

Clearly the contexts for learning take into account more than the classroom site or the school site, but contexts for learning include the political, social, cultural and educational contexts. In this matrix lie the influences on the degree to which learners engage constructively in the learning process. Out of this matrix emerges the kinds of knowledge that will get to count at school, the kind of curriculum adopted by the school, whether the emphasis is on transmission or transformation or both, and lastly what form of organisational culture is accepted for the school.

## *Te Reo Māori: the Māori Language*

Whether Māori learners speak Māori or not, te reo Māori is the basis of a Māori cultural identity, it is an official language and it has not disappeared. As an official language since the 1987 Māori Language Act and as the heritage language of tangata whenua, te reo Māori should have a place in the curriculum of every school. It has been banned and brought back, put out of the curriculum and put back, put up and put down, but its future in schools is still threatened. A genuine curriculum statement exists and is out in schools but now there are too few teachers to teach it.

Māori language has had a chequered path in its claim for recognition. It has the potential to form an important part of the cultural context in which school learning takes place. For Kura Kaupapa Māori, the language is the only language spoken there. In order to reclaim the Māori language, Kura have had to ban English from entering the school grounds in much the same way as Māori was once treated.

Māori attendance at non-Māori schools has lessened the chances Māori have to go to school in a Māori language environment. The reclamation of Te Reo Māori and of a culturally appropriate educational environment is about more than the language, it goes to the heart of a Māori identity. Māori have suffered identity crises for years. Psychological explanations were given to all aspects of Māori engagement or disengagement with school.

The loss of Te Reo Māori as an everyday language was symbolic of the sum of the losses felt by Māori as a result of harsh assimilative policies of successive governments. In its 1986 report, the Waitangi Tribunal noted the decline of the Māori language over time and the evidence of elders (kaumātua) who came before them to speak of their school experiences. In the first quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century for Māori, the dominant theme was of monolingual Māori children going to school and having to learn to speak and study in English. The elders told of being punished if they were caught speaking Māori inside the school gates, even if they spoke it outside the classroom in the playgrounds. While the Department of Education denied that there had ever been any official policy on the matter, Sir James Henare, one of those giving

testimony, said, “The facts are incontrovertible. If there was no such policy there was an extremely effective gentlemen’s agreement” (1986:9).

Policies designed to teach what was considered to be an essential language for success in education, inadvertently or deliberately proved destructive of the heritage language of Māori learners.

The attitudes to Te Reo Māori and to Māori culture in schools and in the wider society were reflective of attitudes towards Māori as a people. As long as Māori stayed out of sight and took their lessons in Māori schools, then Māori rights and a Māori presence could be ignored. The move by Māori to towns and cities challenged government to develop policies that more accurately reflected Māori needs. As the physical distance between Māori and Pākehā lessened, there was not a concomitant closing of the social or educational distance. Te Reo Māori has been used as a tool of colonialism, so that banning it was to strike at the heart of a Māori cultural identity, but it did not go away. The Māori language has only recently found a place in the primary school curriculum and awaits further action. At the same time as there is resistance to te reo Māori, there is a maintenance of conservative views of education, of the value of the canon and of an emphasis on the basics of education. For the most part, this emphasis will be on selections of knowledge from a western cultural archive.

### *Monocultural Ideals*

English monoculturalism was held out as an ideal for Māori as well as for all arrivals in Aotearoa-New Zealand. Pākehā decision makers had no doubts as to the benefits for Māori of replacing their heritage culture with a Pākehā English one. The value Pākehā placed on their culture and language blinded them to the idea that other peoples might, in the same way, value their particular heritage similarly. Ethnocentrism combined with political power, left the potential for Māori cultural inclusion in the formation of the new state, out of the frame. The form of monoculturalism that arose in Aotearoa-New Zealand grew out of a history of English colonisation, which at its high point, held that, although Māori were capable of becoming ‘civilised’, they were inferior. It was that framing of Māori as inferior that

led Pākehā to believe that they were doing their duty in assimilating Māori into non-Māori ways, severing Māori from their cultural identity. Pākehā themselves would not have seen the connections between their perceptions and the impetus of colonisation. New Zealanders held strong views about egalitarianism and a fair deal for everyone and it was reflected in the kind of government, at least for Pākehā, that was developed to secure these ideals.

Board schools were monoculturally Pākehā, and Māori learners who moved from Māori to Board schools carried the responsibility for a successful transition on their own. As Garcia states:

monoculturalism presumes to provide standards of that culture as the final criteria of right and wrong, so that white middle class culture sits at the hub of the teaching-learning universe. (Garcia,R.1982:10)

In just such an environment Māori learners were expected to be able to acquit themselves well educationally as well as adapt their behaviours, values and attitudes to meet the reigning view of the model school pupil. The schools had no need to adapt their prevailing perceptions to meet Māori criteria. The National Committee on Māori Education (NCME:1955) had noted that no policy had been developed for Māori children in Board schools and encouraged development in this area. Some steps were taken to provide support for Māori in Board schools such as help for remedial teaching, advisory help with language programmes, and increased numbers of Māori accepted into teachers colleges (1974:259).

### *Urbanisation*

In the 1950s and 1960s urbanisation for Māori meant more than an uneventful shift to town to seek employment, Māori were propelled into the urban industrial economy at such a pace that there was pressure on the housing, health and education services. Although the Beeby curriculum had supposedly prepared Māori young men for work in the building trade for example, most found employment in unskilled work, particularly the Freezing Works industry, the Railways and the like, where the majority of workers were Māori. The Hunn Report (1960) identified a series of

problems for urban Māori: housing was substandard, too many were leaving school without qualifications, and overcrowded homes led to a poor standard of health. Low incomes compounded the picture, trapping Māori in a cycle of disadvantage. In response to this picture, Hunn made reference to:

a magic circle for progress, better education promotes better employment which promotes better housing, which promotes better health and social standing, which promotes better education and thus closes the circle. (1960:para 53)

Although written decades before Chomsky's writing on equity, Hunn is accurately describing the parameters for equity of endowment as delineated in Chomsky's (1987) terms.

Ranginui Walker (1973:111-112) takes exception to the deficit view of Māori in education, seeing reports such as the Hunn Report as catalogues of Māori failings. It is difficult, he says, for those who are monocultural to analyse problems from a bicultural point of view. Further, Walker argues, the ignoring of Māori identity is the most important disabling factor for Māori learners in school, preventing a child from being able to see the school as a normal environment for Māori. Pākehā teachers are not well prepared to respond to biculturalism and minority-group needs.

*He Huarahi*, a 1980 Report from the National Advisory Committee on Māori Education (NACME) also made some far reaching recommendations for change in the education system to allow it to better meet the needs of Māori learners. Schools it said, should develop a positive philosophy of appreciation of different cultures (1980:36). Māori learners should not always have to be the ones who make the greatest efforts to adapt to a system which is attuned to the needs of Pākehā children rather than to their needs (ibid:36).

The report is decrying monoculturalism and advocating for a system that will be bicultural English-Māori. There was no doubt that Māori were not comfortable in Board schools or Board schools comfortable with Māori, and that some of the sense of ownership and pride demonstrated by Māori communities for their Māori schools

of the past, was lost in the transition to Board schools. The committee made some far reaching assertions:

- that every child in New Zealand should have the opportunity to learn Māori;
- that bi-lingual instruction in schools where the local population is willing should be seriously discussed;
- that the values of the marae are as significant for all our schools as the values of western technological society – both are important to the identity of the New Zealander;
- that we urgently need to use community expertise – including the expertise of Māori parents, many of whom are richly skilled in cultural terms;
- that urgent steps need to be taken to recruit more Māori teachers so that the teaching force becomes more representative of the whole community;
- that we need to give whatever practical support we can to have the marae recognised as a place of learning, a unique New Zealand institution for culture transmission (NACME, 1980:13-14).

The majority of members of the committee who served on the working party for the report were Māori, eleven out of seventeen, but the group was chaired by Peter Boag from the Department of Education.

In 1982, the Minister of Education, Merv Wellington, instigated a review of curriculum structure and balance. The report, *A Review of the Core Curriculum for Schools* was released in 1984, and was greeted as “a post-war milestone for New Zealand education” (Evening Standard, 26.3.84:1). Among a range of other recommendations, the Report suggested that the Māori dimension, Taha Māori, be introduced as a compulsory subject in both primary and secondary schools. It was an attempt to include Māori as a compulsory part of the Primary school curriculum for the first time. The Report saw Taha Māori as an appropriate response to

recommendations from Māori for recognition in the school curriculum as reflected in the NACME Report of 1980. The inclusion of Taha Māori was seen as a first step in a shift for schools towards becoming multicultural; a policy of multiculturalism would be reached through biculturalism (*A Review of the Core Curriculum for Schools*, 1984:31).

The Taha Māori policy was not without its critics. Even the *Dominion* newspaper was moved to include an editorial on the subject stating:

The emphasis on Māori culture (taha Māori) is welcome. Does it go far enough? Apparently Māori culture is not recommended as a compulsory core subject; all that is asked is that some attention be paid to it. .... Educational preparation for our developing bicultural society will require a more positive approach. Bi-culturalism can be an enriching process, but the facilities of the schools to do its promotion justice must be questioned. (*Dominion*, 26.3.84)

Māori voiced opposition to the concept of Taha Māori as recommended in the Curriculum Report on a number of counts. First, without a specific time allocation, as other core subjects received, Taha Māori was optional rather than compulsory. No specific body of knowledge was prescribed for Taha Māori so that it could be as little as morning greetings to pupils at the start of the school day, or as much as inclusion of relevant knowledge across all aspects of the curriculum. Indeed, Resource Teachers of Māori chose the latter strategy in their work with schools to implement Taha Māori into the curriculum.

Second, the resource base needed for implementation was woefully inadequate and Māori were mindful of the negative reactions that could be generated when under resourced and under funded initiatives failed to gain school support. Worse still, was the perception from Māori that Taha Māori put responsibility for the transmission of Māori culture into amateur hands. The attempts to incorporate aspects of Māori into the curriculum gave rise to strong views, one of which was expressed as follows:

I think that the Department of Education's priorities are wrong in this respect. They are now so hell bent on sharing Māoritanga around that scant regard is being given to developing Māori as a language of communication between the generations or between current native speakers of Māori and any future potential native speakers. (Douglas, 1983, cited in Benton 1987:27)

Empowering Māori learners should be the goal of all who teach them, and empowering learners should be the goal of all teachers. A major educational reform programme, instituted by the fourth Labour Government in line with its radical economic reforms and devolution from the state to communities had some sympathy from Māori with greater autonomy experienced at local levels. In the policy statement, *Tomorrow's Schools* gestures towards empowering Māori learners were made with the promise of greater opportunities for parents who wished to have their children learn or be educated in the Māori language, stating specifically that “opportunities will be made available to parents who wish to have their children learn or be educated in the Māori language”. (3.2.1) This was more than Taha Māori programmes could offer, since it implied opportunities for Māori learners to learn through the medium of Te Reo Māori.

Taha Māori was criticised as being of little value to Māori and was considered to be a document to further non Māori knowledge of Māori language and custom. The criticisms were not without foundation for there were many flaws in the Taha Māori curriculum, but there was also a genuine interest from some teachers, schools and learners. The interest in Te Reo Māori and Tikanga Māori was not restricted to schools although it may have been generated by the flurry of activity in Taha Māori, by 1998 it could be said that while Māori made up 60% of the teacher workforce able to teach Māori in bilingual classrooms, it also means that 40% of those teachers were not Māori. (1998, *Nga Haeata Mātauranga* ) Without knowing anything of the quality, that figure, at least on the surface, looks to be a demonstration of commitment by non-Māori teachers to the language, the custom and most importantly to the learners. Only 6% of non-Māori are able to teach in Māori language immersion environments, but the bilingual shift is the significant one. As a role modelling exercise and as an iwi backed representation, it is appropriate that Māori do teach in immersion Māori classrooms, though the immersion figures are more likely to be from Kaupapa Māori school classrooms rather than general ones.

Taha Māori was important for the shifts in attitudes that the initiative represented at the time. Schools took to visiting local marae, to learning at least the beginnings of Te Reo Māori, and to adopting practices in the school that were reflective of Māori

values. Whānau groups and classrooms emerged, teachers flooded after school Māori language classes, Kaumātua were in high demand and schools worked closely with local Māori communities to include aspects of Māori into school life and curriculum.

Taha Māori, however beleaguered the initiative, has also left a legacy. Pre-service Teacher Education programmes were obliged to allow at least 80 hours for students to study in the area and that initial study, while it produced complaints from some, generated a group of graduates who have gone on to become highly successful teachers of Māori learners.

Taha Māori like numerous other initiatives of the times, was swept away by the neo-liberal reforms of the later 1980's. Those schools with a generosity of spirit and a commitment to fostering a special kind of young New Zealander, continued with their work. The New Zealander most likely to benefit has been the subject of a substantial literature, but Picot (7.2.1) did not see an intrinsic value in Taha Māori. Rather it fell into the category of a concession to Māori to encourage them to support the direction of the Report. It is clear that the revival of the Māori language and culture is seen not as an end in itself, but as the key to lifting the performance of Māori children.

The Taha Māori policy did foster greater awareness in schools of the need for a Māori dimension in the school curriculum. There were teachers, Principals and communities who took the issue of Taha Māori seriously and worked towards strategies to implement Taha Māori into schools in an appropriate way. Much of this work was done with regional and local initiatives rather than resulting from a national impetus. An example of this is the work produced in the publication *The Challenge of Taha Māori, a Pākehā Perspective*. The work is the result of a working party effort, and contains strategies, values and philosophies taken from Māori thought that draw from successful attempts to include Taha Māori in schools. In the preface to the document, John Rangihau, a learned Māori educator, elder and leader, lauds the effort of what he describes as “seven Pākehā teachers reaching out to a goal of biculturalism”. In his view, the initiative was a “voyage away from racist assumptions” and for this alone, the work of the schools in this period is to be acknowledged. Despite Māori objections to the policy as a policy for Māori, as a policy for Pākehā it marked a change and had merit. Taha Māori made Māori politically acceptable in schools even

though there was resistance from Māori critics and Pākehā school communities alike for quite different reasons. Taha Māori gave Pākehā learners approval to acknowledge their South Pacific New Zealand identity in ways of their choice. The empowering of Pākehā led to the Smith critique “Taha Māori, Pākehā capture”. Taha Māori served New Zealanders well as a basis for the establishment of a uniquely New Zealand identity, one that would distinguish citizens of Aotearoa-New Zealand from their neighbours in Australia or other Commonwealth nations.

### *Curriculum Progress*

A series of connected policy documents were released by Government in the early 1990's after a flurry of activity to prepare a curriculum for schools that would meet the standards expected in a reformed schooling process. The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (1993) set out what the Secretary for Education described as the foundation policy for learning and assessment in schools. Towards the end of her foreword, she says “ It acknowledges also the value of the Treaty of Waitangi, and of New Zealand's bicultural identity and multicultural society” (O'Rourke,M.1993:1-2). The statement speaks not of Māori but of the bicultural identity of any New Zealander, of the capture of the definition of bicultural by the Crown agency. Certainly within the document te reo Māori is one subject within the broader category of *Language and Languages*. There is no indication of partnership as might be expected with mention of the value of the Treaty of Waitangi. The Ministry view of the value of the Treaty and of New Zealand's bicultural identity are far less than Māori would expect from a genuine expression of those factors. They may have been sufficient for a Pākehā identity and for a Pākehā view of the value of the Treaty, but minimal for Māori. The curriculum is exposed as a social artefact, a social construction framed as a legitimated rationale for the inclusion or exclusion of knowledge and subjects of study from a Pākehā view.

The inclusion of te reo Māori as a subject of study may as well have gained its place because of the success of Taha Māori for Pākehā, than because of its cultural significance to Māori. The wording of the foreword by the Secretary for Education hints that this is the case.

New Curriculum statements commissioned by a new National Government set in train by accident a project to develop a complete set of curriculum statements in te reo Māori. One of the voices interviewed for this thesis had this to say:

*“The New Zealand Curriculum Framework came out of restructuring, prior to that, interpretation and delivery of curriculum was too broad. Four Māori were added to the Minister’s policy group, Monty Ohia, Katarina Mataira, Timoti Karetu and Mike Hollings. They were brought together because the initial curriculum statements had been developed with no Māori critique at all. Māori had no say in the documents. It was only a casual remark from one of the group after work one night that started the thinking that there should be Māori curriculum documents.*

*They had only been brought together to critique the existing documents, there was no plan for Māori documents, but once noticed some money was hastily found to put some Māori curriculum documents together. In Maths and Science, the objectives parallel those set for mainstream. Some parts are not Māori friendly. There was no Māori policy group against which to test objectives. The learning exemplars and assessments however, can come from a range of Māori experiences. Pangarau and Putaiao are teacher unfriendly and need booklets to accompany them. The documents need support books. The whole difficulty with the Māori curriculum statements is that they are led by mainstream ideals and are therefore flawed.*

*The Minister had a policy group for Te Reo, but the original document is now viewed as flawed so it will be reviewed. Once documents are mandated they must be supported by Government, that is, put resources into their support. The curriculum document framework being used is not a Māori one. The newest curriculum statement, Nga Toi is different, it has its own philosophy, based on Māori thinking. Now the Arts curriculum document wants to use the philosophy as well. Nga Toi is the only curriculum document that did not have to take an existing English document as its starting point. Handbooks for teachers are being developed for the statements” ( 8).*

Another who participated in the preparation of curriculum statements described the disappointment there was upon finding that the Māori curriculum statements were not going to receive the same time for planning and forethought given to the English language curriculum statements. Although a statement in Māori was thought to be better than none at all, the process described leads very much to confirmation of the Māori curriculum statements as an afterthought. At the beginning of the 1990’s Kura Kaupapa had been subject to restricted development, no more than 5 new kura to be approved in any one year, and the initiative was only four years old. Yet the Kohanga Reo experience should have led policy makers logically to the view that Kura

Kaupapa Māori were going to expand to accommodate Kohanga graduates and that teachers at Kura Kaupapa, with their philosophy of te reo Māori only, would not be expecting to have to work with English language curriculum statements. If that was not enough of a motive, the bilingual schools and units were very much in existence and had been since 1976. Taha Māori had come into schools and influenced many teachers to learn Māori. But these three significant points were not sufficient for there to have been a planned process at the outset to parallel the development of the set of English language curriculum statements.

The participant interview that follows identifies an attitude, a mindset, that prevented the existence of a strategic plan for Māori.

*“The Māori curriculum statements were an afterthought, they were not planned and they had to be done in such a hurry that we were just there as translators, not as people with Māori knowledge that could be put into special curriculum statements for Māori. I was disappointed and sorry that nothing better was going to be done for Māori. All we did was translate the English document into Māori. I have spent most of my career in Māori schools, in the area where I grew up. We have always had to put in our own local knowledge for our school, yet the standard curriculum statements like the History one for example, give histories from all over the country for every school to teach. Our history is a fascinating one but it isn't in the curriculum. Pākehā historians start writing up Māori histories for their books and we can hardly recognize it when it comes out but that's what is in the curriculum. There are some publications like the Toby Rikihana ones that were popular earlier on, but they were collections of resources that we all used in schools anyway. Local advisors and resource teachers of Māori have spent a lot of time developing resources to support the curriculum and they are a help. It's just a shame that they don't develop the curriculum statements and oversee their implementation. 80% of the English document was translated into Māori.”*  
(11)

Given the concerns over the expropriation and exploitation of Māori knowledge, of Mātauranga Māori expressed in the Wai 262 claim to the Waitangi Tribunal over

Māori Intellectual Property Rights, it may have been fortunate that the Putaiao curriculum document did not include the depth of knowledge held by those who translated the curriculum. However, the point to be made is the disregard for the existence of an indigenous body of knowledge that would benefit learners in Kura Kaupapa Māori. What was being expressed as well, was the lack of respect, even in a Māori curriculum statement, for bodies of knowledge that had the potential to revitalise Māori learners.

A third participant entered the process after having seen an advertisement in the Education Gazette, the writing group were to see the document as parallel to the English language equivalent recently published.

*“The project coordinators were brought together by the personnel in the Curriculum division. We were accountable to the Ministry Policy Review group who reported to the Ministry committees. The writing teams could have reference groups to support them and undertake informal consultation. The policy review group made sure that the work was meeting the policy requirements of the time. Too often Māori inclusion was determined with Pākehā schools in mind. That policy was set when the English language documents were prepared. There were restrictions but we tried to make the document as compatible as possible with the philosophies of teaching in Māori in mind, we tried to ensure that Māori cultural values were upheld. We wanted to produce a useful resource for teachers. Part of the result was the development of a technical vocabulary in Māori with some consistency”.*(16)

One of the challenges for the curriculum writing teams was the inclusion of a technical vocabulary, regardless of which curriculum statement was being prepared, the vocabulary had to match with the concepts being conveyed within the subject area of study. The Māori Language Commission, Te Taura Whiri I te Reo, had a major contribution to make in the exercise and the majority of the new word forms are attributable to Te Taura Whiri.

To what extent Māori whānau and kainga noho retain a collectivist view of life remains to be seen. Whether nuclear or collectivist in nature, all whānau and kainga noho are located within a capitalist democratic state system. The extent to which capitalistic tendencies influence school chances, relies on ideological positions with currency at any one time. But whether democratic neo-liberal or welfare driven, without acknowledgement of Treaty rights for Māori, regardless of other changes, no

government has had to be accountable to Māori to the same extent as they have been to Pākehā.

Young (1971) expands on the notion of knowledge as a social construction, identifying it as a reflection of deeply ingrained but specific power relations. The development of the curriculum statements and the curriculum framework bears out his view of the workings of power relations in the social construction of knowledge and what knowledge will count.

### ***Māori Identity***

In a Māori context, selfhood is a relational idea reflecting individual position and role in the collective context where the individual is important but not the major defining unit of society. Individual and collective identity draws on both ascriptive and achievement factors for its realisation but indigenous philosophy neither excludes people from their heritage environment, nor divorces them from responsibilities to the natural environment. For Māori, although cultural and geographical borders are crossed and recrossed and new generations are born and raised, grounding landscapes remain, for the most part unchanged. Māori identity is intimately connected to landscape and to genealogy. Debate among Māori today has extended to arguments over whether or not individuals and families who move from tribal to urban heartlands to live as nuclear families can be considered to be disconnected from a classical tribal identity. Urban born generations unexposed to extended family socialisation practices common to their tribally based counterparts may or may not devalue a Māori cultural identity, but Māori birth parentage is unalterable.

In this regard a Māori identity retains an essential genealogical base wrapped around with the records of tribal and family histories going back in time for generation after generation. Attempts to define these histories as pre history devalue the manner in which history has been recorded and transmitted, and relatedness.

In attempts to find an acceptable formula for the allocation of fisheries assets to iwi groups, *Te Ohu Kaimoana*, the Māori Fisheries Commission has arrived at a set of criteria for identifying *iwi*. The essential characteristics of an *iwi* are: shared descent

from *tipuna*; *hapu*; *marae*; belonged historically to a *takiwa*; and an existence acknowledged by other Iwi (3:1999). The point is that iwi identity continues to have purchase as a significant basis for political, economic, cultural and personal identity. Far from being either ephemeral, or fixed in time, Māori cultural identities are not static but provide depth and meaning beyond ethnicity and workplace related roles. Indigenous identities have become radical identities in the face of claims against injustices and abrogation of rights perpetrated by colonial nation-states. Post labels are a matter of conjecture rather than statements of fact. But the conjecture has taken on an academic life of its own, growing to be a stifling presence usurping indigenous space with efforts to neutralise indigenous thought by re defining it. Māori aspirations in terms of identity are few, to live as Māori, to experience a high standard of living, and to be citizens of the world. (Durie, M.H., 2001) Whether education and schooling can deliver forms of education that meet those criteria has yet to be seen.

### ***Māori in Education***

Māori wellbeing has been subject to the impact of external forces which have systematically disempowered iwi, hapu and whānau to such an extent that evidence of dysfunctional families and individual normlessness is a constant cause for concern. These features of Māori society arise from a combination of factors over which Māori have had little control.

Māori participation in education is showing the greatest increase at tertiary level (see table 6.1). The Ministry of Education figures show an increase of 15.1% in the years from 1992 to 1997. Māori students are more likely to study in a private training establishment than non-Māori and more likely to be studying at certificate level. The rise of the Māori Private Training Establishment has provided greater access for Māori to tertiary study, but the record for PTE's to date is mixed. Lifeskills courses are numerous but do not have a clear pathway to employment or higher learning. Just the fact that so many Māori enrol in lifeskills courses must be an indictment on the system and on society. If lifeskills courses are necessary for school leavers, presumably the secondary school curriculum has no contribution to make in the area.

Students in TOPS programmes generally reflect the level of school leaving qualifications attained by Māori and the programmes provide the skills not acquired at school.

Those most likely to enter Tertiary institutions are from the periphery regions of Southland, the West Coast, Taranaki and Gisborne, areas where employment opportunities are restricted.

However, the pattern appears to be that Māori are more likely to engage in tertiary education as adult students than as school leavers. Second chance education is therefore an important aspect of provision for Māori.

Table 9.1 *Number of Māori enrolled in formal education programmes 1992, 1997*

<i>Sector</i>	<i>1992</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>% growth</i>
Early Childhood	24,342	30,703	26.1
Schools	126,176	140,873	11.6
Tertiary	18,200	23,617	29.8
Total	168,718	195,193	15.7

( Ministry of Education 2000)

Māori participation in education has increased over the last five years.

In 1998 35% of Māori tertiary students were studying at degree or post graduate level but the raw numbers of Māori studying at tertiary were not available to be able to break this figure down further.

Approximately 30% of Māori leave school with at least a Sixth Form qualification, an increase of 20% since 1974. The greatest rise is seen to have started in the reform period 1986 to 1992, after which it seems to steady at 30%. What happens to these learners after leaving school is not immediately clear. The high point of 45% enrolled in further education and training in 1994 has not been replicated since but instead has remained at around the 35% mark. The largest number of school leavers in 1998

(26.3%) went on to study at Polytechnics, followed closely by Training Opportunities Programmes (TOPS).

Sixteen percent went on to study at University (*Ngā Haeata Mātauranga*, 1998/1999). There are improvements going on in schools and in tertiary education for Māori as the results show, but at the same time, the risks remain.

The Ministry of Education, in its document on *Schools at Risk*, developed criteria for their definition. The criteria are about the safety and wellbeing of the students, the level of the quality of education, the performance of the Board of Trustees, evidence of disharmony and external risk factors.

School does not come without risk for Māori. Māori learners are at risk in English mainstream schools because they are Māori.

Table 9.2 *Risk Factors For Māori At School*

<i>Learners At Risk</i>	<i>Schools At Risk</i>
safety and well-being threatened	jeopardy of safety and well-being
education below minimum standard	education below minimum standard
concern over Board and Management performance in respect to Māori and Tangata Whenua	Board & Management performance cause for concern
Disharmony in school between Māori goals and goals of school generally	Disharmony among key players
viability of Māori performance at risk from external factors	external threats to viability

The difference between the two categories is one of perception. On the one hand, the Ministry of Education has identified factors associated with schools at risk, and such schools tend to be those located in isolated or in low socio-economic areas or both. But Māori learners can be at risk anywhere for threats to Māori safety and well-being can be present in the most well resourced and high performing school. It is only when

schools are monitored in respect to what they do for Māori learners in the school that a more accurate picture emerges. Māori calls for autonomy have been generated in part by dissatisfaction with the performance of general schools in respect to outcomes for their children.

### *School Administration*

Māori control presents school managers with a different set of challenges in respect to community collaboration and an ability to recruit visionary school leaders. I use the term visionary practitioners to describe the qualities required of teachers at the school front for Māori. School effectiveness will depend on having in place visionary administrators and practitioners who can secure positive educational outcomes. Māori control presupposes different methods of delivery, for example, instituting a work environment that highlights collaboration and teamwork in an ongoing process of reflection and improvement. It expects that transfer of control from Pākehā to Māori hands automatically means a change to meaningful Māori symbols, practices and structures to the extent that whereas the former models were designed to make Pākehā learners feel at home, the change should mean that Māori learners will feel at home, that school will no longer represent cultural discontinuity for Māori learners. Yet not all Pākehā learners felt at home in their schools. Pākehā failure rates, although not the focus of this thesis, should also be cause for concern. In order not to repeat this pattern, Māori control will have to mean deep change, not a simple transfer of existing schools with high Māori numbers to Māori control without an understanding of the changes across the system which need to alter if success is to follow. As has been said many times before, Māori are not a homogeneous group, what makes a difference in one school may not be the recipe for success in another. Māori control over Māori education presupposes active networks within Māori communities, alliances with the communities from which the students are drawn so that these networks which are either fragile or non-existent in schools under Pākehā control, are in a position to take strong connections for granted under Māori control. The notion of a visionary practitioner is most important in the role of the Principal. School -based administration should mean a return to concentrating on student performance, on educational outcomes, on having the resources to serve Māori student purposes for the improvement of educational outcomes. A visionary

practitioner is one who can 'whakamana' the whole of the school process from teachers and students, parents and whānau, to communities and curriculum and work together across all of these elements to create a better future for Māori in the school.

The issue of school effectiveness for Māori has to be determined on the basis of the aspirations that Māori hold for their students and on the basis of the aspirations that the students hold for themselves. These have commonly been expressed as seeking the best of both worlds. This expression clearly indicates a desire for a combination of cultural and career choices at school in respect to subject choice, a desire to be affirmed as Māori and as an achieving student. Too many still young people discuss their educational aspirations in the context of regret and sometimes anger as they describe difficulties in accessing school programmes to meet their stated aspirations. One barrier to access commonly encountered was timetabling for the senior school that actively discriminated against senior Māori students being able to choose Māori language in conjunction with subjects that would advance career choice. Māori are expected to sacrifice cultural advancement for career advancement while students whose heritage language was English could safely access both. Schools affirm students whose heritage language is English everyday yet are content to see Māori language as peripheral despite each being an official language of Aotearoa-New Zealand. Te Reo Māori became official through legislation (1988) and the English language official by virtue of English colonisation and its compulsory place in the school curriculum. Māori centred schools are an exception in that they give both languages a place. Reforms in educational management over the past decade and a half, the emphasis on self-managing schools has concentrated on balancing the school accounts and fostering excellence of outcome for the like rather than the different.

There are many Māori who have succeeded in the education system and the schools that do well by Māori students are to be lauded for their efforts. What is yet unclear is how that success is measured, whether success is judged merely by qualification levels achieved upon leaving school which we can categorise as career trajectory success, or whether such success has come as a cost to cultural integrity, or whether success is inclusive of cultural and career achievements. The most common measure of success is educational performance ultimately measured in terms of school qualifications. Certainly there are demonstrable links between school qualification

success and increased life chances, that is, access to gainful employment, higher education, increased social status, better health and housing, all of which are of vital importance. However, this narrow view of success leaves many feeling that this is personal success not school success, and that the achievement of school qualifications happened despite the school not because of it. Certainly in a small study of Māori women's experiences at school (Waitere-Ang, H.1999), this is the conclusion. Māori women participants in the study cited numerous examples of negative treatment from teachers, of ridicule and dismissiveness of effort, even to inferences of deception when one participant outdid her Pākehā classmates in a test. The injustices experienced in school, increased the participants motivation to success despite school prejudice. Not all Māori learners will respond to discrimination in this way. Rather, records of Māori school achievement rates would suggest that the majority of Māori learners do not have strategies to overcome injustices entrenched in the school system.

Another strategy is documented in a study carried out by Hillary and Maui Mitchell in 1988. The Mitchell and Mitchell Report noted that most Māori in their study achieved at the expense of close involvement with other Māoris of their age group (1988:115). According to the Mitchells, some did manage to retain a close involvement with other Māoris and succeed academically, and in their view, those who did had outstanding personalities. The Mitchell study followed others in investigating factors which influence Māori educational success; the Ritchie Studies of the 1950's, Ausubel in 1961 and Judith Simon, 1988. The Mitchell study differs from the literature in its assertion that socio-economic status was not a prerequisite for success in their findings, adding further, that contrary to much current thinking, it is not necessary for parents to have educational qualifications for their children to make the most of opportunities available in the school system (1988:116). They concurred with conclusions drawn by Dr. Alton-Lee that a stimulating and educationally supportive home background is not dependent on high socio-economic status. Her position would be supported by narratives of the lives of Māori who have been successful. Timoti Karetu uses his own life as text in *Te Reo Rangatira*, a senior level textbook which was in common use in schools. In it he describes the elderly grandparents who brought him up and the home environment they provided for him. In a home without books he was encouraged to learn and to take advantage of the

learning school could offer. His grandparents spoke Māori but his school learning was in English.

### *Reports*

Rather than attribute institutional discrimination against Māori pupils as a cause for limited Māori success, the Mitchells see a much greater cause as being strong Māori sanctions against achieving in a system which is based on achievement. For the Mitchells, adding Māori content would be about enhancing self esteem, an acknowledgement of Māori values, but would not solve the attitudinal problem they diagnose as being more serious than low teacher expectations and racist attitudes, that is, the attitudes of the parents, whānau and peer groups to achievement. While the studies discussed are some years old now, the arguments remain the same. Parents interviewed by the Mitchells and some school staff identified parental neglect as problematic for Māori learners, citing it as a considerable influence on the underachievement of Māori learners in schools. Yet in a Massey University longitudinal study, Hoe Nuku Roa (1993-), the evidence is that Māori parents and students do have high educational aspirations, validating school achievement as an acceptable goal, 59.1% stating educational ambition and 23.9% who did not. The study was carried out with a representative sample from a mix of rural and urban sites and provinces and the results throughout the project show a combination of positive aspirations but a low level of educational achievement. What is also clear however, is the need for schools to provide avenues for Māori to achieve in a manner that affirms rather than denies Māori cultural identity. Although the majority of participants were educated through the English language mainstream schools, Māori options for education, spread among choices of Kohanga Reo, Kura Kaupapa, Bilingual classes or Māori Boarding Schools were favoured, a pattern which has some relevance to the tension found between high aspirations but low achievement. Clearly educational outcomes are seen to be attributable in some measure to the cultural incongruence in English language medium schools for Māori learners. Much of the resistance documented as peer pressure which goes beyond teenage contrariness can alternatively be seen as a survival strategy by young Māori in a hostile environment. There is no post in colonisation effects for Māori, schools legitimate colonial processes everyday when Māori identity is denied.

A study, albeit dated, of a sample of Māori University graduates (Fitzgerald 1977) showed that even for those Māori who have succeeded in the limited educational sense, that is, those who have demonstrated the capacity to gain school and tertiary level qualifications, the reference group Māori is highly significant. The observation was made that the education system as it is currently drawn up, threatens Māori identity (1977:56).

Peer pressure then as documented in the Mitchell study may have a measure of force in influencing Māori learners to under-perform at school, if so, then the tension for young Māori who do express a desire to succeed in education, but who also wish to remain loyal to Māori peers signals a dilemma for young Māori that requires resolution. The loyalty to Māori peers is about loyalty to Māori recognition whether it is manifested by Māori values or not, therefore it becomes an acknowledgement of the one significant and identifiable symbol of Māori in the school, the unity of the students themselves. To be divorced from this one symbol of Māori existence in a school is to be seen to be accepting of an assimilated identity, of denial of a perceived Māori cultural identity for personal gain. Such views are not about being against school achievement so much as being against acceptance of an assimilative school system which packages success with assimilation leaving Māori with the dilemma of having to choose one at the expense of the other, in other words the continued manifestation of the colonisation agenda.

As early as 1975 Turoa Royal raised issues of accountability, of ways in which equality of achievement could be realised. He identified a constant review of school aims and objectives as being essential if schools are to be able to respond fully to community needs. While his focus was the introduction of Māori language and culture into the curriculum, nonetheless he was concerned to see that schools did respond to their constituencies and accept liability for school shortcomings. *Administering for Excellence* raised issues of accountability again and became the force behind major reforms of the school system, yet still schools are not genuinely accountable for their performance in respect of Māori communities.

The Education Review Office has responsibility for investigating and reporting on education in schools and early childhood centres. It is responsible, through assurance audits, investigating the management of Māori Education in schools, as well as additional specific requirements for Kura Kaupapa Māori. The assurance audits are to provide the Minister, the governing body of each school and the public, with information about how well the schools are meeting their legal requirements (Education Review Office, *Accountability in Action*, undated). Surprisingly, the Education Review Office does take note of the management of education 'by Māori, for Māori and about Māori, stating that the requirements are sources in the *National Education Guidelines*, the *Education Act, 1989*, and the *State Sector Act, 1988*.

A further responsibility of the Education Review Office is to review schools in respect of their effectiveness in promoting achievement for their students. These are conducted in terms of the school boards expectations as stated in school documents, and what schools are expected to achieve, within the framework of the National Education Guidelines (Education Review Office, *Evaluation Towards Effective Education*, undated). Despite the establishment of this review process, Māori learners are still falling through the cracks in school systems. The lack of accountability by schools to their Māori constituencies is a gap in the system that is unacceptable. In some schools the students drop out, in others they are pushed out. It is not surprising therefore that there are growing numbers of Māori who have chosen to move out. Māori control over Māori education is happening, not necessarily through any major national impetus, but certainly in the gathering places for Māori, ideas and initiatives have begun to flow. Certainly, if the Education Review Office were to ask their review questions specifically about the Māori learners in the schools they visit, changes may have been instigated by school boards who need only provide an overall school profile which can successfully displace statistics related to Māori learners. It is only when Māori learners are the majority that the inadequacies of some schools become evident but can appear to be related only to those schools rather than to more.

It is not that schools and their managers do not seek to improve on current performance but rather that the measures which define performance criteria are not meaningful in terms of performance in respect of meeting the needs of Māori students and their communities of interest. In 1999 for example, the Ministry of Education

published a document on *Teacher Performance Management* that attempts to set professional standards for teachers and measure their achievement against them. The document states that the objective of performance management is to:

- improve learning outcomes for students by improving the quality of teaching and leadership;
- integrate policies, practices, standards and procedures that link the goals and objectives of the school and staff;
- set agreed performance expectations and the processes for measuring performance against those expectations. (1999:8).

Without doubt teacher performance management strategies are an effort to introduce a measure of accountability to the education system. However the sample performance indicators provided to give schools some idea about the formation of criteria are minimal. No teacher will be asked to perform outside their comfort zone to go some distance towards meeting the needs of students who fall outside these. Were teacher performance to be measured specifically against their engagement with the Māori learners in their class, there would be an end to the speculation about their capacity to teach outside their own cultural parameters. In an increasingly diverse society it is still acceptable for teacher performance to be monocultural and for appraisal systems to be structured around a monocultural norm. While this may suit those students attempting to integrate into the monocultural norms of Pākehā New Zealand society, it continues to be a further blow for Māori students with expectations of rights to freedom to learn while being free to be Māori at school. Systems of accountability in schools ought to be able to identify exactly how each component will address the learning needs of Māori students, that is, both the cultural and the career components.

### ***Teacher Education***

In 1987 Richard Benton, in a Report compiled for the Royal Commission on Social Policy, identified a range of issues relating to the adequacy of staffing and training provisions, noting, for example, Simon's point that failure to recruit, train and provide a significant number of Māori teachers to at least the proportion of Māori children in the schools, increases the impression that education is a Pākehā prerogative (1987:12). Not only could education be seen as a Pākehā prerogative, but worse,

Pākehā teachers might feel that it is and discount Māori participation. Early studies of teacher trainees examined by Benton provide some support for such a hypothesis in that the trainees are seen to be ethnocentric in their orientation, being biased at the outset about the capabilities of Māori learners. Benton cites the trainees holding views that Māori children lack in intellectual ability or application (ibid). A major study of teacher trainees, by now pre-service teacher education students conducted by Margery Renwick and June Vize (1993) included issues of equity as a concern, stating their assumption that: “Teachers had a pivotal role to play in any concerted public policy seeking greater equity and that teachers in training needed to be prepared for this aspect of their professional role” (1993:159).

By 1989, the cohort studied for the research, 100 hours of Māori Studies was mandatory in colleges of education. Student views about these programmes was mixed. The study was carried out at three different colleges and started with the 1989 intake, reinterviewing them each year to identify any change in response to questions asked in their first year of study. In regard to racism and biculturalism, fairly uninformed responses were given at the first interview and by the final year the researchers were able to say that there was a heightened awareness of the issues although about a third of the students said that their views on sexism and racism had changed, and about a quarter, that their views on socio-economic status and biculturalism had changed (1993:171). Responses differed from college to college, with some at Auckland saying that their views on racism or biculturalism had become more understanding and tolerant, and others that their attitudes were more negative. Auckland responses included some feeling that as Pākehā students they were ‘put down’ by the Māori Studies department, while those from Wellington and Christchurch who said that their views on racism or biculturalism had changed, said that increased experience and understanding had made them more positive in their attitudes (ibid). Unfortunately the large majority of these respondents will go on to become teachers and it is most likely that those who graduated from the Auckland College of Education did go on to teach in Auckland schools where the likelihood of classes with high numbers of Māori and Polynesian children is greater than in any other city. Unless there is a major intervention to change graduates views, their biases are likely to condition their work from beginning teacher years onward to senior positions of responsibility in schools. Expected leadership in respect to equity issues

will be at risk if prospective teachers cannot change. The non-Māori identity of so many teachers who carry major responsibility for teaching Māori learners in schools is a daily risk factor for Māori but a guarantee for Pākehā of the dominance of Pākehā cultural reproduction in schools.

While the number of Māori entering Pre Service Teacher Education is growing, a total of 468 across all sectors in 1998, almost double the total for 1994, the rate does not keep pace with the proportion of learners in the compulsory school sector who are Māori. In 1998 there were 174,103 Māori learners in the Early Childhood and school sector, leaving Māori, on the basis of bare figures, with a 1:15 chance of having a classroom teacher who is Māori. Since Māori learners are likely to be more clustered than are Māori teachers, the chances may be less. The likelihood of Māori learners going right through school without ever having a teacher who is Māori remains high. According to Ministry of Māori Development figures, 8% of the teacher workforce was Māori in 1998, and Māori made up 60% of the teacher workforce able to teach bilingual classes and 94% of those able to teach solely in Te Reo Māori (2000:20). While the likelihood is high that the latter group of Māori teachers will have regard for Māori cultural capital, teachers who are Māori may still concede to the dominance of Pākehā cultural reproduction in schools. In the past teachers who are Māori have had the role of inculcating a school culture that fosters Pākehā dominance.

### ***Whānau Wellbeing***

While several indicators have been used to measure socio-economic status in relationship to education and well-being, the factors shown to have the greatest influence are income and poverty, employment and occupation, health and housing (National Health Committee,1998:8). Social cohesion or interconnectedness also appears to be important in its own right. Three broad categories of indicators have also been used to describe the social well-being of New Zealanders and their significance for social policy planning:

- family and household circumstances;
- occupation and work;
- health, security and well-being (Davey,1998:1-7).

Of these, personal and household income, household composition and family type and legal and social marital scale are measures of family and household circumstances while participation in education and training, the labour force and domestic and caring work are useful to describe occupation and work. The third category, health, security and well-being, incorporates measures such as lifestyle, smoking, alcohol and drug use, accidents, disability and hospital attendance.

The development of the New Zealand Index of Occupational Status (the NZSEI) goes further, linking education and income with occupation and providing a more robust scale than the Elley-Irving Scale of male occupations. It includes women in the workforce and those in part time work. High scores are linked to occupations which are better paid with less manual work.

Measures of socio-economic well-being derived from census data, have also been developed to identify disadvantage at community, rather than household levels including a New Zealand Index of Deprivation (NZDep96).

It is based on nine variables selected from census data and applying to mesh blocks (i.e. geographical units containing about 90 people which are used for collating statistics). The nine variables are: communication (telephone), income (benefits), employment, income (equivalised income), transport (car), support (single parent), qualifications, home ownership, and living space (Crampton, Davis, 1998:81-84). The NZDep96 enables each mesh block to be given a deprivation score. The deprivation score is more about the likely health problems of individuals living in a particular residence (within a defined mesh block) than offering a direct causality with educational outcomes. For example smoking is more likely to occur where there is a high deprivation score but the links with education have to be inferred (Howden-Chapman, Cram, 1998:16-17). But just as there are implications for health from the nine variables, so to do health and socio-economic factors have flow on effects for educational outcomes. Since the majority of Māori fall into the low socio-economic areas, any proposed policy changes to facilitate positive educational outcomes for Māori needs to target people as well as places and take a multifaceted approach to solution posing. Missing from these factors are the categories of wellbeing that more

accurately engage with a Māori identity such as those that were examined in an earlier chapter.

In addition to socio-economic effects, the level of social cohesion can affect educational outcomes. Strong ties with family or whānau, high levels of civil and political participation, good public transport, good social networks and a strong community identity can overcome some of the ill-effects of deprivation. Unfortunately, the two are linked; poor housing conditions for example contribute to social exclusion while the absence of a telephone (networking) is more likely to be associated with low income. In 1996 fifteen percent of Māori households were without a telephone compared to five percent of New Zealand households (Ibid:34-35).

Targeting Māori behaviours requires an understanding of both cultural and social factors so that the message is not received as an injunction imposed from above without any reference to local feelings or realities.

# CHAPTER 10

## CONCLUSION

### EDUCATION AND MĀORI IDENTITY

Part One of the thesis set out the basis of the Māori position in Aotearoa-New Zealand. This part comprises an historical and contemporary analysis of the relationship between Māori and the state including the constitutional arrangements that exist between the two parties as they derive from the early colonial relationship between Māori and the British Crown. Part one includes a comparative exploration of indigeneity.

Part Two comprises a critique of Māori education research and argued for an indigenous methodology for understanding the lived reality of Māori 'at school'.

Part Three engaged in critical policy analysis and drew conclusions as to Māori educational aspirations.

Three themes have recurred in this thesis. The first is that more often than not the New Zealand education system has performed poorly for Māori. The second is that Māori experience of education cannot be considered outside the realities of being Māori. Underlying both themes the common thread of identity, is seen as a critical determinant of educational achievement. The third theme is that Māori are inextricably affected by the limitations on their exercise of political power, and by the on-going interplay of the colonial relationship between Māori and Pākeha to Māori disadvantage. As evident in education as it is in politics, Māori aspirations are subject to the Pākeha veto.

The binary relationship that has developed between Māori and the Crown, or Māori and the State is examined through an extensive literature, and analysed for evidence of practice that either empowers or disadvantages Māori. Despite a long history of submissions to policy makers by Māori, and an increase in the number of Māori who advise on a range of educational issues, the inequalities of power inherent in coloniser/colonised practices still have purchase in the twenty-first century.

In 1986, the Waitangi Tribunal concluded that: " something has gone wrong. Māori children are not being adequately educated. We think that the system is at fault and has been at fault for many years. We suspect that somewhere at some influential level in the Department, there remains an attitude- it may be in planning or in education boards, or at the level of principals or head teachers, we cannot say - a vestige of the attitude expressed by a former Director of Education who wrote in the middle of the first half of this century: ..The natural abandonment of the native tongue involves no loss on the Māori.." (cited in Waitangi Tribunal Report, 1986:37)

Further to the relationship between Māori and the State (Crown) has been the evolution of the major relationship for Māori as peoples, that is, the relationship between Māori and Pākeha. The colonial nature of the development of the relationship, of a differentiation between the two of political power, has meant that Māori continue to live as secondary citizens in Aotearoa-New Zealand, and that this positioning has an influence on the degree to which Māori succeed at school. A range of interacting determinants affect this major outcome. The political, economic and cultural positioning of Māori all affect Māori potential for educational success and Māori actual success. Without a significant power base, Māori are dependant upon the goodwill and support of Pākeha to help Māori in the realisation of a range of aspirations, education among them.

Apart from examination of an extensive literature, the research conducted for this thesis was informed by the views of schooling held by a number of Māori. Forty Māori participants spoke either in individual interviews or in groups, about their experiences of school and the aspirations they held then, for the future. The voices acted as a counter to the ideological positions underlying policy statements, helping to make clear the relations of power that exist in decision making processes for Māori education. Policy making elites, whether as agents of the state, or politicians in government, have the power to decide on the directions for Māori education and how those goals will be resourced. The value positions of the dominant majority find expression in policy, in law, in research and in state funded directions for change. Generally, Māori value positions remain subject to the Pākeha veto. Outside the state structures is a further power, the power of the fourth estate to influence public opinion

either for or against government policy. The media gives close scrutiny to policy for Māori. It shapes public views through the presentation of news items, highlighting opinion in editorials, and providing space for regular columnists, many of whom hold strong views. More often than not, the views present a negative view of Māori aspirations.

Policies for Māori education were examined not only for their content but for the changes they have generated over time. It was clear that by and large policies did signal an intention to effect changes, at least in the rhetoric if not in reality but all too often there was a mismatch between the policy goal and the actual outcome. For example, the Hunn Report (1960) heralded an apparent policy shift from the earlier assimilationist policies of the high colonial period of the mid to late eighteenth century, to a policy of integration. There was the suggestion that Māori knowledge had a contribution to make to the school curriculum; that the best of both cultures could be brought together to shape progress for Māori. But despite the good intentions, Māori noted so little change, that the integration policy was seen as an assimilationist policy by another name. Little about school changed except that the Māori school service was closed down. Māori cultural identity was effectively devalued in the public school system, leading to a generation of urbanised Māori who became alienated from their heritage identity and the values it encompassed.

Arising from an analysis of policy statements, and the voices of research participants, it has been possible to identify several major conclusions to this thesis. To a large degree they all hinge on the significance of being Māori and the potential of the education process to endorse or diminish a Māori identity. While clearly a strong identity is not the only ingredient in the recipe for success, failure and under-achievement are more likely to occur where there has been a dysjunction between identity, education policies, the curriculum and the school ethos.

This thesis maintains that due recognition of identity as a major determinant of educational success has been largely overlooked, initially by colonial aspirations for a mono-cultural society based on British ideals and later by a governmental preoccupation with class, equity and universal provision. Being Māori is not the same as being a New Zealander or being poor. Māori do not necessarily aspire to the same

goals as other New Zealanders, even though, like most New Zealander parents they want their children to be well educated. The equally powerful ambition is that their children should also be able to celebrate being Māori and to enjoy the benefits of modern New Zealand. The links between identity and educational success are multiple and circuitous. In so far as educational policies and practices can enhance cultural identity, educational outcomes are more likely to be favourable. But where identity is undermined by the educational process itself, the chances of doing well are correspondingly poor. Too often, a trade off is required whereby success demands the abandonment of a Māori identity.

Because many Māori have been alienated from a Māori cultural heritage, and because of the emphasis on class in the European context, it has sometimes been presumed that the effects of socio-economic disadvantage are the more important considerations for modern Māori. There is indeed abundant evidence that Māori are disproportionately represented in the lower income brackets and are therefore more prone to the misfortunes associated with disadvantage. But the class approach to Māori education overlooks the importance of culture as a foundation for identity and a building block for learning. In other words, this thesis rejects the notion that Māori educational success (or failure) is mainly a product of class.

The corollary is that Māori are more likely to succeed if the school actively endorses and promotes a strong Māori identity. Not all educationalists - Māori or non-Māori would necessarily agree that the school is the appropriate place for the intergenerational transmission of Tikanga Māori and Mātauranga Māori. Kura and Wharekura do not have to address such concerns to the same extent, but the issue of what knowledge properly belongs outside of state funded education options remains an issue. Schools do have a role to ensure that they carry out their responsibilities to Māori learners by ensuring that the contexts for learning, teaching and for school organisation are cognisant of the needs of Māori. To this extent the distinctions between Mātauranga Māori and Akoranga Māori are useful. Akoranga Māori allows for appropriate selections of Māori knowledge to be included in the school curriculum and for the teaching and learning practices used for their transmission are appropriate to Māori. Some Māori express concern that by involving themselves with Māori cultural aspirations, there is a risk that culture will be misappropriated in much the

same way that land was alienated by the early settlers. And some New Zealanders see Māori culture as they do religion – not to be brought into the school grounds. But in so far as cultural heritage is a fundamental component of identity, it cannot be set aside from the curriculum, or the school way of life as if it had no bearing on educational outcomes.

Nor is the formation of Māori identity a matter entirely for schools. Policies for Māori education must also recognise the cultural and social realities that give shape to Māori experience. Research leading to the formulation of policies needs to factor in the significance of culture, and equally the significance of cultural alienation. There is no single Māori cultural stereotype. Thus, educational policies for Māori must be able to embrace a range of circumstances recognising diversity amongst Māori. At the same time there are sufficient commonalities shared by Māori to justify a distinctive approach to research for policy development.

One commonality is an affiliation by Māori to the group. A group identity complements (or strengthens) an individual identity and often overshadows individuality. While being an individual is not unimportant, a group identity confers attributes and denotes strengths that defy individual expression. Often the preference for affiliation with the group is seen as an extension of belonging to a whanau or a hapu. In any case it is part of being Māori and a further conclusion from this thesis is that Māori are more likely to succeed at school if a cohort approach is offered so that along with the individual, the group identity can be endorsed and factored into the learning process. Māori have habitually congregated together at school, for support, for companionship and for mutual benefit; the same process can be fostered inside the classroom for similar reasons.

At a wider level, Māori educational policies and practices must be seen as part of a broader platform for Māori advancement. The tendency to sectorise development imposes artificial barriers between social and economic policies, and between social policies themselves such as education, health, and justice. In contrast, policies for Māori development attempt to bring sectors together so that an integrated approach can occur. Rather than separating education from health or employment, the starting point is community need and services are wrapped around whanau, recognising in the

process those cultural imperatives that give meaning to a Māori identity and the aspirations of Māori people. In short there is a context for Māori education that goes well beyond the boundaries of the education sector to lie within a Māori development framework

Positive development and the reassertion of cultural identity are pathways that Māori share with indigenous peoples the world over. Colonisation, depopulation, alienation from resources (including cultural resources), and political oppression, have not been the experience of Māori alone. Nor have the responses been unique. The Saami of Norway, the First Nations in Canada, Native Americans, and Australian indigenous peoples, have moved in similar directions to throw off the lingering impacts of colonisation and oppression. It is now possible to identify a common indigenous response to the injustices of the past. It includes re-culturation, a move towards self determination, active roles in service delivery, partnerships with states, and a re-exploration of indigenous knowledge. While the Māori response differs in several respects, indigenous responses can inform Māori educational planning and provide international benchmarks against which progress in Aotearoa-New Zealand can be measured.

A significant difference between the position of Māori and other indigenous peoples lies in the Treaty of Waitangi. While the Treaty does not spell out the rights that Māori might expect by virtue of being indigenous, it prescribes a relationship between Māori and the Crown, based on the principle of partnership. For many years, in so far as the Treaty was acknowledged at all, its implications tended to be limited to the ownership of physical resources. But the pronouncements of the Waitangi Tribunal regarding the importance of Māori language and the onus on the State to actively protect it, as well as the findings from the Royal Commission on Social Policy that the Treaty should be applied to social policies, greatly expanded modern understandings of the Treaty obligation. This thesis argues that the Treaty of Waitangi underpins the rationale for requiring evidence of the development of ongoing relationships between tangata whenua and the State at all stages of the policy cycle. The Treaty argument needs to be distinguished from an equity argument since it would apply even if Māori educational achievement matched non- Māori. In this light, the Treaty places a fetter

on the Crown's right to formulate policies for Māori, including educational policies, without involving Māori directly.

Active Māori participation also implies a measure of control. Misunderstandings between Māori and the State about education and other policy areas, can often be traced to a reluctance by the State to share power and to allow Māori greater control over Māori affairs. Yet there is evidence, and this thesis supports the claim, that educational achievement by Māori is more likely to occur when Māori have a degree of control over both policy formulation and the delivery of educational services. The success of Kohanga Reo as a Māori driven initiative and the development of wananga by iwi to provide alternate tertiary educational opportunities, suggest a potential that has yet to be fully realised. In those examples, a key factor has been the control that Māori have asserted over the process. These models of Māori control demonstrate the extent to which Māori display a vested interest in the education system and are willing to seek changes to it in order to further the educational aspirations of Māori.

But there are other factors as well. *Te Rērenga o te Rā* has analysed a range of factors that impact on Māori education and especially Māori educational achievement. Cultural identity and autonomy have emerged as the twin pillars upon which accomplishment can be generated. Though neither represents a total explanation, they are both highly significant prerequisites for the development of a system that can generate Māori success. Schools therefore, have an obligation to acknowledge, respect and foster the growth of a Māori cultural identity just as they do a Pākeha cultural identity for Pākeha children.

While Māori have been colonised and urbanised, the inescapable conclusion is that being Māori matters. When this attribute is factored into the education process and to policies that inform and guide the provision of education, Māori will be more likely to experience education as a source of empowerment.

## EPILOGUE

### A FINAL NARRATIVE – ONE DAY AT SCHOOL

I am nobody in particular, since I do not have my own name nor can I claim to have been one of the Forty. However, my voice comes from the hundreds of pages that make up the substance of this thesis and in that sense I speak as a last word, a final comment on the ideas, the arguments, the challenges and the hopes upon which each chapter has been crafted.

There could be many starting points, but the one that is most vivid in my mind is the day that I took my son for his first day at school. He was the oldest, the mataamua, and the hopes of our small family as well as our wider whānau were unfairly pinned on him; not that he knew. In fact he was excited about school for entirely other reasons – a chance to play with the ‘big kids’, to catch up with a cousin, to eat lunch, and to fill up the new schoolbag that his grandmother had bought him.

The road to school was a long one and there were many side streets. As if getting there were not enough of a challenge (it was 8.30 am and my little ones were still at home with their aunty), being sure about the right street was probably a bigger hurdle. A left turn here would lead to the private catholic school; a right turn would finish up at the small country school that his father attended; straight ahead would take us to the local primary. My son wondered if he would ever be able to find his way home alone. I wondered if I had chosen the right school. We both wondered how we would be received when we reached the end of the road.

We arrived, and on time. I found the classroom and walked up to the person who looked most like a teacher. I was right. ‘Good-morning’ she said, cheerfully, confidently and radiating abundant common sense. I wanted to say tena koe, and then to kiss her, not because I had any great affection for her, but to acknowledge that we were, together, about to embark on a journey to prepare my son for what was ahead of him so that he could do well for himself and perhaps also meet some of our own hopes. But there was something about the encounter – the abundant common sense

perhaps - that made me hold back. "Good-morning," I replied. "This is Te Tino Tangata."

"Oh my goodness," she exclaimed. "What do you call him for short?"

"Tino."

"Then we will call him Tim," she declared.

It was then that I had this overwhelming desire to tell her about my brilliant son and why he had been given his name. I wanted to make it clear that on his father's side he was descended from the greatest lineage of the tribe and on my side his great-great-great-grandfather had signed the Treaty of Waitangi while his grandmother had been the first postmistress in the valley. I wanted to explain that he could not only kick a ball with both feet but according to his father he could catch like a 10 year old. And I thought she ought to know that already he could write his own name and draw a fair representation of a cow. Then there was his intelligence. Because he was always asking questions about the stars and the moon we believed he could become a great scientist, maybe a teacher at a university. I wanted to boast about his ability to talk to the old people in both English and Māori and how they all seemed to warm to his enthusiasm and his energy. But most of all I wanted her to see that this boy was destined for great things and to tell her how special he was.

But I didn't. To my everlasting shame I said none of those things. Pathetically, and for some reason that was not clear to me I simply said "I hope he doesn't cause you any trouble." Why I said that I will never know. Was it something about the commonsense attitude, or the school itself, or the Pākehā teacher, or my own feeling of inadequacy? "I hope he doesn't cause you any trouble." I had set my boy up as a potential trouble-maker.

The teacher smiled, "We know how to handle them" she said. "I am sure he will be no more trouble than the rest."

Well he wasn't, but nor was he any less trouble. He quickly became another Māori boy whose abundant energy was configured into potential mischief, and whose love of talking was interpreted as defiance. As the teacher predicted they were all the same. He stopped speaking Māori to our old people, gave up on the stars and the moon and never became the All Black that his father dreamed about. Nor did his illustrious background seem to cut much ice, with his teachers or for that matter with himself.

It was time to leave. A sudden urge to take him home again came, and went. Now I was quite lost for words. Already I had said what I didn't mean. "Be good" I managed, reinforcing my earlier warning. "Yeah" he said.

The return trip home that morning was longer than the walk to school. At every cross street I hesitated. Had I made the right choice? Was this the best school for my son? Day one was hardly a long enough period of time to jump to any conclusions and in the end it would probably turn out more or less or okay. At least that is how I comforted myself. But even before I reached our house I had a gnawing feeling that although things might well be alright, I had said good bye to brilliance. Te Tino Tangata had become Tim and in an odd sort of way both his teacher and I had conspired to set the train of mediocrity in motion.

It was a relief to get back to the two little ones. They were special and I took comfort in their special-ness. I also cried a little, and not only because I missed my son. Then I did not fully know why I was crying so my sister thought it was just aroha for the boy. Many years later, however, when we helped him celebrate his 21<sup>st</sup> birthday, it was clearer. I knew I had been crying because even on that first day at school it seemed that so many of the things which made my son what he was, would never be allowed to flourish. At school he had entered a new life where he would not be seen as special and where our hopes and dreams for him – and his own dreams - would be set aside in favour of other preconceptions.

Of course it was not all bad. It never is. In the end, things turned out quite well. Some of his teachers, the ones who belonged the Rugby Club came to the 21<sup>st</sup> and spoke, with an element of surprise, about what a fine man he had become. And they

were right. He *had* become a fine man. But I knew, and I think his father did too (although we never actually spoke about it) that there is a difference between turning out quite well and reaching full promise.

I still wish his first teacher and I had started out with a better understanding so that we might have conspired to capture the promise and open out the horizons. Instead our unspoken conspiracy about putting down trouble, put too small a price on the promise within that five year old Māori boy.

I will not let my son make the same mistake when he enrolls his daughter, my mokopuna, at school next year. Her horizons should not be dimmed by the short-sightedness of those around her. She should be able to bear her name with pride and dignity and her worlds should expand to accommodate her mind and her ambition. And, more than comfortable, she should be a leader in both worlds.

## POST SCRIPT

The colonial -indigenous relationship is a defining relationship for iwi Māori in Aotearoa-New Zealand; an ongoing tension that sets Māori apart from their near Pacific neighbours who have won back political independence. Māori writers have claimed a discursive space in which to reflect upon and debate the modern relationship as the strongly material phase of colonisation shifts into a hegemonic one. While white New Zealanders were subjected to imperial hegemony to some extent through representation as colonials from a far flung corner of the British Empire, their presence in Aotearoa-New Zealand was not a forced presence. <sup>i</sup>

The articles and principles of the 1840 Treaty of Waitangi that legitimated the British presence in Aotearoa-New Zealand, have become the basis for debate over material and cultural property rights as they have either benefited or disadvantaged the respective Treaty partners.

Although this thesis is not primarily a historical one, it has nonetheless drawn on historical insights. However, just as educational policy and objectives can be culture bound, so too can historiography depend on the cultural perspectives and political motivation of historians.

Since this thesis reached its final editing stages, work that has emerged in this arena raises some pertinent issues. The discursive spaces as sites of contestation are evidenced by examples not solely between writers from the simple binary relationship between Māori and non-Māori, but also across and within tribal boundaries.

In a book edited by Judith Binney (2001) entitled; *The Shaping of History*, Wellington, Bridget Williams Books Ltd., a chapter by Tipene O'Regan, titled "Old Myths and New Politics", sets out some key points in Ngai Tahu history that he considers the basis of Ngai Tahu understanding of Ngai Tahu manawhenua over their designated tribal region. 'I am willing to have it tested by rigorous examination and subjected to scrutiny within the discipline of Māori traditional history and conventional historical method' (p.19).

In contrast, Te Maire Tau, also Ngai Tahu, asks the question 'Can Māori, who in the main have been removed from their traditional villages and who are increasingly assimilating the culture, language, genes and memes of the colonizers, claim any real connection to the past in a manner that does not resemble the claim by Charlemagne?'<sup>ii</sup>

The future of Ngai Tahu lies in accepting the death of the past. Like the Western God, our ancestors are dead' (p.150).

As a Māori historian, Tau challenges the continuity of Māori views that see the interconnections with the environment as extensions of personal and collective identity. For him, if Māori interact and view the world 'according to a text already written', it can be defined as mirror knowledge and as such, lead ultimately to the death of knowledge itself. Tau's work entitled; "The Death of Knowledge," is published in the *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol.35,no.2 (October 2001) 131-152

While Sir Tipene and Tau might contest Ngai Tahu positioning, Ngai Tahu has also been challenged from without in cross claims to compensation for colonial dispossession of lands in the South Island tribal estates by hapu of both Rangitāne and Te Ati Awa.

In a keynote address to the New Zealand Historical Association Conference (December 2001), Kerry Howe argues that debates over the Treaty of Waitangi and ethnicity have led to a uni-dimensional picture of the colonial past, one that is difficult to challenge. Such an argument reinforces Tau's view of a set text. As a historian, Howe contends that little is known about Māori society in the nineteenth century. He makes reference to a 'glaring nineteenth century silence' (p.4)

An earlier writer, Ann Parsonson, signalled the potential for the diversity of traditional societies to be ignored in an article entitled "The expansion of a competitive society", *New Zealand Journal of History*, vol.14, no.1 (April 1980): 45-60.

Similarly, Alan Ward, a historian who has worked closely with Treaty claimants and the Waitangi Tribunal, observes that, "Even if the Māori world was uniform and homogenous before 1769 it certainly ceased to be so thereafter." (p.120). He warns that; "suddenly introducing a monolithic Māori perspective, as if it were the only one, and withholding critical scrutiny and discussion out of deference or political correctness is no solution," (p.120). Ward's work is entitled; "Historical Method and Waitangi Tribunal Claims." It is published in a 1996 text edited by Miles Fairburn & W.H.Oliver, *The Certainty of Doubt: Tributes to Peter Munz*, Wellington, Victoria University Press.

It would be a mistake to view Māori experiences as uni-dimensional, Māori have had to be expert at managing multiple relationships whether through whanau, hapu or tribal alliances. Historically, iwi and hapu have managed those relationships through the nuances and flexibilities of oral history, telling the text in the context for which it is applicable.

However, at the colonial-indigenous front, the commonalities of experience and of outcomes of those experiences allow for Māori peoples to advance a common cause and commonality of interests beyond the intra and inter tribal.

There can be no singular interpretation of the past nor has that been the intention of this thesis. Whether in the silence of the written word or the eloquence of the oral tradition, the texts of Māori historiographies reflect the frames in which they are set. Much depends on the balance between oral and written evidence and how these might be weighted-a point on which historians generally, have yet to find agreement.

---

<sup>i</sup> See Glen Thomas (1993) for a similar discussion on the predicament of white Australians.

<sup>ii</sup> Tau is making reference here to a scenario where Charlemagne 'believed he was a legitimate Roman Emperor in AD 800, when the last Roman Emperor in the west, Romulus Augustus, was captured in Ravenna and forcibly retired to Campania on a pension in AD 476' (2001:150).

# HE RĀRANGI WHAKAPUAKANGA

## REFERENCES

(1990 May). The Dominion Sunday Times.

Hui Rangatiratanga Report. (1990). (Findings of a Hui held at Rotorua Lakes High School, July).

Kotahitanga Centenary Rangiata, East Cape Waipatu. (1992). Auckland.

The Unfortunate Experiment at Henderson High . (1990). (April), 94-98. Auckland: Metro Publishing Partnership.

Adams, P. (1977). Fatal Necessity: British Intervention in New Zealand, 1830-1847. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

AJHR. (1968). E-1:27.

Anderson, G. (1990). Fundamentals of Educational Research. London: The Falmer Press.

Apple, M. W. (1993). Official Knowledge. London: Routledge.

Apple, M. W. (1999). Power, Meaning and Identity. New York: Peter Lang.

Asher, G., & Naulls, D. (1987). Māori Land. Wellington: New Zealand Planning Council.

Assembly of First Nations. (1998). Residential School Update, March 1998. Ottawa: AFN Health Secretariat.

Ausubel, D. P. (1961). Māori Youth. Wellington: Price Milburn.

Ball, D. G. (1940). Māori Education. in I.L.G. Sutherland (ed.), The Māori People Today . Wellington: Whitcombe and Tombs.

Ball, S. J. (1994). Education Reform. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Banks, J. A. (1994). Multiethnic Education. MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Barrington, J. M., & Beaglehole, E. (1974). Māori Schools in a Changing Society. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.

Battiste, M. (2000). Reclaiming Indigenous Voice. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Beeby, C. E. (1992). The Biography of an Idea. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.

Belich, J. (1986). The New Zealand Wars. Auckland: Auckland University Press.

Benton, R. (1981). The Flight of the Amokura. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.

- Benton, R. (1987). How Fair is New Zealand Education? Part 11, Fairness in Māori Education. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.
- Benton, R. (1988). The Matawaia Declaration: Some Educational and Administrative Implications. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.
- Best, E. (1952). The Māori as he was: A brief account of Māori life as it was in pre-European days. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Beyer, L. E., & Apple, M. W. (1998). The Curriculum. Albany: New York State University Press.
- Bishop, R. (1996). Addressing Issues of Self-Determination and Legitimation in Kaupapa Māori Research. in B. Webber (ed.), He Paepae Korero . Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.
- Bishop, R., & Glynn, T. (1999). Culture Counts. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Boast, R. P. (1990). Treaty Rights or Aboriginal Rights. New Zealand Law Journal, (January).
- British Parliament. (1841). Parliamentary Papers. 311(XVII), 28.
- Broadfoot, P. Changing Priorities in Assessment: An International Reform Agenda. in Qualifications for the 21st Century. Wellington, New Zealand.
- Brookfield, F. M. (1989). The New Zealand Constitution. Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Brownlie, I. (1992). Indigenous Peoples: A Relevant Concept? in F. M. Brookfield (ed.), Treaties and Indigenous Peoples . New York : Oxford University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1986). Actual Minds, Possible Worlds. Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1996). The Culture of Education. Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Buck, P. The Value of Tradition in Polynesian Research. Journal of the Polynesian Society, 35, 181-203.
- Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1988). The Self-Managing School. London: Falmer Press.
- Carlson, D., & Apple, M. W. (1998). Power, Knowledge and Pedagogy. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1987). The Chomsky Reader. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Churchill, W. (1993). Colonialism, Genocide and the Expropriation of Indigenous Spiritual Tradition in Contemporary Academia. in Indigenous Voices . Hamilton: Ontario.
- Churchill, W. (1995). Since Predator Came. Littleton: Aigis.
- Clark, N. (1991). The Hyperenchantment of the World? Ecology, Aesthetics and the Postmodern. Sites, 22(Autumn).

- Cloher, D. U. (1999). Research Strategy for Examining the Determinants of Māori/Non-Māori Disparities. Research Report. Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Codd, J. A. (1988). The Construction and Deconstruction of Educational Policy Documents. Journal of Education Policy, 3(3), 235-247.
- Codd, J. A. (1990). Educational Policy and the Crisis of the New Zealand State. in S. Middleton, J. Codd, & A. Jones (eds.), New Zealand Education Policy Today: Critical Perspectives. Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Cody, J. F. (1953). Man of Two Worlds. Wellington: A.H. and A.W. Reed.
- Committee to Review Curriculum for Schools. (1987). The Curriculum Review. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Connolly, P., & Troyna, B. (eds.). (1998). Researching racism in education: politics, theory and practice. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Constantino, R. (1978). Neocolonial Identity and Counter Consciousness. London: Merlin.
- Cox, L. (1993). Kotahitanga: The Search for Māori Political Unity. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Crampton, P., & Davis, P. (1998). Measuring Deprivation and Socio-Economic Status: Why and How? The New Zealand Public Health Report, 5(11/12), 81-84.
- Cunningham, C. (1999). Responsive Research in Māori Education. Palmerston North: School of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Curry, G. A. (1962). Report of the Commission on Education in New Zealand. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Daglish, N. (1980). How Half-Civilized People Ought to be Managed: John Gorst, Education and the Waikato Māoris, 1860-1863. Durham and Newcastle Research Review, IX(45), 135-144.
- Dakin, J. C. (1973). Education in New Zealand. Auckland: Leonard Fullerton.
- Davey, J. (1998). Tracking Social Change in New Zealand: From Birth to Death IV. Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies.
- De Tocqueville, A. (1946). Democracy in America (1965 ed.). London: Oxford University Press.
- Delgado-Bernal, D. (1998). Using a Chicana Feminist Epistemology. Educational Review, 68 Winter(4).
- Delgado-Gaitan, D. (1993). Researching Change and Changing the Researcher. Harvard Educational Review, 63 Winter(4).
- Deloria, V., & Cadwalader, S. (1984). The Aggressions of Civilisation: American Indians Policy since the 1880's. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1994). Handbook of Qualitative Research. London: Sage.
- Department of Education. (1961). The Arts of the Māori. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Department of Education. (1989). Tomorrow's Schools. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Department of Justice. (1988). Principles for Crown Action on the Treaty of Waitangi. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Department of Prime Minister and Cabinet. (1997). Strategic Result Areas for the Public Sector 1997-2000. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Dewes, K. (1975). The Case for Oral Arts. in M. King (ed.), Te Aohurihuri. Wellington: Hicks, Smith and Sons.
- Duff, R. (1956). The Moa-Hunter Period of Māori Culture. Wellington: R.E. Owen Government Printer.
- Durie, A. E. (1990). The Changing Nature of Māori Families. Fourth International Congress on Women's Health Issues Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Durie, A. E. (1993). Evaluation of the Tihe Mauriora Teacher Development Contract. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Durie, A. E. (1989). Mana Māori and Development. Delta, 42, 15-18.
- Durie, A. E. (1993). Papatuanuku te Ukaipo. in Proceedings of the UNESCO Asia-Pacific Regional International Experts Meeting, Griffith University. Brisbane: Griffith University.
- Durie, A. E. (1993). Report on the Evaluation of the 'Tihe Mauriora' Teacher Development Contract. Palmerston North: ERDC, Massey University.
- Durie, A. E. (1997). A seed that is sown from Rangiatea will never be lost. in J. Cummins (ed.), The Encyclopedia of Language and Education, 5. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Durie, A. E. (1994). The Treaty of Waitangi in the Life of the Nation. in P. Green (ed.), Studies in New Zealand Social Problems. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Durie, A. E. (1992). Whaia te Ara Tika: Research Methodologies and Māori. Paper presented at a Māori Research Seminar. Massey University.
- Durie, M. H. (2001). A Framework for Considering Māori Educational Advancement. Paper presented at a National Māori Education Hui, Taupo.
- Durie, M. H. (2001). The Hui Taumata Mātauranga: Progress and Platforms for Māori Educational Advancement. Paper presented at a National Māori Education Hui, Taupo.
- Durie, M. H. (1998). Te Mana Te Kawanatanga: The Politics of Māori Self-Determination. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

- Durie, M. H. (1995). Tino Rangatiratanga. A Discussion Paper, Māori Congress.
- Durie, M. H. (1989). The Treaty of Waitangi - Perspectives on Social Policy. in I.H. Kawharu (ed.), Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi . Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Durie, M. H. et. al. (1996). Māori Profiles, A Report to Te Puni Kōkiri. (Report No. THR 96/1). Palmerston North: Department of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Durie, M. H. et. al. (1995). Te Hoe Nuku Roa Framework: A Māori Identity Measure. Journal of the Polynesian Society, 104(4), 461-470.
- Education Review Office. (1997). Students at Risk: Barriers to Learning, No. 7, Winter. Wellington: Te Tari Arotake Mātauranga.
- Elder, J. R. (1934). Marsden's Lieutenants. Dunedin: Coulls Somerville Wilkie and A.H. Reed for the Otago University Council.
- Evans, B. L. (1969). A History of Agricultural Production and Marketing in New Zealand. Palmerston North: Keeling and Mundy.
- Ewen, A. (1994). Voice of Indigenous Peoples. Santa Fe: Clear Light Publications.
- Fanon, F. (1967). The Wretched of the Earth. London: Penguin.
- Featherstone, M. (1990). Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalisation and Modernity. London: Sage.
- Fitzgerald, T. K. (1977). Education and Identity: A Study of the New Zealand Māori Graduate  
Global Culture: Nationalism, Globalisation and Modernity. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.
- Fleras, A. (1999). Politicising Indigeneity. in P. Havemann (ed.), Indigenous Peoples' Rights . Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1988a). The care of the self: The History of Sexuality, 3. (R. Hurley Trans.) New York: Vintage House.
- Foucault, M. (1988b). The Political Technology of Individuals. in L. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. Hutton (eds.), Technologies of the Self . Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1980). Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Freeman, W. L. (1993). Research in Rural Native Communities. in M.J. Bass et. al. (eds.), Conducting Research in the Practice Setting, 5 . Newbury Park: Sage.
- Freire, P. (1998). Teachers as Cultural Workers: Letters to Those Who Dare. Boulder: Westview Press.

- Gall, M., Borg, W., & Gall, J. (1996). Educational Research: An Introduction (Sixth ed.). U.S.A.: Longman.
- Galtung, J. (1994). Human Rights in Another Key. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Garcia, R. (1982). Teaching in a pluralistic society: concepts, models, strategies. New York: Harper and Row.
- Gerwitz, S., Ball, S. J., & Bowe, R. (1995). Markets, Choice and Equity in Education. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Gibson, M. A., & Ogbu, J. U. (1991). Minority Status and Schooling. New York: Garland.
- Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). Becoming Qualitative Researchers: An Introduction. New York: Longman.
- Goulton, F. (1997). He Huarahi Ako: Pathways to Learning. Masters Thesis, Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Grace, G. (1990). The New Zealand Treasury: The Commodification of Education. in S. Middleton, J. Codd, & A. Jones (eds.), New Zealand Education Policy. Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). Selections From the Prison Notebooks. New York: International Publishers.
- Hacksaw, F. (1989). Nineteenth Century Notions of Aboriginal Title and their Influence on the Interpretation of the Treaty of Waitangi. in I.H. Kawharu (ed.), Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, S. (1997). Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices. London: Sage.
- Hall, S., Held, D., & McGrew, T. (1992). Modernity and its Futures. Oxford: Open University Press.
- Ham, C., & Hill, M. (1993). The Policy Process in the Modern Capitalist State. Sussex: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Harker, R. K., & McConnochie, K. R. (1985). Education as a cultural artifact: studies in Māori and Aboriginal education. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Harre, J. (1966). Māori and pākehā: a study of mixed marriages in New Zealand. Wellington: Reed.
- Hastings, W. K. (1996). The Right to an Education in Māori. Wellington: Institute of Policy Studies.
- Havemann, P. (1999). Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Australia, Canada and New Zealand. Auckland: Oxford.

- Healey, K. (1993). Indigenous Peoples: Issues for the Nineties, 10. NSW: The Spinney Press.
- Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (1999). Global Transformations. California: Stanford.
- Henare, D. (1995). The Ka Awatea Report. in M. Wilson, & A. Yeatman (eds.), Justice and Identity . Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Hirsh, W. (1990). Issues and Factors Related to Māori Achievement in the Education System. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Hobsbawn, E., & Ranger, T. (1983). The Invention of Tradition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hohepa, M., & McNaughton, S. (1993). Tikanga a Rangahau: Nga Mahi Hāhu: Practices of Research. in F. Cram, & M. Nairn (eds.), New Zealand Psychological Society Bulletin, Special Issue, Number 76, March .
- Hollis, M., & Lukes, S. (1982). Rationality and Relativism. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Howden-Chapman, P., & Cram, F. (1998). Social, Economic and Cultural Determinants of Health. Paper prepared for the National Health Committee on Health and Disability, Wellington.
- Hughes, J. (1989). The Philosophy of Social Research. Essex: Longman.
- Hui Reo Rua o Aotearoa. (1988). The Matawaia Declaration. Matawaia.
- Hunn, J. K. (1960). Report on the Department of Māori Affairs. Wellington.
- Irwin, K. (1994). Māori Research Methods and Practices. Sites, 28(Autumn), 25-43.
- Jackson, M. (undated). The Crown, The Treaty and the Usurpation of Māori Rights. Paper delivered at the Human Rights in the Pacific and Asia Conference Wellington.
- Jackson, M. (1975). Literacy, Communication and Social Change. in I.H. Kawharu (ed.), Conflict and Compromise . Wellington: A.H. and A.W. Reed.
- Jackson, M. (1989). The Treaty of Waitangi and the Drafting of the Education Bill. Prepared for the Runanga Matua.
- Jackson, S. (1990). Te Karanga o te Iwi. 140. Auckland: Metro Publishing Partnership.
- Jackson, W. K. (1970). New Zealand in the Pacific. in B.M. Brown (ed.), New Zealand in the Pacific (pp. 19-29).
- Jahnke, H. T. (1996). Whaia te Iti Kahurangi, Contemporary Perspectives of Māori Women Educators. Masters Thesis, Palmerston North: Massey University.
- James, C. (1992). New territory: the transformation of New Zealand, 1984-92. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

- Jehlen, M. (1997). History Beside the Fact. in E.A. Kaplan, & G. Levine (eds.), The Politics of Research . New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Jennings, H. M. (1950). The Māori District High School. MA Thesis, Wellington: Victoria University.
- Jesson, B. (1999). Only Their Purpose is Mad. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Johnston, P. M. G. (1998). He Ao Rereke: Education Policy and Māori Under-achievement - Mechanisms of Power and Difference. PhD Thesis, Auckland: Auckland University .
- Kaplan, E. A., & Levine, G. (1997). The Politics of Research. New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- Kawagley, A. O. (1995). A Yupiaq World View: A Pathway to Ecology and Spirit. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Kawharu, I. H. (1975). Conflict and Compromise. Wellington: A.H. and A.W. Reed.
- Kawharu, I. H. (1977). Māori Land Tenure. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kawharu, I. H. (1975). Orakei: A Ngati Whātua Community. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.
- Kawharu, I. H. (1989). Waitangi: Māori and Pākeha Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Kelsey, J. (1995). Globalisation, Sovereignty and the State. Sites, 30(Autumn), 165-172.
- Kelsey, J. (1995). The New Zealand Experiment. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Kelsey, J. (1990). A Question of Honour? Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Kelsey, J. (1999). Reclaiming the Future. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Kelsey, J. (1993). Rolling Back the State. Wellington: Bridget Williams.
- King, M. (1989). Mori Mori: A People Rediscovered. Auckland: Viking, Penguin Books.
- King, M. (1976). Te Ao Hurihuri. Wellington: Hicks, Smith and Sons.
- Kohere, R. T. (undated, unpublished). Manuscript.
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lange, D. (1988). Tomorrow's Schools: The Path to Change. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Lauder, H. (1990). The New Right Revolution and Education in New Zealand. in S. Middleton, J. Codd, & A. Jones (eds.), New Zealand Education Policy Today . Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Lukes, S. (1974). Power: A Radical View. London: Macmillan.

- Maddock, K. (1991). Identity, Land and Liberty. Niimegen: Instituut voor Culturele und Sociale Antropologie.
- Magga, O. H. (1993). The Policy Towards the Sami People in Norway. in Majority-Minority Relations Proceedings of a Seminar held in Guovdageaidnu, Norway: World Commission on Culture and Development.
- Mahuika, A. T. (1976). Leadership Inherited and Achieved. in M. King (ed.), Te Ao Hurihuri . Wellington: Hicks, Smith and Sons.
- Manuel, G., & Posluns, M. (1974). The Fourth World. Canada: Collier McMillan.
- Māori Studies Department. (1994). Kia Pumau Tonu. Hui Whakapumau Māori Development Conference Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Marshall, R. (1985). PPTA News 6. Wellington: PPTA.
- McHugh, P. G. (1989). Constitutional Theory and Māori Claims. in I.H. Kawharu (ed.), Waitangi: Māori and Pākehā Perspectives of the Treaty of Waitangi . Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- McIntyre, W. D., & Gardner, W. J. (1971). Speeches and Documents on New Zealand History. Wellington: Oxford University Press.
- McKinlay, P. (1990). Redistribution of Power? Devolution in New Zealand. Wellington: Victoria University Press.
- Mead, S. M. (1984). Nga Timunga me nga Paringa o te Mana Māori. in S.M. Mead, & et. al. Te Māori . Auckland: Heinemann.
- Meek, R. L. (1976). Social Science and the Ignoble Savage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Metge, J. (1999). Changing Whānau Structures and Practices. Proceedings of Te Hua o te Whānau Palmerston North: Te Pūtahi a Toi.
- Metge, J. (1967). The Māoris of New Zealand. London: Routledge and Keegan-Paul.
- Middleton, S., Codd, J., & Jones, A. (1990). New Zealand Education Policy Today. Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Miliband, R. (1969). The State in Capitalist Society. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Ministerial Advisory Committee on a Māori Perspective for the Department of Social Welfare. (1986). Puao-Te-Ata-Tu. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Ministry of Education. (2000). Nga Haeata Mātauranga. Wellington: Te Tahuu o te Mātauranga.
- Ministry of Education. (1999). Nga Haeta Mātauranga. Wellington: Te Tahuu o te Mātauranga.

- Ministry of Education. (1998). School Statistics. Wellington: Te Tahuu o te Mātauranga.
- Ministry of Education. (1999). Teacher Performance Management. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (1999). Teacher Performance Management. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Ministry of Education. (1990). Tihe Mauri Ora, Māori Language Syllabus for Schools. Wellington: Ministry of Education.
- Miron, L. F. (1996). The Social Construction of Urban Schooling: Situating the Crisis. New Jersey: Hampton Press.
- Mitchell, H. A., & Mitchell, M. J. (1988). Profiles of Māori pupils with high marks in School Certificate English and Mathematics. Wellington: Department of Education.
- Moon, P. (1993). Māori Social and Economic History to the end of the Nineteenth Century. Auckland: Birdwood.
- Mulgan, R. (1989). Māori, Pākehā and Democracy. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Mullard, C. (1985). Race, Power and Resistance. London: Routledge.
- Murchie, E. (1984). Rapuora: Health and Māori Women. Wellington: Māori Womens' Welfare League.
- Murray-McIntosh, R. P. et. al. (1996). Testing Migration Patterns across Polynesia with Sequences of the Hypervariable Region of Human Mitochondrial DNA. Wellington: School of Medicine.
- NACME National Advisory Committee on Māori Education. (1980). He Huarahi. Wellington: Department of Education.
- National Advisory Committee on Māori Education. (1980). He Huarahi. Wellington: National Advisory Committee on Māori Education.
- National Health Committee. (1998). The Social Cultural and Economic Determinants of Health in New Zealand: Action to Improve Health. Wellington: National Advisory Committee on Health and Disability.
- National Māori Congress. Minutes of May Hui, Hastings. 1993, unpublished.
- Ngugi, W. T. (1986). Decolonising the Mind. Portsmouth: Heineman.
- Nicholson, S. (1986). Gender and History: The Limits of Social Theory in the Age of the Family. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nisga'a Nation. (2000). Appendices Nisga'a Final Agreement. BC: Nisga'a Nation.
- Nisga'a Nation. (2000). Nisga'a Final Agreement. BC: Nisga'a Nation.

- Nisga'a Nation. (undated). Wilp Wilxo'Oskwhl Nisga'a: For the Nisga'a Nation, Formal Education Comes Home . New Aiyansh: Nisga'a Nation.
- Nisga'a Tribal Council. (1996). Nisga'a Agreement in Principle Makes BC History. New Aiyansh: Nisga'a Tribal Council.
- Nordstrom, H., & Vaughan, S. (1999). Trade and Environment. Geneva: World Trade Organisation.
- Nyce, D. (1995). Wilp Wilxo'oskwhl Nisga'a. New Aiyansh: Nisga'a Tribal Council.
- NZCER. (2000). Research News, 31(2, September).
- O'Dowd, L. (1990). Preface. in A. Memmi The Coloniser and the Colonised . London: Earthscan.
- Oddie, G., & Perrett, R. (1992). Justice, Ethics and New Zealand Society. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- OECD. (1995). Schools Under Scrutiny. Paris: OECD.
- Offe, C. (1984). Contradictions of the Welfare State. London: Hutchinson.
- Ogbu, J. U. (1991). Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities in Comparative Perspective. in M.A. Gibson, & J.U. Ogbu (editors), Minority Status and Schooling . New York: Garland Publishing.
- Oliver, W. H. (1977). The Origins and Growth of the Welfare State. in A.D. Trlin Social Welfare and New Zealand Society . Wellington: Methuen.
- Olssen, M. (1988). Mental Testing in New Zealand. Dunedin: University of Otago Press.
- Omi, M., & Winant, H. (1989). Racial Formation in the United States. London: Routledge.
- Openshaw, R., Lee, G., & Lee, H. (1993). Challenging the Myths. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Orange, C. (1990). The Dictionary of New Zealand Biography, 1, 1769-1869. Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Orange, C. (1987). The Treaty of Waitangi. Wellington: Allen and Unwin.
- Parata, H. Mainstreaming a Māori Affairs Policy. in Ka Pumau Tonu, Proceedings of the Hui Whakapumau August 1994 . Palmerston North: Māori Studies Department, Massey University.
- Parker, W. (undated). Korero Purakau no Te Ao Māori. (Unpublished paper) Palmerston North: Department of Education, Massey University.
- Pei, M. (1952). The Story of English. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company.
- Penetito, W. T. (1986). Ideology and Practice in Māori Education: Two Sides of the Same Coin. Keynote Address to Principal's Centre. Auckland: University of Auckland.

- Penetito, W. T. (1984). Taha Māori and the Core Curriculum. Delta, 34.
- Penetito, W. T. (1986). Taha Māori in Schools, Revolution or Transformation. Paper presented to West Auckland Principals' Association Conference. Auckland..
- Penetito, W. T. (1986). Towards Social Justice, Curriculum, Culture and Context. Paper presented at Institute for Educational Research. Wellington.
- Pere, R. R. (1982). Ako: Concepts and Learning in the Māori Tradition. Working Paper, Number 17. Hamilton: University of Waikato.
- Pihama, L. (1993). Tungia te Ururua, kia tupu whakaritorito te tupu o te Harakeke. M.A. Thesis, University of Auckland: University of Auckland.
- Pool, I. (1991). Te Iwi Māori. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Popkewitz, T. S. (1999). Critical Traditions, Modernisms, and the 'Posts'. in T.S. Popkewitz, & L. Fendler (eds.), Critical Theories in Education: Changing Terrains of Knowledge and Politics . New York: Routledge.
- Poulantzas, N. (1973). Political Power and Social Classes. London: New Left Books.
- Prakash, G. (1995). After Colonialism. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature. New York: Bantam Books.
- Prime Ministerial Taskforce on Employment. (1994). He Puanga Mahi Rau. Wellington: Prime Ministerial Taskforce on Employment.
- Puketapu, B. T. (1993). He Mata Ngaro: Māori Leadership in Educational Administration. Masters Thesis, Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Pybus, T. A. (1954). The Māoris of the South Island. Wellington: Reed.
- Rains, F. V. (1999). Historical Amnesia and Intellectual Authority. in L.M. Semali, & J.L. Kincheloe What is Indigenous Knowledge? New York: Falmer Press.
- Ramsay, P. D. K. (1972). Māori Schooling. in S.J. Havill, & D.R. Mitchell (eds.), Issues in New Zealand Education . Auckland: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Rangihau, J. (1976). Learning and Tapu. in M. King (ed.), Te Aohurihuri, The World Moves On . Wellington: Hicks, Smith and Son Ltd.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). Feminist Methods in Social Research. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Renwick, R., & Vise, J. (1993). Windows on Teacher Education. Wellington: N.Z.C.E.R.
- Report of the Committee to Review the Curriculum for Schools. (1987). The Curriculum Review. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Reynolds, H. (1998). This Whispering in our Hearts. Australia: Allen and Unwin.

- Riggs, P. R. (1992). Whys and Ways of Science. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Ritchie, J. (1956). Basic Personality in Rakau. Wellington: Victoria University.
- Ritchie, J. (1957). Childhood in Rakau. Wellington: Victoria University.
- Ritchie, J., & Ritchie, J. (1993). Violence in New Zealand. Wellington: Brassell.
- Roper, B., & Rudd, C. (1993). State and Economy in New Zealand. Auckland: Oxford University Press.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1988). The April Report, 11. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Royal Commission on Social Policy. (1987). Te Tiriti o Waitangi me te Kaupapa mo Nga Ahuatanga-a-Iwi, Nama 1. Wellington: RCSP.
- Royal, T. (1983). Accountability to the Multicultural Community. Paper presented to the Third NZEAS Conference. Auckland Teachers' College: Auckland.
- Royal, T. C. (1998). Te Ao Mārama - A Research Paradigm. in Te Pū Manawa Hauora (eds.), Te Oru Rangahau: Proceedings of the Māori Research and Development Conference. Palmerston North: School of Māori Studies, Massey University.
- Said, E. W. (1993). Culture and Imperialism. London: Vintage.
- Said, E. W. (1993). Orientalism. New York: Vintage.
- Salmond, A. (1976). Āmiria: The Life Story of a Māori Woman. Wellington: A.H. and A.W. Reed.
- Sambo, D. (1993). Indigenous Peoples and International Standards - Setting Processes: Are States Governments Listening? Transnational Law and Comparative Problems, 3.
- Sarup, M. (1991). Education and the Ideologies of Racism. Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham.
- Schwab, J. (1978). The Practical: A Language for Curriculum. in I. Westbury, & Wilkof (eds.), Science, Curriculum and Liberal Education: Selected Essays. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Scott, R. A. (1986). The challenge of taha Māori: a Pākeha perspective. Auckland: Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.
- Semali, L. M., & Kincheloe, J. L. (1999). What is Indigenous Knowledge: Voices From the Academy. New York: Falmer Press.
- Sen, A. (1998). On Ethics and Economics. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sennett, R. (1995). Something in the City. in Times Literary Supplement 22.
- Serrano, R. C. (1996). Letter to the ed. Indigenous Knowledge Monitor, 4(April), 14-16.
- Sharp, A. (1990). Justice and the Māori. Auckland: Oxford University Press.

- Shiva, V. (1993). Monocultures of the Mind. Penang: Third World Network.
- Simon, J. (1986). Ideology in the Schooling of Māori Children. in Delta: Research Monograph No. 7. Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Sinclair, K. (1952). Māori Nationalism and the European Economy 1850-60. Historical Studies, 5(May), 119.
- Skuttnab-Kangas, T., & Cummins, J. (1988). From Shame to Struggle. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Smith, G. H. (1997). The Development of Kaupapa Māori: Theory and Praxis. PhD Thesis, Auckland: Auckland University.
- Smith, G. H. (1992). Research Issues Related to Māori Education. in The Issue of Research and Māori. Auckland: University of Auckland Research Unit for Māori Education.
- Smith, G. H. (1990). Taha Māori: Pākeha Capture. in J. Codd, R. Harker, & R. Nash (eds.), Political Issues in New Zealand Education. Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Smith, L. T. (1999). Decolonising Methodologies. London: Zed Books.
- Smith, L. T. (1996). Nga Aho o Te Kākahu Mātauranga: The Multiple Layers of Struggle by Māori in Education. PhD Thesis, Auckland: Auckland University.
- Snook, I. (1990). Educational Reform in New Zealand: what is going on? Access: Critical Perspectives on Education Policy, 8(2), 9-18.
- Snook, I. (1981). Ethics of Educational Research. Delta, 29, 9-15.
- Sorenson, M. P. K. (1998). Nā To Hoa Āroha, From Your Dear Friend, Vol. 3. Auckland: Auckland University Press.
- Statistics New Zealand. (1998). New Zealand Now: Māori. Wellington: Department of Statistics.
- Stephenson, M. A., & Ratnapala, S. (1993). Mabo: A Judicial Revolution. St Lucia: Queensland University Press.
- Stokes, E. (1985). Māori Research and Development: A Discussion Paper. Wellington: National Research Advisory Council.
- Sunstein, C. R. (1997). Free Markets and Social Justice. New York: Oxford.
- Taskforce to Review Education Administration. (1988). Administering for Excellence. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Tauroa, H. (1984). Māoritanga in Practice. Auckland: Office of the Race Relations Conciliator.
- Tawhai, T. (1978). He Tipuna Wharenui o Te Rohe O Uepohatu. Masters Thesis, Palmerston North: Massey University.

- Te Ariki, C., & Spoonley, P. (1992). Te Whakapakari Te Mana Tangata. Palmerston North: Sociology Department, Massey University.
- Te Awekōtuku, N. (1991). He Tikanga Whakaaro: Research Ethics in the Māori Community. Wellington: Manatu Māori.
- Te Ohu Kaimoana. (1999). Report to the Minister. Wellington: Māori Fisheries Commission.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (1999). The International Labour Organisation Convention No. 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries 1989: Discussion Document. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (1998). The National Māori Language Survey. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Puni Kōkiri. (2000). Progress Towards Closing Social and Economic Gaps Between Māori and Non-Māori. Wellington: Ministry of Māori Development.
- Te Roopu Whaiti. (2001). Te Manatū Mātauranga Māori Discussion Paper.
- Temm, P. (1990). The Waitangi Tribunal: the conscience of a nation. Auckland: Random Century NZ Ltd.
- The Treasury. (1987). Government Management: Brief to the Incoming Government, 11. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Thomas, J. (1993). Doing Critical Ethnography. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tovey, A. G. (1961). The Arts of the Māori. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). Individualism and Collectivism. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Troyna, B., & Hatcher, R. (1992). Racism in children's lives: a study of mainly-white primary schools. London; New York: Routledge in association with the National Children's Bureau.
- Troyna, B., & Hatcher, R. (1992). Racism in Children's Lives: A Study of Mainly White Primary Schools. London: Routledge.
- Venne, S. H. (1998). Our Elders Understand Our Rights: Evolving International Law Regarding Indigenous Rights. Penticton, B.C.: Theytus Books.
- Von Glahn, G. (1981). Law Among Nations. New York: McMillan.
- Wagner, R. (1975). The Invention of Culture. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Waho, T. (1999). Mana Tamariki. Proceedings of Te Hua o te Whānau Palmerston North: Te Pūtahi a Toi.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (1987). The Orakei Report. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Waitangi Tribunal. (1986). Te Reo Māori Report. Wellington: Government Printer.

- Waitere-Ang, H. J. (1999). Te Kete, the Briefcase, Te Tuara: The Balancing Act - Māori Women in the Primary Sector. Masters Thesis, Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Walker, R. (1985). Cultural Domination of Taha Māori: The Potential for Radical Transformation. in J. Codd et. al. (eds.), Political Issues in New Zealand Education . Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.
- Walker, R. (1990). Ka Whawhai Tonu Matou: Struggle Without End. Auckland: Penguin.
- Walker, R. (1996). Nga Pepa a Ranginui: The Walker Papers. Auckland: Penguin.
- Weatherford, J. (1988). Indian Givers. New York: Ballantine Books.
- Wetere, K. (1984). Māori Economic Summit Conference Proceedings. Wellington: Government Printer.
- Wetere, K. (1994). Ten Years of Māori Development. Opening Address in Proceedings of Hui Whakapumau, Kia Pumau Tonu Palmerston North: Massey University.
- Wexler, P. (1989). Curriculum in the Closed Society. in H. Giroux, & P. McLaren (eds.), Critical Pedagogy, The State and Cultural Struggle . Albany State: University of New York.
- White, L. G. (1994). Policy Analysis as Discourse. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 13(3), 506-525.
- Willaims, R. (1983). Keywords. London: Fontana.
- Wilson, M., & Yeatman, A. (1995). Justice and Identity. Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.
- Young, I. M. (1990). Justice and the Politics of Difference. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Young, R. (1995). Colonial desire: hybridity in theory, culture, and race. London; New York: Routledge.

*APPENDIX ONE*

# Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities Forty-fifth session

## Discrimination against indigenous peoples

Report of the working group on indigenous populations on its eleventh session

Chairperson: Ms Erica-Irene A Daes

### ANNEX I

---

Draft declaration as agreed upon by the members of the working group at its eleventh session

*Affirming* that indigenous peoples are equal in dignity and rights to all other peoples, while recognizing the rights of all peoples to be different, to consider themselves different, and to be respected as such,

*Affirming also* that all peoples contribute to the diversity and richness of all civilizations and cultures, which constitute a common heritage of humankind,

*Affirming further* that all doctrines, policies and practices based on or advocating superiority of peoples or individuals on the basis of national origin, racial, religious, ethnic or cultural differences are racist, scientifically false, legally invalid, morally condemnable and socially unjust,

*Reaffirming* also that indigenous peoples, in the exercise of their rights, should be free from discrimination of any kind,

*Concerned* that indigenous peoples have been deprived of their human rights and fundamental freedoms, resulting, inter alia, in their colonization and the dispossession of their lands, territories and resources, thus preventing them from exercising, in particular, their right to development in accordance with their own needs and interests,

*Recognizing* the urgent need to respect and promote the rights and characteristics of indigenous peoples, especially their rights to their lands, territories and resources, which derive from their political, economic and social structures and from their cultures, spiritual traditions, histories and philosophies,

*Welcoming* the fact that indigenous peoples are organizing themselves for political, economic, and social and cultural enhancement and in order to bring an end to all forms of discrimination and oppression wherever they occur,

*Convinced* that control by indigenous peoples over developments affecting them and their lands, territories and resources will enable them to maintain and strengthen their institutions, cultures and traditions, and to promote their development in accordance with their aspirations and needs,

*Recognizing* also that respect for indigenous knowledge, cultures and traditional practices contributes to sustainable and equitable development and proper management of the environment,

*Emphasizing* the need for demilitarization of the lands and territories of indigenous peoples, which will contribute to peace, economic and social progress and development, understanding and friendly relations among nations and peoples of the world,

*Recognizing* in particular the right of indigenous families and communities to retain shared responsibility for the upbringing, training, education and well-being of their children,

*Recognizing* also that indigenous peoples have the right freely to determine their relationships with States in a spirit of coexistence, mutual benefit and full respect,

*Considering* that treaties, agreements and other arrangements between States and indigenous peoples are properly matters of international concern and responsibility,

*Acknowledging* that the Charter of United Nations, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and the International Covenant on Civil and political Rights affirm the fundamental importance of the right of self-determination of all peoples, by virtue of which they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development,

*Bearing in mind* that nothing in this Declaration may be used to deny any peoples their right of self-determination,

*Encouraging States* to comply with and effectively implement all international instruments, in particular those relating to human rights, as they apply to indigenous peoples, in consultation and cooperation with the people concerned,

*Emphasizing* that the United Nations has an important and continuing role to play in promoting and protecting the rights of indigenous peoples,

*Believing* that this Declaration is a further important step forward for the recognition, promotion and protection of the rights and freedoms of indigenous peoples and in the development of relevant activities of the United Nations system in this field,

*Solemnly proclaims* the following United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples:

## Part I

### Article 1.

Indigenous peoples have the right to the full and effective enjoyment of all of the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are recognized in the Charter of the United Nations and in the human rights law;

### Article 2.

Indigenous individuals and peoples are free and equal to all other individuals and peoples in dignity and rights, and have the right to be free from any kind of adverse discrimination, in particular that based on their indigenous origin or identity;

**Article 3.**

Indigenous people have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development;

**Article 4.** Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinct political, economic, social and cultural characteristics, as well as their legal systems, while retaining their rights to participate fully, if they so choose, in the political, economic, social and cultural life of the State;

**Article 5.**

Every Indigenous person has the right to belong to a nationality;

## Part II

**Article 6. No Genocide** Indigenous peoples have the collective right to live in freedom, peace and security as distinct peoples and to full guarantees against genocide or any other act of violence, including the removal of indigenous children from their families and communities under any pretext.

**Article 7.**

Indigenous peoples have the collective and individual right not to be subject to ethnocide and cultural genocide, including the prevention of and redress for:

- (a) Any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their integrity as distinct peoples, or of their cultural values or identities;
- (b) Any action which has the aim or effect of dispossessing them of their lands, territories or resources;
- (c) Any form of population transfer which has the aim or effect of violating or undermining any of their rights;
- (d) Any form of assimilation or integration by other cultures or ways of life imposed on them by legislative, administrative or other measures;
- (e) Any form of propoganda directed against them;

**Article 8.**

Indigenous peoples have the collective and individual right to maintain and develop their distinct identities and characteristics, including the right to identify themselves as indigenous and to be recognized as such;

**Article 9.**

Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right to belong to an indigenous community or nation, in accordance with the traditions and customs of the community or nation concerned. No disadvantage of any kind may arise from the exercise of such a right;

**Article 10.**

Indigenous peoples shall not be forced from their lands or territories. No relocation shall take place without the free and informed consent of the indigenous peoples concerned and after agreement on just and fair compensation and, where possible, with the option of return,;

**Article 11.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to special protection and security in periods of armed conflict.

States shall observe international standards, in particular the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, for the protection of civilian populations in circumstances of emergency and armed conflict, and shall not:

- (a) Recruit indigenous individuals against their will in the armed forces and, in particular, for use against other indigenous peoples;
- (b) Recruit indigenous children into the armed forces under any circumstances;
- (c) Force indigenous individuals to abandon their lands, territories or means of subsistence, or relocate them in special centers for military purposes;
- (d) Force indigenous individuals to work for military purposes under any discriminatory conditions;

## Part III

**Article 12.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to practice and revitalize their cultural traditions and customs. This includes the right to maintain, protect and develop the past, present and future manifestations of their cultures, such as archaeological and historical sites, artifacts, designs, ceremonies, technologies and visual and performing arts and literature, as well as the right to restitution of cultural, intellectual, religious and spiritual property taken without their free and informed consent or in violation of their laws, traditions and customs;

**Article 13.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to manifest, practice, develop and teach their spiritual and religious traditions, customs and ceremonies; the right to maintain, protect, and have access in privacy to their religious and cultural sites; the right to use and control of ceremonial objects; and the right to repatriation of human remains.

States shall take effective measures, in conjunction with the indigenous peoples concerned, to ensure that indigenous sacred places, including burial sites, be preserved, respected and protected;

**Article 14.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to revitalize, use, develop and transmit to future generations their histories, languages, oral traditions, philosophies, writing systems and literatures, and to designate and retain their own names for communities, places and persons.

States shall take effective measures, especially whenever any right of indigenous peoples may be affected, to ensure this right and to ensure that they can understand and be understood in political, legal and administrative proceedings where necessary through the provision of interpretation or by other appropriate means;

## Part IV

**Article 15.**

Indigenous children have the right to all levels and forms of education of the State. All indigenous peoples also have this right and the right to establish and control their educational systems and institutions providing education in their own languages, in a manner appropriate to their cultural methods of teaching and learning.

Indigenous children living outside their communities have the right to be provided access to education in their own culture and language.

**Article 16.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to have the dignity and diversity of their cultures, traditions, histories and aspirations appropriately reflected in all forms of education and public information.

States shall take effective measures, in consultation with the indigenous peoples concerned, to eliminate all prejudice and discrimination and to promote tolerance, understanding and good relations among indigenous peoples and all segments of society;

**Article 17.**

Indigenous people have the right to establish their own languages. They also have the right to equal access to all forms of non-indigenous media.

States shall take effective measures to ensure that State-owned media duly reflect indigenous cultural diversity;

**Article 18.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to enjoy fully all rights established under international labour law and national labour legislation.

Indigenous individuals have the right not to be subjected to any discriminatory conditions of labour, inter alia, employment and salary;

## Part V

**Article 19.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to participate fully, if they so choose, at all levels of decision-making in matters which may affect their rights, lives and destinies through representatives chosen by themselves in accordance with their own procedures as well as to maintain and develop their own indigenous decision-making institutions;

**Article 20.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to participate fully, if they so choose, through procedures determined by them, in devising legislative or administrative measures that may affect them.

States shall obtain the free and informed consent of the peoples concerned before adopting and implementing such measures;

**Article 21.**

Indigenous people have the right to maintain and develop their political, economic and social systems, to be secure in the enjoyment of their own means of subsistence and development, and to engage freely in

all their traditional and other economic activities. Indigenous peoples who have been deprived of their means of subsistence and development are entitled to just and fair compensation;

**Article 22.**

Indigenous people have the right to special measures for immediate effective and continuing improvement of their economic and social conditions, including in the areas of employment, vocational training and retraining, housing, sanitation, health and social security.

Particular attention shall be paid to the rights and special needs of indigenous elders, women, youth, children and disabled persons;

**Article 23.**

Indigenous people have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for exercising their right to development. In particular, indigenous people have the right to determine and develop all health, housing and other economic and social programmes affecting them and, as far as possible, to administer such programmes through their own institutions;

**Article 24.**

They also have the right to access, without any discrimination, to all medical institutions, health services and medical care;

## Part VI

**Article 25.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to maintain and strengthen their distinctive spiritual and material relationship with the lands, territories, waters and coastal seas and other resources which they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used, and to uphold their responsibilities to future generations in this regard;

**Article 26.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to own, develop, control and use the lands and territories, including to total environment of the lands, air, waters, coastal seas, sea-ice, flora and fauna and other resources which they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used. This includes the right to the full recognition of their laws, traditions and customs, land-tenure systems and institutions for the development and management of resources, and the right to effective measures by States to prevent any interference with, alienation of or encroachment upon these rights;

**Article 27.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to the resititution of the lands, territories and resources which they have traditionally owned or otherwise occupied or used, and which have been confiscated, occupied, used or damaged without their free and informed consent. Where this is not possible, they have the right to just and fair compensation. Unless otherwise freely agreed upon by the peoples concerned, compensation shall take the form of lands, territories and resources equal in quality, size and legal status.

**Article 28.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to the conservation, restoration and protection of the total environment and production capacity of their lands, territories and resources, as well as to the assistance for this purpose from States and through international cooperation. Military activities shall not take

place in the lands and territories of indigenous peoples, unless otherwise freely agreed upon by the peoples concerned.

States shall take effective measure to ensure, as needed, that programmes for monitoring, maintaining and restoring health of indigenous peoples, as developed and implemented by the peoples affected by such materials, are duly implemented;

**Article 29.**

Indigenous peoples are entitled to the recognition of the full ownership, control and protection of their cultural and intellectual property.

They have the right to special measures to control, develop and protect their sciences, technologies and cultural manifestations, including human and other genetic resources, seeds, medicines, knowledge of properties of fauna and flora, oral traditions, literatures, designs and visual and performing arts;

**Article 30.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine and develop priorities and strategies for the development or use of their lands, territories and other resources, including the right to require that States obtain their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands, territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources. Pursuant to agreements with the indigenous peoples concerned, just and fair compensation shall be provided for any such activities and measures taken to mitigate adverse environmental, economic, social, cultural or spiritual impact;

## Part VII

**Article 31.**

Indigenous peoples, as a specific form of exercising their right to self determination, have the right to autonomy or self-government in matters relating to their internal and local affairs, including culture, religion, education, information, media, health, housing, employment, social welfare, economic activities, land and resource management, environment and entry by non-members, as well as ways and means for financing these autonomous functions.

**Article 32.**

Indigenous peoples have the collective right to determine their own citizenship in accordance with their customs and traditions. Indigenous citizenship does not impair the right of indigenous individuals to obtain citizenship of the States in which they live.

Indigenous peoples have the right to determine the structures and to select the membership of their institutions in accordance with their own procedures.

**Article 33.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to promote, develop and maintain their institutional structures and their distinctive juridical customs, traditions, procedures and practices, in accordance with internationally recognized human right standards.

**Article 34.**

Indigenous peoples have the collective right to determine the responsibilities of individuals to their communities.

**Article 35.**

Indigenous peoples, in particular those divided by international borders, have the right to maintain and develop contacts, relations and cooperation, including activities for spiritual, cultural, political, economic and social purposes, with other peoples across the borders.

States shall take effective measures to ensure the exercise and implementation of this right.

**Article 36.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to the recognition, observance and enforcement of treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements concluded with States or their successors, according to their original spirit and intent, and to have States honour and respect such treaties, agreements and other constructive arrangements. Conflicts and disputes which cannot otherwise be settled should be submitted to competent international bodies agreed to by all parties concerned;

## Part VIII

**Article 37.**

States shall take effective and appropriate measures, in consultation with the indigenous peoples concerned, to give full effect to the provisions of this Declaration. The rights recognized herein shall be adopted and included in national legislation in such a manner that indigenous peoples can avail themselves of such rights in practice.

**Article 38.**

Indigenous people have the right to have access to adequate financial and technical assistance, from States and through international cooperation, to pursue freely their political, economic, social, cultural and spiritual development and for the enjoyment of the rights and freedoms recognized in this Declaration.

**Article 39.**

Indigenous peoples have the right to have access to and prompt decision through mutually acceptable and fair procedures for the resolution of conflicts and disputes with the states, as well as to effective remedies for all infringements of their individual and collective rights. Such a decision shall take into consideration the customs, traditions, rules and legal systems of the indigenous peoples concerned.

**Article 40.**

The organs and specialized agencies of the United Nations system and other intergovernmental organizations shall contribute to the full realization of the provisions of this Declaration through the mobilization, *inter alia*, of financial cooperation and technical assistance. Ways and means of ensuring participation of indigenous peoples on issues affecting them shall be established.

**Article 41.**

The United Nations shall take the necessary steps to ensure the implementation of this Declaration including the creation of a body at the highest level with special competence in this field and with the direct participation of indigenous peoples. All United Nations bodies shall promote respect for and full application of the provisions of this Declaration.

## Part IX

**Article 42.**

The rights recognized herein constitute the minimum standards for the survival, dignity and well-being of the indigenous peoples of the world.

**Article 43.**

All the rights and freedoms recognized herein are equally guaranteed to male and female indigenous individuals.

**Article 44.**

Nothing in this Declaration may be construed as diminishing or extinguishing or future rights of indigenous peoples may have or acquire.

**Article 45.**

Nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying for any State, group or person any right to engage in any activity or to perform any act contrary to the Charter of the United Nations.

---

Source: United Nations Economic and Social Council, Commission on Human Rights, Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities, *Discrimination Against Indigenous Peoples, Report of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations on its eleventh session*. Chairperson-Rapporteur: Erica-Irene A. Daes. U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2.1993/29/Annex I.23 August 1993

---

*APPENDIX TWO*

## SEMI STRUCTURED INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. What was school like for you?
2. Did you learn much about Maori at school?
3. Was there anything Maori about your school?
4. Were you able to learn Te Reo Maori at school?
5. Would you have liked to be able to learn to speak Maori at school?
6. How did you get on with your teachers?
7. Did you have any particular favourite subjects?
8. Were there many Maori students at your school?
9. Can you say what it was like for you to be Maori at school?
10. Were you comfortable with being Maori?
11. Were your teachers comfortable with you being Maori?
12. Did you feel that being Maori made any difference?
13. Did you have much idea about what you wanted to do when you left school?
14. Can you say more about that?
15. Was there anyone in particular who helped you make up your mind?
16. Do you think that schools do well by Maori students?
17. If you could change schools what would you do?
18. Is there anything else you would like to add to your story?

