Unsettling Pākehā Fragility

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Politics

at Massey University, New Zealand.

Penny Leach

September 4, 2020

Ethics statement

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named in this document are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you want to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Professor Craig Johnson, Director (Research Ethics), email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Abstract

In this thesis, I explore the way that Pākehā (settler) identity can act as a barrier to, or alternatively, as motivation for, engaging with colonialism and decolonisation in Aotearoa New Zealand. I also discuss Pākehā conscientisation, and how Pākehā can continue to hold ourselves accountable on this non-linear journey.

I construct a composite epistemology drawing from interpretivism with an explicitly structural element, critical feminism and action research with a Baradian twist. This is used to explore the journeys of seven participants grappling with being Pākehā, discovering their complicity in colonial structures and practices, and imagining different ways of being and decolonised futures. I search for their edges of comfort, and at times, our conversations enable an evaluation of previously uninterrogated positions.

As a Pākehā researcher, studying other Pākehā, while trying not to re-entrench colonial structures, I am conscious of the need to try to engage ethically in this topic alongside my participants as we work on ourselves and each other. The Baradian action research element imagines participants as accomplices in a broader project of understanding our complicity in colonialism and disrupting our own Pākehā defensiveness. This approach accounts for the inevitability that our encounters facilitate change, in both the researcher and the participants, through involvement in the thesis.

I draw heavily on literature across the themes of whiteness, white fragility, settler colonialism, Pākehā identity, ignorance, uncertainty, discomfort and ethical engagement. I find that there is a high degree of alignment between the theory and the experiences of my participants. This holds both in terms of the problem space they recognise in Aotearoa, and the way they navigate complicity, seek to make space, catch ongoing colonial processes in their own ways of being and reach toward uncertain futures.

Acknowledgements

During the editing of this thesis, one of my editors said to me, “writing is a collaborative process”. While this is an absolutely true statement, I would extend the scope to include not just writing, but the entire masters journey. With that in mind, I would like to extend my deepest gratitude to the following people:

To Elizabeth Kerekere, Jack McDonald, Kelsey Lee, Marama Davidson and Wiremu Winitana, who over the years have generously shared with me their perspectives on colonialism from a Māori point of view, and have been patient and gentle with my questions and challenged and pushed me when I needed it.

To my participants, for sharing their experiences and thoughts with me so openly and with such insight and thoughtfulness, at times sitting in discomfort and then delving into where it came from and telling me.

To Michalia Arathimos, my shining example of the possibility of juggling academia with parenting and everything else, and for all the complicated, messy, challenging conversations we have had.

To my colleagues, Ann Shacklady-Smith, Gwen Shaw and particularly Wiremu Winitana, who picked up the slack for me on days I was concentrating on writing.

To Elizabeth Kerekere and Michalia Arathimos, for the time, love and energy they put in to editing this thesis, being brutal and making me kill my darlings.

To my supervisor Bethan Greener, for picking me up when I was supervisorless, being staunchly beside me when I was buffeted, and keeping me tethered to the dimension of the possible, always with humour.

To my parents Foss Leach and Janet Davidson, husband Martin Krafft and daughters Veronika and Melanie, for childcare, closed doors, absent weekends, support, love, printing and cheering on.

Thank you all so, so much.

Contents

Contents **v**

1 Introduction **1**

1.1 Purpose 1

1.2 Research objectives 2

1.3 Background 3

1.4 Structure of the thesis 5

2 Literature Review **6**

2.1 Introduction 6

2.2 Whiteness, white privilege and white fragility 6

2.3 Settler colonist states and identities 8

2.4 Pākehā identities 11

2.5 Uncertainty and ignorance 14

2.6 Discomfort 16

2.7 Anti-racism, allyship and ethics 18

2.8 Conclusion 21

3 Epistemology **22**

3.1 Introduction 22

3.2 Interpretivism 22

3.3 Critical feminist epistemologies 24

3.4 Action research 25

3.5 Conclusion 28

4 Method **29**

4.1 Introduction . . . 29

4.2 Participants as accomplices . . . 29

4.3 Sampling . . . 31

4.4 Interviewing . . . 32

4.5 Participants . . . 32

4.5.1 Andrew . . . 33

4.5.2 Beatrice . . . 33

4.5.3 Charlotte . . . 33

4.5.4 David . . . 33

4.5.5 Eddie . . . 34

4.5.6 Fabienne . . . 34

4.5.7 George . . . 34

4.6 Data management . . . 35

4.7 Analysis . . . 35

4.7.1 Familiarisation . . . 35

4.7.2 Initial codes . . . 36

4.7.3 Searching for themes . . . 37

4.7.4 Reviewing themes . . . 37

4.7.5 Defining and naming themes . . . 37

4.7.6 Report . . . 38

4.8 Ethics . . . 38

4.8.1 Considerations for participants . . . 39

4.8.2 Considerations for myself . . . 40

4.9 Conclusion . . . 41

5 Participants: The problem space **42**

5.1 Introduction . . . 42

5.2 On a monolithic identity . . . 42

5.3 Myths . . . 43

5.4 Barriers . . . 45

5.5 Privilege, power, and racism . . . 47
5.6 Conclusion . . . 50

6 Participants: Formative experiences 51

6.1 Introduction . . . 51
6.2 Living overseas . . . 51
6.3 Seeing our complicity . . . 52
6.4 Relationships . . . 54
6.4.1 Learning from Pākehā . . . 54
6.4.2 Learning from Māori . . . 55
6.5 Family influences or childhood experiences . . . 61
6.6 School experiences and learning our history . . . 63
6.7 Activism and workplaces . . . 64
6.7.1 Activism . . . 64
6.7.2 Career and workplace influences . . . 65
6.8 Personal accountability . . . 66
6.8.1 Recognising mistakes and catching thoughts . . . 66
6.8.2 Actions versus thoughts . . . 67
6.8.3 Innate ways of being . . . 68
6.9 Conclusion . . . 69

7 Participants: Themselves 70

7.1 Introduction . . . 70
7.2 Identity-making for participants . . . 70
7.2.1 An absence of culture . . . 71
7.2.2 Hybridity . . . 72
7.2.3 Routes versus Roots . . . 72
7.2.4 Te Tiriti as grounding . . . 73
7.2.5 Nation based identities . . . 73
7.2.6 Other avenues to identity . . . 74
7.3 Specificity of 'Pākehā' . . . 75

7.4 Motivations and the fluidity of identities and politics 76
7.4.1 Redemption 78
7.4.2 Emotionality 79
7.5 Levels of comfort 82
7.6 The non-linearity of the journey 84
7.7 Conclusion 85

8 Participants: Possibilities and futures 86
8.1 Introduction 86
8.2 Far more honest grappling 86
8.3 Cultural pluralism 88
8.4 Power sharing 89
8.5 Making space 90
8.6 Land 92
8.7 Time 95
8.8 Conclusion 96

9 Analysis 97
9.1 Introduction 97
9.2 Pākehā identity 97
9.3 Seeing complicity 99
9.4 Emotionality and guilt 100
9.5 Time and the journey 101
9.6 Relationships 101
9.7 Ethics and making space 103
9.8 Ignorance 104
9.9 Boundaries and blindspots 105
9.10 Conclusion 106

10 Conclusion 108
10.1 Introduction 108
10.2 The beautiful mess 108

10.3 Reflections 110
10.3.1 On my process 110
10.3.2 On the project 111
10.4 Conclusion 113

Bibliography **114**

A Appendices **124**
A.1 Information Sheet 124
A.2 Consent Form 126
A.3 Interview Questions 127

1. Introduction

In November 2016, I was approaching the end of my first year studying Politics as an adult student. I was living in Germany and working while my children slept. My last reading for the year was Mohanty and Martin: 'What's Home Got to Do with It?' (Mohanty, 2003, Chapter 3). I had spent eight years living away from Aotearoa[1] *and had developed a strong sense of national pride, common to the Kiwi expat experience. Reading this chapter was like being hit by a truth-train. My pride had been predicated on privilege, colonialism, and ignorance. How could I continue to hold both that sense of pride and the growing discomfort of realising my complicity in colonial structures and injustice? That crisis has solidified into an ongoing struggle with my identity as Pākehā*[2] *on these islands. I love Aotearoa but am keenly aware of my privilege, even in being able to feel that love. Is it possible to decolonise our country and to grapple honestly with an identity that is descendent of settler colonists?*

1.1 Purpose

This thesis explores the ways Pākehā identity acts as a barrier to, or alternatively, as motivation for, engaging with colonialism and decolonisation, and how we[3] Pākehā can hold ourselves accountable on that journey. This has involved delving into the literature of whiteness, settler colonialism and Pākehā identity, together with exploring the journeys of seven participants grappling with being Pākehā. The motivation behind this research is normative, and stems from my need to unearth the ways my

[1] When naming the country, I use 'Aotearoa'. In adjective form, I use 'New Zealand', for example, 'New Zealand identity'. Finally, for citizens, I use 'New Zealander'. I have left quotations verbatim.

[2] Throughout this thesis is the occasional use of Māori language. The first time a word appears, I provide a translation. Where it originates from academic literature, I use the author's translation. Where it comes from my participants, I use a definition from a resource such as https://maoridictionary.co.nz where possible. Key words I am using, and their meanings are: *Māori*: indigenous people of Aotearoa.
Pākehā: New Zealander of European descent, first generation upwards.
Tauiwi: non-Māori (not specifically Pākehā) New Zealanders.
Pākehātanga: the -tanga suffix denotes the quality derived from the base noun (-tanga, n.d.).
These words are more complicated than this and have complex histories (Marcetic, 2018), but these definitions are sufficient for the purpose of this thesis. I have not modified quotations from other authors, so where Pākehā appears without a macron, for example, this is to be faithful to the original text, although I insert *[sic]*. Finally, I had originally used 'Pākehāness' in this thesis and was made aware during editing that as it is an anglicisation of a Māori word, 'Pākehātanga' would be a better choice. In the interests of honesty, I have left 'Pākehāness' where it is a quote from either myself or a participant during an interview.

[3] I am deliberately using 'we' (and 'our') to indicate my own membership in the group identity of Pākehā.

own Pākehā identity is entangled with my complicity in colonial processes, in order to then help dismantle them. This explains the conscious decision to follow an epistemological practice[4] of explicitly positioning, and interweaving myself through the thesis, both in language[5], and substance. This, alongside my research choice to explore what Pākehā think about them-/ourselves, sits in tension with an urgent need to decentre white voices and avoid white narcissism. I explore this in detail in my *Ethics* section.

1.2 Research objectives

This project conceives of its participants as accomplices, and the process of interviewing them as the co-creation of knowledge[6]. Words such as 'explore' and 'discuss' are therefore central to the research objectives, which are:

1. Explore the relationship between participants' construction of their Pākehā identity and of their national identity, and to what extent they draw a separation between the two.
2. Explore in what ways Aotearoa's colonial history and present inform participants' constructions of Pākehā identity.
3. Explore how participants' Pākehā identity is comfortable or unsettled, and whether they embrace uncertainty and discomfort or struggle against it.
4. Explore what participants think decolonisation might mean in practice and how comfortable this is for them.
5. Discuss any possible disruptive moments or confluence that troubled participants' previously uninterrogated identity constructions.

These research objectives, indeed this thesis assume some contextual understanding of the legacy and present realities of settler colonialism in Aotearoa. I will not devote too much space to providing this background, other than to emphasise that, since contact, the relationship between Māori and Pākehā has been beset with violence and injustice. Because of war, colonial land theft, and racist government policy (Cheyne et al., 2008), Māori are continually overrepresented in inequality statistics (Poata Smith (2013), see e.g. Ministry of Health (2013)). The relationship between Māori and the

[4] See *Epistemology*.
[5] 'I' and 'me', alongside 'we' and 'our', as noted above.
[6] See *Participants as accomplices*.

State has been fraught and full of contradictions, and Māori have a long tradition of activism to assert their rights (Durie, 2005). Pākehā responses to this have ranged from ambivalence to outright hostility (which is touched upon in my *Literature Review*). Finally, although we differ from some other colonial contexts because of the existence of a Treaty (Te Tiriti o Waitangi[7]), many of the same aspects of other stories of settler colonialism and its damage apply here as well[8].

1.3 Background

An exploration of Pākehā discourses reveals a pervasive unwillingness to engage critically with our colonial past and present. This is expressed in comments on our media websites on articles about Māori-Pākehā relations, Waitangi Day, or colonial history, in the form: "This all happened before our time. Move on and look forward" (Zachpagella, 2018); "We are all New Zealanders" (Triple A, 2018); and "I just wish we can just be a land of Kiwis and move on" (Dazzamo, 2018). Many reject outright the label 'Pākehā', objecting to an ethnicity marker, preferring just 'New Zealander' (Bell, 1996).

I was curious to explore the connection between notions of identity (both self and national) and Pākehā openness to engaging with the historical and present realities of colonialism. My suspicion was that as the relationship between self and national identity tightens, tending toward the universalisation of Pākehā identity to a national identity, the less open an individual is to exploring colonialism and how it is expressed.

An illustration of this 'tightening' may be useful: A Pākehā who claims (as I once did) that 'colonial stoicism' is characteristic of New Zealand identity is necessarily excluding other peoples than those descended from settlers, while universalising their own culture to the whole country. This conflation of ethnicity and nationality demonstrates the 'unmarkedness' of Pākehātanga, reflecting how white people often see themselves as outside race (Bell, 1996, p. 148), (see also DiAngelo, 2011; Dyer, 1997; Fowler Snyder, 2015), and entrenches the fact that our institutions are Pākehā ones (Bell, 1996, p. 148).

DiAngelo's (2011) work on white fragility helps to unpack these common white responses of "anger, withdrawal, emotional incapacitation, guilt, argumentation, and

[7] The Treaty of Waitangi.
[8] For further reading, I recommend Walker (2004), and, more recently, Elkington et al. (2020).

cognitive dissonance" (p. 55) when exposed to discussions about race. They[9] argue white subjects are unmarked by race, see themselves just as 'people', and insist upon colour blindness (a form of strategic ignorance (Bailey, 2007)). Whiteness is supported by both the discourse of universalism (we are all the same) and the discourse of individualism (we are all different) (DiAngelo, 2011, p. 59). Whiteness and white fragility play out in Aotearoa in the unmarkedness of Pākehā (Bell, 1996, p. 148). Pākehā culture is unmarked and taken for granted, its specificity is not recognised, and Pākehā ethnicity becomes conflated with nationality (p. 149).

This very real neocolonialism of excluding Tangata Whenua[10] identities— among others— in the construction of nationhood, is a politics of settlement as violence and forgetting (Bell, 1996, pp. 150-153) which denies our colonial past and creates a Pākehā identity "'born' post colonisation out of the New Zealand soil" (Bell, 1996, p. 156).

My own experience of marking, and continuing to mark, my identity as 'Pākehā', as opposed to just 'New Zealander', has involved sliding around on an uncomfortable plane between points of defensiveness, guilt, and paralysis. Yet Bell (2004) has shown that both refusal and acceptance of guilt avoids engagement and responsibility. The politics of refusal silence discussion, facilitate an aversion toward responsibility, and deny history. Denial of history contributes to the fragility and immaturity of the Pākehā identity (p. 93). Refusal paradoxically acknowledges the fact there is something to *be* refused (p. 94). However, accepting guilt is also problematic as it is situated within a desire for innocence (p. 94). Bell's 'third way' between refusal and acceptance is to make guilt be 'borne' rather than 'bared' (p. 101): guilt must be lived and dealt with.

Part of our responsibility in Aotearoa as Tangata Tiriti[11] involves understanding how our identity narratives are entangled with, and constituent of, the politics of refusal and guilt (Bell, 2004). We must 'mark' our Pākehātanga, and "identify existing mechanisms of self-interest and develop strategies for subverting them" (Lawn, 1994, p. 298). Exploring how some Pākehā are navigating this unsettling is the aim of this research.

[9] During the writing of this thesis, I became increasingly uncomfortable using gendered pronouns when citing unknown authors, as I was aware I could never know for sure from a citation what gender these authors wish to use. Therefore I have settled on gender neutral pronouns for all authors.

[10] Indigenous people - people born of the whenua, i.e. of the placenta and of the land where the people's ancestors have lived and where their placenta are buried (Tangata Whenua, n.d.).

[11] People of the Treaty; includes Pākehā but also all other migrant people. Often interchanged with 'Tauiwi'.

1.4 Structure of the thesis

Following this introduction, the thesis continues into a *Literature Review*, which starts with theory on whiteness, white fragility and white privilege. It then narrows to settler colonial identity, then narrows again to Pākehā identity. I then review the related topics of uncertainty, ignorance, discomfort, ethical engagement and allyship.

The third chapter, *Epistemology* takes the reader through the three main epistemological traditions I am drawing from: interpretivism, critical feminism and action research. I characterise each and explain what they each bring to this project.

The fourth chapter, *Method*, describes the process behind the participatory element: my approach to sampling, interviewing, data management, coding and thematic analysis. It also includes reflections on the process, my relationship with and responsibilities to my participants, and concludes with the ethical considerations for the project.

Next are four chapters setting out responses from participants: *Participants: The problem space* discusses what they thought about Pākehā *in general*: identity making, understanding of colonialism, and barriers to grappling with these issues. The chapter title reflects participants' identification of the problem space of the colonial field.

Participants: Formative experiences delves into events or experiences which influenced the way participants think about colonialism, and what enabled them to engage with this topic, even when uncomfortable.

Participants: Themselves discusses how participants thought about their own identities, and how they felt about being Pākehā specifically. It also examines motivations and emotions, levels of comfort, and the non-linearity of their journey.

Participants: Possibilities and futures looks to what participants thought decolonisation might mean, for themselves as individuals, for structures and institutions, and what it meant for their relationship with land.

Analysis aligns participants' thoughts with theory; moving across the emergent themes of Pākehā identity, seeing complicity, emotionality, guilt, time, relationships, ethics, and ignorance. Finally, I touch on boundaries and blindspots.

Finally, the *Conclusion* summarises key findings, and reflects upon my, and my participants', journey through the project.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

This literature review starts with a broad study of whiteness, white privilege, and white fragility[1], before narrowing to the more specific, but still international, literature on settler colonialism and identity. It then narrows once more to examine specifically Pākehā identity, while retaining a focus on the way uncritical iterations of identity contribute to the performance, and entrenchment of colonial privilege and power.

This is followed by a survey on the literature on uncertainty, ignorance and discomfort. These can be either oblivious responses or deliberate epistemological strategies, deployed in the service of or resistance to whiteness and settler colonialism. Finally, the ethical dimensions of engaging non-colonially, the challenges and pitfalls of allyship and anti-racism, and the risks of reinscribing colonial structures even while claiming to be working against them, are explored[2].

2.2 Whiteness, white privilege and white fragility

DiAngelo's (2011) work on whiteness and white fragility has become a foundational way to understand white responses to discussions about race. They use Frankenberg's (1993) definition of whiteness:

> A location of structural advantage, of race privilege. Second, it is a 'standpoint', a place from which White people look at ourselves, at others, and at society. Third, 'Whiteness' refers to a set of cultural practices that are usually unmarked and unnamed (Frankenberg, cited in DiAngelo, 2011, p. 56).

White people are positioned as outside culture, as the norm, and therefore view themselves as universal humans. Their identity is unracialised, meaning their white-

[1] I have opted against capitalisation for these terms, except where they appear directly quoted from the author.

[2] As my focus is specifically on Pākehā, I have largely left aside literature on the impacts of colonialism on indigenous peoples. This is not because it is not relevant, but because my project is about "whites . . . work[ing] on whites" (Johnson, 2005, p. 145). I have also not explicitly included theories of change, other than where they specifically relate to white, or Pākehā conscientisation.

ness functions as a blindspot: "White people are just people" (p. 59). Dyer (1997) shows that this blindspot of white people "being 'just' human" (p. 2) is imbued with power.

DiAngelo's (2011) definition of white fragility is:

> A state in which even a minimum amount of racial stress becomes intolerable, triggering a range of defensive moves. These moves include the outward display of emotions such as anger, fear, and guilt, and behaviors such as argumentation, silence, and leaving the stress-inducing situation. These behaviors, in turn, function to reinstate white racial equilibrium (p. 57).

They build upon Bourdieu's (1993) *habitus*, which is a socialised subjectivity existing through practice and interaction between actors and their environment. Being challenged results in intolerable disequilibrium. White fragility is a product of this habitus, and resistance is expressed in anger, guilt, hurt feelings, and shutting down.

White people use both the discourse of universality (we are all the same) and the discourse of individualism (we are all different). Both deny white privilege and undermine the significance of race. As white people are unmarked by race, they have the privilege of not having to be concerned by it. This prevents them from building resilience to difficult and uncomfortable conversations about race. DiAngelo (2011) argues if white fragility is framed as an issue of stamina, a strategy to address it could be resilience-building. Such repositioning, hooks (2014) suggests, might allow anti-racist white people to "understand the way in which their cultural practice reinscribes white supremacy without promoting paralyzing guilt or denial" (p. 177).

Despite the rage fuelled responses to making the invisibility of whiteness visible (Dyer, 1997), in order to build cross-cultural solidarity, whiteness must be 'marked', white subjects must "understand how [they are] directly implicated in racial injustice by virtue of being White in the present" (Fowler Snyder, 2015, p. 299). Addy (2008) also recommends acknowledging whiteness, arguing "the journey into white awareness begins with recognition of the implications of the silence around being white, and with an initial step from denial to ownership of 'whiteness' " (p. 16). To inoculate against the white fragility responses of guilt and hopelessness, they advocate remembering white privilege is "conferred by birth rather than through any individual action or belief" (p.

20), and while unearned, it is also unasked for (p. 12).

In order to understand the process required to own whiteness, Linder (2015) explored white antiracist identity development and developed a machine with cogs model. Their participants went through an initial linear process of introduction to racism; resistance, anger and defensiveness; and acceptance. Following this, three interdependent cogs worked together to maintain oppression: guilt and shame; fear of appearing racist; and distance from whiteness (on the grounds of other oppressed identities). Getting caught between these cogs led to cycling between activism and inaction. They discuss participants' overanalysis or hyper-awareness, impacting on their ability to have authentic relationships with people of colour. They argue that there is a need for a balance of cognitive, emotional and behavioural responses to racism: overemphasising any one of the three will lead to incomplete transformation and being stuck in the cogs. Their model problematises the idea of a concluded, final state.

Hage (2000) switches the lens from racism and uses nationalism as an organising principle, arguing that racism itself is not inherently motivating, but rather, connected to belonging and territoriality. The image of the nationalist as the person with the capacity to manage the national space allows for a critique of 'tolerance' as a white nationalist practice masquerading as benign. 'Evil' white nationalists are explicit in their approach toward 'Others' (nationalistic practices of exclusion), while 'good' white nationalists advocating for tolerance and multiculturalism still position the dominant as the one tolerating, and those not conforming to the white fantasy ideal as the tolerated. Inclusion and exclusion practices are structurally similar, confirming the white subject as manager of the national space (pp. 90-91).

2.3 Settler colonist states and identities

The politics of settlement has been described variously as 'forgetting' (Bell, 1996), 'dreaming' (Turner, 2011), an 'imaginary' (Bell, 2014), and 'structures of feeling' (Rifkin, 2011), which all speak to the ways settler identities and emotions have consequences outside of the settler mind: making-over place and culture (Turner, 2011), defining the contours of the world (Bell, 2014), constructing sociopolitical formations and re-entrenching

settler privilege (Rifkin, 2011). According to Rifkin (2011), settler structures of feeling appear self-evident, and are made concrete through everyday practice. To undo these structures, one must pay attention to the logics that create them, the "ways settlement works through ordinary sensations of space and selfhood" (p. 343).

A discourse of authenticity, a double standard where indigenous peoples are expected to remain 'traditional', fixed, frozen in time (essentialised)—but settler identities are dynamic and fluid—haunts indigenous and settler identities and how they relate (Bell, 2014). Settlers are doubly inauthentic, because of being modern (relative to the European framing of an earlier, 'primitive' state), and because they are out of place on a different land. On the other side, indigenous peoples are doubly authentic, because of the 'primitive' framing, and because they are *of* the land. Settlers, Bell (2014) argues, are prone to ontological uncertainty about identity, and resort to identity constructions more about what they are *not*, than what they are. These discourses of in/authenticity act as a constant disciplinary mechanism upon indigenous identities. Any gesture toward inclusive cultural pluralism still occurs *on the settlers' terms* and relies upon the authenticity discourse.

Hybridity has been used to delegitimise indigenous identities[3], while the syncretic Pākehā identity remains unproblematic. "Both essentialism and hybridity can be used in the service of colonial domination or in resistance to it" (Bell, 2014, p. 87). Imagining identities and hybridity as performative creates a space for agency, to identify and undo the domination in settler identities (Bell, 2014). A danger still exists however, as hybridity and essentialism still operate on the field of the settler imaginary.

For the CANZUS states (Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States) that are the focus of Bell's (2014) book, the colonisers never left. Within this context, they examine various theories of identity (starting from Kymlicka, 1995; Taylor, 1994; Tully, 1995), critique them within the settler context, and draw out the main tensions of a politics of recognition. First, the extent to which recognition is asymmetrical or mutual: whether recognition of indigenous identities occurs on indigenous terms or within the settler framework. Second, the issue of assimilation or pluralism: whether recognition and reconciliation politics actually operate as strategies of containment, and A.

[3] For example weaponising blood quantum.

Smith (2012) would add, erroneously presume the continuance of the settler state as arbitrator of claims, whose sovereignty goes unchallenged. Rose (1996) calls this 'deep colonising': colonising practices embedded within the very institutions and practices claiming to reverse colonisation.

Tuck and Yang (2012) argue settler colonialism is distinct from other types of colonialism, as homemaking requires colonialism to become a structure and not an event (Wolfe, 2006). This incompleteness of settler colonialism is revealed, Mackey (2014) writes, by the ongoing presence of indigeneity and continued claims from indigenous people. This prompts settler anxiety, and shows that settler responses of certainty and entitlement are in fact "fantasies of possession" and "fantasies of entitlement" (pp. 241-242). These emotional responses are not just individual acts, but an example of how colonial power shapes reality, or "settler structures of feeling" (Rifkin, cited in Mackey, 2014, p. 240).

Navigating this space can be difficult. Maddison (2012) discusses psychological barriers to reconciliation in settler colonial Australia. Descendants of settlers and original inhabitants continue to live together, and the need to feel good about belonging can lead to "explanations and justifications for immoral and unjust actions in the past" (p. 696). These can either hold, allowing for positive identification, or fail, resulting in profound and complex guilt and defensive national identity. National identification and uncritical histories maintain solidarity with the perpetrators of historical injustice, and this leads to their political descendants bearing some responsibility for the past actions. As "social group or national identity is a crucial component in understandings of collective guilt" (p. 699), it is worthwhile to examine how these identities are policed, and why narratives like Gallipoli are chosen to be commemorated.

Also in the Australian context, Probyn (2002) uses two pieces of settler writing (Read, 2000; Somerville, 1999) expressing 'belonging', to examine an apparent paradox. Acknowledging a risk of cultural appropriation while grasping toward belonging, shows complicity with imperialism. Simultaneously, complicity is the very obstacle *to* belonging. This anxiety of belonging stems from an ethical threat, rather than a material one: citizenship, access to land, or entitlement under law are secure. As settler belonging

is an unavoidable "expression of epistemic violence" (p. 91), epistemic violence trying to know itself becomes a condition for investigating settler belonging. Therefore, complicity is the "most useful and ... *only* starting point for white writing" (p. 80).

Another form of settler appropriation is use of the word 'decolonisation' as a metaphor (Tuck & Yang, 2012). It recentres whiteness and represents a settler *move to innocence*. Settler moves to innocence are "those strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege, without having to change much at all" (p. 10). Ultimately, many politics of recognition, reconciliation or even projects claiming to be 'decolonising' represent settler moves toward innocence, centring settler futures and desire for redemption (Tuck & Yang, 2012). This is also true in the specific context of Aotearoa, to which I now turn.

2.4 Pākehā identities

While much literature on colonialism in Aotearoa is concerned with the impacts on Māori, the search for what it means for Pākehā identity is also present (eg King, 1991; Sneddon, 2004). Navigating this uncertain space can lead to various responses. One is refusal: rejecting the ethnic marker 'Pākehā' in favour of the national 'New Zealander'. This strategy of "invoking national belonging as a means of contesting white privilege can further entrench settler privilege" (Rifkin, 2011, p.349). "The 'we' of national membership functions as an unreflexive yet central frame for tracking feeling and the ways it structures experiences of personhood and place" (Rifkin, 2011, p. 346).

The choice of identity marker itself is therefore a political act, Bell (1996) argues. Self-identification as 'Pākehā' "displaces white New Zealanders from their position of discursive exnomination as the (normal, ordinary) New Zealanders" (p. 153). Pākehā constructing themselves as the 'other' and recognising their identity is relational with Māori and mutually constituted, still doesn't resolve the issue that Pākehā benefit from colonising processes. Biculturalism is another strategy (Bell, 2009), and so too attempts at redemption via unity with indigenous peoples, trying to achieve acceptance, and ultimately, belonging (Bell, 2009, p. 159).

A further response is guilt, which can either be refused or accepted. Both options,

argues Bell (2004), avoid any engagement or responsibility to act. Refusal forecloses any discussion about history, which itself contributes to the fragility of Pākehā identities. The paradox of refusal is that it simultaneously accepts there is something to *be* refused (p. 94). Accepting guilt can also be problematic if it is 'bared' (p. 94), as this is situated with a desire for innocence. Instead, they argue, guilt must be 'borne': "lived with and dealt with, rather than obsessed about and denied" (p. 101). Therefore, guilt must be bearable. Within this, is a sense of agency. However, "as the dominant culture, we find it hard to accept cultural vulnerability" (Sneddon, 2004, p. 79) .

Discussing Pākehā identity-making, Bell (2009) highlights the difference between returning to roots and coming to terms with routes. The latter means engaging with colonialism and this is an unsettling process, rather than a resolution (pp. 155-156). Engaging however, is complicated, as settlement requires *forgetting* (Turner, 1999), or dreaming history (Turner, 2011), which is the deepest form of forgetting. Living without history Turner (1999, p. 21) causes a state of melancholy, grief without an object. Pākehā don't know how to weep. We have "powerful though inarticulate feeling[s]" (p. 22). In the absence of critical examination of self, we turn to cultural elements like sport and love of the beach to define ourselves.

Although these cultural elements help with identity construction, Bell (2014) shows how Pākehā appropriate Māori culture to assist further. Elsewhere (Bell, 1996), they write, "pakeha *[sic]* culture may be the national culture in terms of providing the pervasive, commonsense underpinnings for the ordering of social life, but Maori culture is the *national culture* when distinctiveness and ethnic exoticism is called for" (p. 149, emphasis mine; see also Kirton (1997)).

Pākehā responses to a petition to establish a national day to commemorate the New Zealand wars demonstrate this disconnect with history. Nearly three quarters of public submissions opposed the petition. Opponents rejected an 'apartheid-style' (O'Malley & Kidman, 2018, p. 303) categorisation of people into Māori and Pākehā, preferring a "'colour blind' version of national identity" (p. 302). They describe how an "uncomfortable silence . . . descended over the topic" (p. 305) of wars[4]. The responses to claims

[4]They chart the evolution from uncomfortable silence to significant controversy and backlash over the period from the 1970s to 1998

that highlight ethnic or racial difference "cut across an imagined national identity that was both harmonious and homogeneous" (p. 306). The need to feel good about the nation leads to strategies to explain away or justify past deeds.

McCreanor (2005) discusses the notion of the 'standard story': a prop which simplifies complex issues within a culture. The standard story idea implies there are competing but marginalised alternative stories. The Pākehā story is the standard story, built around images such as 'Number 8 Wire': a metaphor for 'utilitarian ingenuity' (p. 55). Discursive Pākehā themes about Māori reproduce social orders advantaging Pākehā and disadvantaging Māori. The alternative accounts are "closed, functional materialism with colonialist, patriarchal foundations that are exacerbated by neoliberal political ideologies that reinforce division, injustice and exclusion" (p. 55).

Highlighting these competing stories, Johnson (2005) distinguishes between 'old' and 'new' Pākehā identities. 'Old' operate a politics of homogeneity and assimilation ('one-New Zealandness'). 'New' embrace the label, and disavow old identities as colonial, racist and paternalistic. Pākehā anti-racists recognised that understanding themselves and their Pākehātanga could be politically transformational. Even defining Pākehā culture as oppressive, needing "cultural renovation, if not revolution" (p. 152), it is difficult to separate Pākehātanga from its hegemony. Pākehā need to go through a process of Freire's (1996) *conscientizaçao*, Johnson (2005) argues, which can happen through overseas travel, workplaces, study, unusual childhoods and family backgrounds. Seeking answers from the Māori or Polynesian 'other' risks perpetuating power imbalances (p. 146; See also Berenstain (2016)). Therefore, the point that"whites should work on whites" (p. 145) is a strong one. Although the Pākehā anti-racists were aware of the dangers of 'one-New Zealandness', there was still slippage from 'Pākehā' to 'New Zealander', and Pākehā as oppressors to Pākehā as oppressed. Johnson (2005) describes Freire's observations upon visiting Aotearoa, that this oppressors/oppressed double-helix for the coloniser creates an opening for the colonised. Freire (1996) argued "it is only the oppressed who, by freeing themselves, can free their oppressors. The latter, as an oppressive class, can free neither others nor themselves" (p. 36).

This interlinked nature of identities is beautifully illustrated by Bell (2017), who de-

scribes a community complex with seven pou[5], with one representing Pākehā. Although the Pākehā pou affirms identity, and the seven together show it is possible for Māori and Pākehā ontologies to co-exist, this doesn't mean their relationship is 'settled' (p. 16). They recommend considering "the ways in which Māori are in fact part of who Pākehā are, that to enhance the mana of one is to enhance the mana of the other, and that harm done to Māori also diminishes our/their own flourishing" (p. 21). However, relating in a non-colonial way requires embracing uncertainty, as I will discuss.

2.5 Uncertainty and ignorance

The interrelated themes of uncertainty and ignorance also occur frequently in settler colonial literature. Ignorance can be an oblivious response or strategically deployed, and can both entrench or disrupt colonial processes, depending on how it is deployed and in whose service.

Mackey (2014) challenges how certainty is often framed as an "unequivocally desirable and positive state of affairs ... a self-evident universality" (p. 236). Decolonisation requires uncomfortable, uncertain practices, humility and courage, and coming to terms with settlers not having the right to know everything. The people of settler descent Mackey interviewed were "angry and resentful that they were forced to feel such uncertainty" (Mackey, 2014). Their use of passive tense is telling: uncertainty was *forced upon them*. However, settler uncertainty "may actually be necessary for decolonisation" (p. 249).

Uncertainty is inextricably tied to ignorance. Alcoff (2007) and Mills (2007) both provide useful explorations of ignorance. Alcoff (2007) suggests there are three types of ignorance: a function of the general situatedness of knowers; imbued in group identity, where dominant groups have a positive interest in ignorance; and explicitly structural, where oppressive systems produce ignorance. Ignorance is not a lack, but a "substantive epistemic practice that differentiates the dominant group" (p. 47). It is insufficient to interrogate our situatedness, group identity or structural context. To overcome ignorance, we must make epistemology itself reflexive and critical of its location (p. 57).

[5] "Carved poles ... with carved images of ancestral figures (human and non human), key historical events and representations of scenes ... represent[ing] something of the genealogy of each of the seven peoples, the story of their becoming, their relationships with each other and their relationships to this place" (Bell, 2017, p. 16).

Similarly, Mills (2007) argues white ignorance is non-knowing, involving racism, in a society structured around domination/subordination relations. White normativity centres the European reference group as a constitutive norm, which, alongside strategic 'colour-blindness', leads to white refusal to recognise historical injustice and differential resources. White people emphasise individual, rather than structural explanations for socio-economic position, fail to see discrimination, and claim those insisting race is important— namely those affected— are the real racists. Denial is made possible by collective memory and collective amnesia. White identity, memory and amnesia are intimately linked. If one group is epistemically disadvantaged (see also Fricker, 2007), that directly impacts testimony, and therefore collective memory. We must:

> Understand how certain social structures tend to promote these crucially flawed processes, how to personally extricate oneself from them (insofar as that is possible), and to do one's part in undermining them in the broader cognitive sphere (Mills, 2007, p. 23).

To transform ignorance, then, Logue (2008) argues we must see beyond it. This involves denouncing investment in certainty, looking to the "contradictory space between the desire to know and the desire to ignore" (p. 61), and creating a "pedagogical space of dynamic uncertainty wherein the interplay between knowledge and affective investments in forms of ignorance can be explored" (p. 61).

Demonstrating this investment, Bailey (2007) shows ignorance is entangled with identity, as white supremacy requires racial ignorance and resistance to corrective information. White ignorance is shaped by an epistemically cozy logic of purity that rejects ambiguity. Bailey (2007) rejects resistances relying on these logics, as "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house" (Lorde, 2003). Instead, Bailey (2007) builds on Lugones's (2003) mayonnaise metaphor. Macroscopically, mayonnaise appears homogeneous; under a microscope, curdling is revealed. Undoing the fictitious purity of white ignorance requires "white folks work toward cultivating an identity without emulsifiers. We must think of ourselves as curdled beings" (Bailey, 2007, p. 91).

Ignorance itself has two sides, as Jones (2001) shows, in their study of Pākehā students' responses to a pedagogical experiment that, unusually, decentred them. First,

the students' ignorance about the *limits* of knowing, a "passion for ignorance, via a fantasy of mastery" (p. 288), the "blissful assumption we could know everything" (p. 285). The liberal subject assumes all knowledge is available to those who seek it. This is an ignorance about the boundaries of the knowable, and worse, in its desire to be taught, it is a drive for redemption (p. 313). The second side of ignorance is a deliberate strategy to embrace a passion of ignorance, allowing for not-knowing and non-mastery. The Pākehā students struggled to relocate themselves as knowers in such a framework, their "presumption of potential mastery, of entitlement to know . . . in ruins" (p. 285).

Bell (2014) also argues that relating in a non-colonising way requires respecting the unknowable difference between us, the *alterity*, the right to be not-known. They draw upon Moore (1997), who calls this 'positive silence', which is a "potent and active element of cross-cultural understanding" (Moore, 1997, p. 644). Engaging with uncertainty and deliberate not-knowing can be discomforting, however.

2.6 Discomfort

Sium et al. (2012) remind us there is "no escaping complicity within a settler colonial state, especially for those of us who have settled here, though complicity looks different for each of us" (p. III). As whiteness doesn't play well with others, this leads to the question "co-existence at what cost and for whose benefit?" (p. IV). Recognising our complicity is unsettling, but such questions must be asked. They advocate humility in the face of the unsettling nature of decolonisation, arguing that there is a power in questioning and accepting not everything is knowable. This "living without the entitlement to know everything (and therefore be certain) will likely lead to settler discomfort [which] may need to be embraced instead of resisted in order to participate in the difficult work of decolonization" (Mackey, 2014, p. 250). Recalling the Pākehā students "in ruins" (Jones, 2001, p. 285) shows how discomforting this is.

Tuck and Yang (2012) describe discomfort powerfully: "the settler, disturbed by her own settler status, tries to escape or contain the unbearable searchlight of complicity, of having harmed others just by being one's self" (p. 9). Further, Boler's (1999) pedagogy of discomfort invites us to recognise how emotions define what and how

we choose to see/not see. We must understand the *genealogies* of our positionalities and emotional resistances (p. 123). The fragility of white identity is that privilege is not based on individual merit, but on arbitrary social status. If selves are built upon frail identities, then national identities are built upon "complex fictions and investments" (p. 132). Challenging these beliefs and assumptions risks defensive anger; fear of change, or losing personal and cultural identities, but with a "nuanced reflection one may come to recognize defensive anger as the protection of precarious identities" (p. 130). Often, anger is easier than feeling vulnerable. To reimagine relations, we need to transform our own identity. Self-reflection is insufficient, we must also undertake discomfort as an approach to how and what we see.

A pedagogy of discomfort (Boler & Zembylas, 2003) requires identifying and rejecting common exit strategies provided by the hegemonic liberal individual approach to difference, which are:

- The celebration/tolerance model, in which every individual is different. This fails to address power.
- The denial/sameness model, in which we are all the same underneath. This is assimilationist and erases difference.
- The natural response/biological model, in which some difference is innate and fear is natural. This excuses oneself from the difficult task of understanding power and difference.

Instead, they build upon Hall (1987), who argues "all identity is constructed across difference" (p. 45). Boler and Zembylas (2003) therefore advocate embracing ambiguity in difference, which:

> Enables one to see, with humility, and gratitude, and pain, how much one has been shaped by one's contexts, to sense both the extent and the boundaries of one's vision, to see how circumstances can circumscribe as well as inspire, and to become self-aware to some extent of one's perspectives (Narayan, cited in Boler & Zembylas, 2003, p. 83).

This ambiguity is discomforting, and requires vulnerability, emotional labour, and the critical evaluation of self. It reveals fragility and contingency, but is ultimately em-

powering. Their pedagogy of discomfort has an ethical dimension, and is to ethics in allyship that I now turn.

2.7 Anti-racism, allyship and ethics

Freire (1996) discusses the role the oppressor plays in liberation. Discovering an oppressive identity may cause "considerable anguish" (p. 31), but does not necessarily lead to solidarity. True, authentic solidarity with the oppressed requires overcoming generational prejudices, lack of confidence in the oppressed, and urge to be the executors of a transformation: "those who authentically commit themselves to the people *must re-examine themselves constantly*" (p. 42, emphasis mine).

In the context of Aotearoa, Bell (2008) discusses what is required from Pākehā, for Māori to 'recover'. Pākehā have to make space, decentre ourselves (where 'centre' represents politics and power). The centre is not a secure place: it depends on the margins, so requires continual centring to maintain itself. Making space requires decentering, and accepting a pluralisation of valid centres. Universalism, particularly epistemological domination, must be abandoned. Their ethics requires an acceptance of alterity, of unknowable difference. Knowing the 'other' forces them into our own ontologies which is a form of epistemological violence.

Alcoff (2007) states "it takes a crisis of some sort for a person to radically question one of her or his basic beliefs or belief sets" (p. 45). How do we prompt this examination without a crisis? Boler (1999) attempts to answer Pratt's (1984) question:

> Why and when does a person willingly undertake change, especially if one is materially and ideologically safe and comfortable? What does one stand to gain from questioning one's cherished beliefs and changing fundamental ways of thinking? (Boler, 1999, p. 124).

First, we gain a way of looking at the world that is more complex but also truthful; second, to move beyond fear; and third, relief in moving beyond pain (Boler, 1999).

In addition, rather than look at what *we* stand to gain, Bell (2014) directs us to focus attention on the ethical dimensions of a relationship. They use a Lévinasian ethics, the crux being "attention to our ethical obligations can interrupt our will to mastery and

certainty, and open settler subjects to the possibilities of relations of mutuality rather than domination" (p. 174). Alterity of the 'other' is the catalyst for social life: without the 'other' our lives would be bare. They acknowledge politics requires *judgement* between competing demands, so politics must be deduced from ethics, be self-reflexive, open to challenges from ethics, interruptible. They use 'proximity' as an ethical, rather than spatial closeness. Proximity combines epistemological distance (unknowable alterity) with closeness, framed as *concern*. Tuck and Yang (2012) also advocate an ethics of incommensurability, demanding unsettling innocence, moving away from reconciliation where settlers are motivated toward innocence and settler futures. Incommensurability requires accepting there are questions decolonisation is not obliged to answer. This may, they acknowledge, feel "unfriendly" (p. 35).

There are multiple risks to avoid when engaging, from epistemic exploitation and competing marginalities to confessionalism and even empathy. Berenstain (2016) describes the risk of epistemic exploitation, when "privileged persons compel marginalized persons to produce an education or explanation about the nature of the oppression they face" (p. 571). This maintains oppressive structures, as it privileges the needs of the dominant group. It is exploitation, because it involves both unpaid labour and missed opportunity costs. Further, for the marginalised person faced with a demand to educate; the default response from the privileged person(s) is scepticism. They build on Fricker's (2007) epistemic injustices[6], noting a hermeneutical resource gap can be exacerbated when the dominant group refuses to adopt new language to describe oppression. This can be weaponised as a reason to dismiss the very education demanded from the marginalised, upholding ignorance on the grounds of specific language.

A second risk is falling into the trap of competing marginalities. Fellows and Razack (1998) argue that a 'race to innocence' is the belief one's own claim of oppression is so urgent, it undermines one's complicity in the oppression of others. It fails to recognise oppressive structures are co-constitutive: to focus on dismantling one without simultaneously undoing the others is futile. We need to abandon positions of innocence.

[6]Fricker (2007) argues epistemic injustices are a function of power. Testimonial injustice is when someone is wronged in their capacity as a giver of knowledge. Hermeneutical injustice is when someone is wronged in their capacity as a subject of social understanding. A hearer committed to ethical epistemology must be critically sensitive to both.

They call for solidarity on the grounds that any liberation leaving other subordination intact is not true liberation at all.

Further, A. Smith (2013) warns against slipping into confessionalism. Confessing privilege doesn't dismantle the oppressive structures enabling privilege. It leads to cultural capital being bestowed upon those least privileged, with the perverse outcome being the goal to be as oppressed as possible. They are highly critical of the self-reflexive settler subject who explains they came to see their complicity through exposure to Native peoples, as in the white subject's telling of these stories, the subaltern does not speak (Spivak, 2010). Instead of setting up a dynamic of confessor and hearer, they recommend starting from the position of all being complicit in oppressive structures and all needing to work together to dismantle them.

Finally, Boler (1999) shows that empathy, an emotion frequently promoted as a way to bridge difference, is also problematic. The 'others' with whom we are encouraged to empathise don't want empathy, they want justice (p. 110). Empathy doesn't include responsibility for recognising oneself as implicated in power dynamics. Emotional responses such as pity, compassion, sympathy or empathy risk being founded on a concern for self: imagining oneself in another's position centres the self. They raise the challenge, again following Pratt (1984), to "undertake our own work" (p. 15). This responsibility must be *borne* (p. 114), they argue, using the same language as Bell (2004).

To demonstrate how this can work in practice, Huygens (2007) evaluates Pākehā responses to the Treaty of Waitangi. They use Drucker's (2003) model for innovation spread in society, based on *Radicals*, *Translators*, *Early adopters* and *the Mass*. Māori who challenge the status quo and assert their tino rangatiratanga[7] are *radicals*; *translators* include Pākehā supporting their claims and working to bring other Pākehā along (for example Treaty educators); *early adopters* have typically received Treaty education and have changed; *mass* is the large, mostly Pākehā group who are invested in the status quo (pp. 89-90).

They describe some of the facilitating and inhibiting factors for Pākehā change. The former include: a feeling for justice; empathy through one's own personal experience of injustice; support, challenge or education from Māori; a sense of connected destiny;

[7] Self-determination, sovereignty, autonomy, self-government (Tino Rangatiratanga, n.d.).

need to join with like-minded others and be part of a liberation community. Inhibitory factors include: fear, rigidity, complacency; concern about loss of relationships with others who have different views; material or known worldview loss. Barriers they identified included various fallacies about the dominant group, including the assumption that it is homogeneous. Pākehā individualism is a problem, as collective change is required, and also because guilt shows a sense of individual rather than collective responsibility (p. 185). Kirton (1997) makes a similar point about a "normalised Paakeha/Tauiwi *[sic]* sense of individuality" (p. 12), competitive individualism giving us our "main ontological understanding of human beings" (p. 13). We bizarrely presume homogeneity within our 'one-people-one-nation', even as it is made up of individuals.

Essentially, Huygens (2007) argues that some people are so entrenched in their views that they can't accept the possibility of an alternative vision, or simply don't want to share power. The best case scenario is they recognise the world around them changing and their own views becoming a minority (pp. 172-174). They note that some Treaty educators felt real change would take seven generations (p. 176), and found that a steady progression was not a given, instead a 'journey' was a better characterisation. However, they observed a tendency to become stuck in denial or guilt[8]. Finally, any model of change must neither blame nor alienate Pākehā, but "respect the flame in all of us" (Huygens, cited in Huygens, 2007, p. 193).

2.8 Conclusion

The theory related to this topic of Pākehā identity, colonialism and ways of engaging, is rich and varied. This provides a strong foundation for my research: at the outset in order to help me understand and hone the questions I am asking my participants; as a way of understanding how to hold myself accountable as an ethical researcher, as a Pākehā working the hyphen of theory-praxis; and then as a set of arguments and ideas within which to ground my participants' stories and experiences.

[8] This is compatible with the cogs model that Linder (2015) describes in the anti-racist identity development, where the interlocking cogs of guilt and shame; fear of appearing racist; and distance from whiteness worked together to maintain oppression.

3. Epistemology

3.1 Introduction

This thesis requires a composite epistemology constructed from variants of interpretivism, critical feminism, and action research. These build upon and complement each other, and each brings value to my research. I begin by wanting to explore and understand the position and experiences of my participants. This is a highly qualitative process, and draws on the interpretivist recognition that "truth and knowledge are subjective, as well as culturally and historically situated, based on people's experiences and their understanding of them" (Ryan, 2018, p. 17). As I am keenly aware of my own privileged positionality, I include feminist epistemology. All research has a normative dimension, and especially in decolonisation work, there is a connection between theory and praxis, or "taking our ideas off the bookshelf and acting on them" (Sium et al., 2012, p. VIII). I therefore include action research, but with a Baradian twist to account for how I do not deliberately seek to disrupt my participants; rather I embrace the inevitability that encounters facilitate change in all of us. This chapter therefore explores interpretivism, critical feminist and action research, which woven together form the main epistemological approaches informing this thesis.

3.2 Interpretivism

Interpretivism emerged as a reaction to positivism, constituting a shift away from "approaches that seek value-free causal explanation in terms of variables external to the beliefs of social actors" (David, 2010, p. xxvi). Interpretivism embraces subjectivity of actors and the social construction of reality. The aim of the interpretivist researcher is *verstehen*, to understand the concepts an actor uses to make sense of their experience of the world (David, 2010, p. xxiii). Within interpretivism, there are strands and disagreements. One key disagreement is the extent to which external power structures influence individuals' construction of reality.

There is an apparent paradox in accounting for individual construction of social experience without recourse to an external reality; and incorporating accounts of structural power and oppression, as critical theorists would have it, as though they were external realities. David (2010) describes various attempts to navigate this contradiction. One is by shining a light upon how social structures are achieved (p. xxxviii). David refers to Garfinkel's suggestion that social order exists, but is sustained by interactions of social actors, thus is performed (p. xxxviii): "if social order existed as some kind of architecture external to actors, they could 'fall back' on it in the face of disruptions, but they cannot, and have to engage in ongoing patchwork" (David, 2010, p. xxxix). The structure-agency binary may therefore be naïve (p. xxix). Reimagining it in performative terms is a good solution, and 'patching' becomes a key concept for my research.

Because I am operating in a colonial environment, in which the "dominance of the Western perspective has deeply entrenched hierarchical structures and power positions" (Parsons & Harding, 2011, p. 5), accounting for oppressive structures is crucial:

> Individuals participate in broader social processes, even as that experience is lived and narrated as if it were merely a sensation emanating from inside. Such analysis draws attention to structures of feeling that connect individual emotion to sociopolitical formations while highlighting the ways that understanding feeling as expressive of individual identity stymies the capacity to envision large-scale social change" (Rifkin, 2011, p. 345).

I am particularly interested in exploring the point at which my participants faced a disruptive moment, and, rather than continuing to 'patch', instead began to question the social order, and their role in performing it. Garfinkel's interpretivism is thus an anchor for my interviews.

Doubt (1989) further demonstrates that, while Garfinkel's relation to their subject is apolitical, in the short story "Color Trouble" (Garfinkel, 1940), the protagonist acts as Garfinkel's alter ego, interested in the "symbiotic relation between the interpretative process and social structure" (p. 254), which is challenged by racism (p. 260). If the rules are inadequate, the actor must construct their own source of action in a difficult situation (p. 259).

DiAngelo's (2011) discussion of Bourdieu's habitus thus moves to marry Garfinkel with the concept of white fragility: habitus is a socialised subjectivity existing through practice and interaction between actors and their environment. When challenged, it results in intolerable disequilibrium. Here is Garfinkel's patching in whiteness practice: denial, resistance, guilt, and attempting to restore equilibrium.

Even while addressing disruption and patchwork, this is still largely a descriptive approach to social phenomena, whereas I want to explore change in place of patching. As I am engaging with my participants as accomplices[1], I include action research. First however, we must address another concern. Interpretivism does not generally attend to the entanglement of the researcher with the object of study. Indeed Garfinkel uses narrative as a proxy for himself. Feminist scholars, among others, have been critical of researchers ignoring positionality, and it is to them I now turn.

3.3 Critical feminist epistemologies

I am very aware of my own positionality in this research, as a member of the dominant (Pākehā) group, and as someone on my own journey of grappling with how my identity is entangled with colonialism and structural oppression. As such, I draw upon critical feminist epistemologies, acknowledging that knowledge is partial, situated, embodied (Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1987), and that research demands constant reflexivity.

Haraway (1988) cautions against the 'god trick' of claiming to "see . . . everything from nowhere" (p. 581). With a feminist approach, argues Harding (1987), "the researcher appears to us not as an invisible, anonymous voice of authority, but as a real, historical individual with concrete, specific desires and interests" (p. 9). The positivist god trick forecloses the very real specificity and positionality of the researcher, and denies the research project the more honest approach of acknowledging the entanglement of the researcher in the subject they are investigating. Harding and Haraway agree that introducing the researcher's subjective position increases objectivity, compared to god trick-like research pretending to neutrality (Haraway, 1988; Harding, 1987).

Harding (1987) shows that epistemology asks who can be a knower, what counts as knowledge, what kinds of things can be known? (p. 3). Narrowing the scope of what

[1] See *Participants as accomplices*.

needs exploration to the perspective of "bourgeois, white men's experiences leads to partial and even perverse understandings of social life" (p. 7). They reject relativism, as it only appears when the dominant group's hegemony is challenged (p. 10). Haraway (1988) claims relativism means being nowhere and everywhere at once (p. 584).

Feminist epistemology is therefore an embodied objectivity, of situated, partial knowledges, accepting contradictions, reflexive but not relativist. The researcher must be answerable and responsible, for what they see, and how they interpret it. Haraway (1988) advocates a shift from an unmarked, disembodied research gaze to a marked, embodied one. Sholock (2012), in *Methodology of the Privileged*, also critiques researchers with unmarked positionalities, encouraging reflexivity to "probe the unintelligibility of whiteness in their lives . . . to learn to recognize their own racial identity in order to disrupt the normativity of whiteness" (p. 705). However, reflexivity alone is insufficient, as being aware that racism is so systemic and white privilege so impossible to escape, one can end up feeling 'trapped' (p. 706). They dismiss racial sedition—unlearning whiteness—arguing the choice of shrugging off whiteness is a privilege (pp. 707-708). Overcoming multiple ignorances of privilege and repeated 'slippage' while trying to be an anti-racist feminist researcher can lead to helplessness, self doubt and cognitive anxiety. They argue for embracing epistemic uncertainty, to "disrupt cognitive manifestations of white privilege wherein white knowers expect epistemic comfort, confidence, and mastery" (pp. 703-704) which holds for both researcher and subject.

Uncertainty is a crucial element of this research, epistemologically, and in what I am asking of myself, and my research participants. However, the process of participation leads to change, both in the researcher, and the participants, and for that reason, I now turn to action research.

3.4 Action research

Bradbury Huang (2010) defines action research as "a transformative orientation to knowledge creation in that action researchers seek to take knowledge production beyond the gate-keeping of professional knowledge makers" (p. 93). A key point is that the researcher is not seeking to just understand or explain particular realities, but to effect

change. There is an explicitly emancipatory goal. Knowledge claims are not neutral, so contextualising the researcher's position 'anchors' a project. Without this, expressions can "masquerade as worryingly disembodied and neutral" (p. 95).

Parsons and Harding (2011) explore the relationship between postcolonial theory and action research, concluding "action research processes, focused through a postcolonial lens, can illuminate lingering biases and stereotypes, and where racism and ignorance can be analyzed, challenged, and ultimately eliminated" (p. 5). Postcolonial theory challenges the dominant Western hegemony, while action research "promises to problematize uncontested 'colonial' hegemonies of any form" (p. 1). Here is Bradbury Huang's emancipatory aim: the elimination of racism. Parsons and Harding (2011) caution us to consider how, when we "privilege and construct certain kinds of knowledge are we continuing the myth of inferior worlds, inferior races and inferior ways of being?" (p. 4). The researcher's responsibility to consider epistemological options carefully and reflexively is clear, especially within a colonial context.

It is therefore important to situate action research, Noffke (2012) argues, "through the use of a wider body of social theory, one that has embraced a social justice agenda that takes into account both local and global manifestations of oppression" (p. 7), mentioning feminist or postcolonial work. Action research "has always been deeply connected to social struggle" (p. 7). Acknowledging the now axiomatic claim, "the personal is political" (Hanish, cited in Noffke, 2012, p. 3), Noffke discusses the personal, professional and political dimensions of action research, explaining early feminists saw action research as able to directly make change, rather than waiting for research consumers to make changes, thereby eliminating a step. However, they also caution against reflexive complacence, as action research, "unproblematized in terms of its goals, can act to reinscribe existing practices rather than create new forms which focus on social justice" (Noffke, 2012, p. 15).

Lykes et al. (2018) use Participatory Action Research (PAR) in a graduate workshop called 'Undoing Racism'. Their project is situated within a broader literature of decolonising education[2] but is applicable to my research: their rationale for choosing PAR was to critically interrogate the idea of the Western self and the colonized 'other',

[2] e.g. Asher (2009), Villanueva (2013).

and account for vestiges of colonialism (p. 406). They align their research to decolonial, anti-racist, critical, feminist and liberatory praxis (p. 409). The students in their workshop appreciated vulnerability and fallibility, in contrast to the post-positivist value of being 'right' (p. 413), or the perfectionism embedded in white supremacist culture (p. 414; see also Okun, 2001). Working through this shift was disruptive, sometimes painfully challenging, but very worth it (p. 412), demonstrating a transformative effect.

However, I have a key point of departure from action research. I am not explicitly seeking to disrupt my participants; rather I am embracing the inevitability of encounters facilitating change. To reconcile this, I draw upon Barad's (2007) agential realism, and various readings of Barad in transformative and active research. Barad (2007) uses the term 'intra-action', which "signifies the mutual constitution of entangled agencies" (p. 33). While 'interaction' assumes agencies prior to interaction, 'intra-action' "recognizes that distinct agencies do not precede, but rather emerge through, their intra-action" (p. 33). Through this process, "marks are left on bodies" (p. 176). Barad (2007) argues there is an "ethical obligation to intra-act responsibly in the world's becoming, to contest and rework what matters and what is excluded from mattering" (p. 178).

This has been used by Marn and Wolgemuth (2017) to theorise transformative interviews as purposeful entanglements. Transformative interviewers "assume that all human interaction is interventional in some way" (p. 366), due to Barad's constantly mutually constitutive elements (p. 367). They borrow from Deleuze and Guattari (1987) to imagine transformation "'lasting' beyond the temporal boundaries of the interview intra-action ... continuing as lines of flight" (p. 373) beyond the interviews. Similarly, Kara (2017) describes a co-produced activist research methodology based on Barad's (2007) 'diffraction', which is a "term from physics that describes the interactions of ripples resulting from several stones being cast into a pool at once, or in sequence before the first ripples die away" (Kara, 2017, p. 291). These "patterns of difference that make a difference" (Barad, 2007, p. 72) are what constitute the world. Finally, Gordon (2018) combines Barad's agential realism with Pickering (1995), and subsequently Hekman (2010), who use the metaphor of a mangle to theorise 'scholarship-as-activism': "We

are always in the mangle, though the mangle is always changing, transforming through the intra-action that constitutes it. . . . The mangle is constantly in a state of becoming, and through that becoming agency is continually produced" (Gordon, 2018, section 'New Materialist Activism').

This deviation from a more classical action research sits more comfortably with my research. Rather than a purposeful disruption through research, a Baradian approach recognises the inevitability of my encounters with my participants leaving 'marks' on both of us, and agency emerging from the intra-action.

3.5 Conclusion

Given the colonial context in which I am operating, the epistemological choice is itself a political act. These three traditions all bring something to this research. Interpretivism is woven through to help me with *verstehen*, understanding how participants make sense of their identity, the social orders in which they operate, and how they contribute to, patch, or refuse to patch, the performance of those orders. The feminist epistemological approach embodied by Haraway and Harding demands relentless reflexivity and situationality of knowledge, and encourages me to always interrogate my own partial and positional interpretations. The action researchers remind me that unless I ground my work in emancipatory social theory, I risk reinscribing power I am trying to break open. Finally, the Baradian variant allows me to embrace that encounters with my participants have the potential to facilitate change in both of us.

4. Method

4.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the process I followed during this project, from the conception of my relationship to participants, through to writing up the final thesis. I start with a discussion about my participants as 'accomplices' who are collaborating with me in a project of problematising uncritical Pākehātanga and coming to terms with our complicity in ongoing colonial practices. The more practical considerations of sampling and how interviews were conducted are then outlined, before introducing my participants, reflecting upon my relationship with them and how our interviews went. Data management, privacy and my process of transcription and consent checking are then laid out, before explaining analysis of the data, including coding, thematic analysis, and the writing of this thesis. Although ethics is foundational to the entire project, the ethics section appears at the end of this chapter. This is because ethics was an ongoing concern that stayed with me in all stages of the framing, planning, and writing

4.2 Participants as accomplices

I went through a complex process of understanding my relationship to my participants. I personally match the profile I created for them, so I landed on the position that while we are positionally similar, the difference is that they are living the topic, while I am living it, *and* studying it. This is not enough of a differentiation to frame our relationship as *me studying them.* We are having conversations and, collaborating on the project of understanding our complicity in colonialism. Through these encounters, as acknowledged earlier[1], agency emerges and both the participants and I are changed.

In considering how to utilise my experience and voice through this process, I opted to put myself in conversation with participants. This creates space for me to discuss my experiences during the interviews, and also during writing. I believe this is the

[1] See *Action research*.

most appropriate method from a feminist epistemological standpoint that insists upon reflexivity and situationality. To operationalise this, I journalled after each interview.

This approach framed my Interview Questions[2] where I wrote: "The interviews are intended to be semi-structured conversations, in which we meander through the various parts of the subject together". The interviews *were* conversations: at times I interjected, we interrupted each other, and collaboratively searched for an appropriate word or concept. This is reflected in the *Participants* chapters, where I occasionally write about testing a point, suggesting a word, or looking for an anxiety. Acknowledging this reflects my commitment to an epistemological practice demanding an honest approach to my positionality, and entanglement with the object of study.

Reading Indigenous Action Media (2014) I found an idea that resonated with me. They shift from the term 'ally' to 'accomplice', on the grounds that 'ally' has become a disembodied identity, detached from the struggle it purports to support. Allies' motivations are grounded in shame and guilt, which may provide impetus for activism but leads to white centring. Accomplices, on the other hand, "aren't afraid to engage in uncomfortable/unsettling/challenging debates or discussions" (section 'Navigators & Floaters'). Their work in the "anti-colonial struggle is to attack colonial structures & ideas" (section 'Suggestions for some ways forward . . . ').

I found this idea of 'participants as accomplices' useful for grappling with how to conceptualise the relationships I have with my participants. We are interrogating mainstream ideas about Pākehā identity, asking why some of us might be willing to, despite discomfort, have difficult conversations and engage with our colonial complicity.

The academic literature I found on accomplices is limited. Powell and Kelly (2017) have written about academics as accomplices. They build on Matias et al. (2014), who show how Critical Whiteness Studies (CWS) "centres the normalisation of white domination in an effort to address how 'whites deflect, ignore, or dismiss their role, racialization and privilege in race dynamics' (Matias et al., 2014. p.291)" (Powell & Kelly, 2017, p. 44). Using CWS, they problematise white allyship, on a number of grounds, one being how the "ally paradigm ideologically positions whites as those who assist and people of color as those who need assistance, thereby maintaining oppressive hi-

[2] See *Appendix: Interview Questions*.

erarchies" (p. 45). Instead, they provide useful pointers on being an *accomplice* in the academy, including: reflecting on intentions, and centring privilege and oppression in work. Finally, their discussion of the intersubjectivity of stories resonated:

> The stories we share are performative, dialogical encounters, embodying our histories and identities in ephemeral form. Thus, the stories my participants shared were shaped by the interaction of their identities and mine. ...Acknowledging the ways my whiteness, history, and multiple identities participated in shaping all aspects of my research does not lead to a more valid narrative. Rather, it helps the reader to understand the stories of my participants as performative representations of our lives. And the notion that a true narrative doesn't exist does not mean that there is no knowledge to be gained from the study. Through different interpretations new ideas become apparent (p. 50).

I am therefore framing my participants and I as accomplices in a research project of critical feminist, anti-racist problematisation of whiteness as expressed in Pākehātanga, including our own complicity. This speaks to my reading of Barad (2007), in that this collaboration inevitably changes us, while agency emerges from our intra-actions.

4.3 Sampling

I used a snowball sampling approach to find six participants through my existing networks. My original proposal had specified 'between five and eight'. The participant profile was as follows: at least a first generation New Zealander, of Pākehā ethnicity[3], who does not identify any other country (where their parents or grandparents may have migrated from, for example), as 'home'. The key characteristic was openness to having a personal, potentially challenging conversation with me about identity and its entanglement with colonial realities, including willingness to share any disruptive moments that had shifted their perspective on the topic.

I did not explicitly limit age, gender, socio-economic, education, or other factors. While a comparative lens might be interesting across demographic difference, the sam-

[3] Whether a participant identified as 'Pākehā' was secondary, but they needed to be of Pākehā ethnicity. The possibility of interviewing someone who did not explicitly identify as Pākehā led me to exclude self-identification as 'Pākehā' as a criterion, but this did not eventuate.

ple size is sufficiently small as to foreclose generalisability. I initially settled on six participants, while keeping the option open to extend to eight. After I had completed the first six interviews, I was able to include a seventh. As this person had been living overseas for a number of years, he provided a useful 'foil' against the others, as although he occupies the same ethnic and cultural positionality, he is removed from the everyday grappling with it.

My final seven participants ranged in age from late teens to early forties. Three were women and four were men. They varied from students to professionals, had different socio-economic backgrounds and grew up in different parts of Aotearoa. I had a sufficient relationship with each of them to allow for an open conversation, and this ranged from relatively recent acquaintance, to a friendship approaching 15 years. Many of my participants knew or were aware of each other, which had to be managed carefully [4].

4.4 Interviewing

I conducted semi-structured, individual interviews, as these conversations had the potential to be highly personal. Together with the information sheet and consent form[5], I also sent the interview questions to participants in advance, to help guard against any possible distress. Each participant agreed to a follow-up interview if required, but this proved unnecessary.

The interviews ranged in length from just under an hour to more than two and a quarter hours. After the first, I wondered to what extent I was 'leading' participants to consider issues they had not delved deeply into. I discussed this with my supervisor, and came to the conclusion that as the interviews were designed to be a conversation where the participants and I were constructing meaning together, and they evidentially felt comfortable contesting suggestions, or disagreeing outright, 'leading' was less of an issue than in other epistemologies.

4.5 Participants

I gave each participant an alphabetical pseudonym: 'Andrew', 'Beatrice', and so on.

[4] See *Considerations for participants*.
[5] See *Appendix: Information Sheet*.

4.5.1 *Andrew*

Andrew is a first generation Pākehā in his early forties. His parents migrated from England. His was my first interview, which was a wise choice as we are close friends and have a high level of trust. His answers aligned with my thoughts, which was reassuring in the first interview but did not prepare me for different answers in subsequent interviews. Some of the topics we discussed led me to look more carefully for the same thing in subsequent interviews, which was beneficial.

4.5.2 *Beatrice*

Beatrice is a multiple[6] generation Pākehā in her mid thirties. Our interview was immediately different from the first one. Her responses to my first questions about Pākehā identity typified it as an 'absence' which made this quite hard to delve further into. I cautiously prompted her with a few ideas to see if they landed, without wanting to lead too much, and found she was quite willing to disagree with me, which was reassuring. She told me when she was unsure how to answer a question.

4.5.3 *Charlotte*

Charlotte is a multiple generation Pākehā in her early twenties. My interview with her was on the same day as the interview with Beatrice, which was an interesting contrast. When I read the transcript I found I had done quite a lot more prompting, perhaps emboldened by my experiences with Andrew and Beatrice. When writing, I found myself occasionally relying on her agreeing with me, for example, saying, "Yeah. Totally".

4.5.4 *David*

David is a multiple generation Pākehā in his late thirties. Our interview was perhaps influenced by a story I relayed from the previous evening, where I had taken an opportunity to call out racist behaviour. We had a long talk about how to call out/call in people when behaving inappropriately, which did not arise in any other interview. He asked me whether he should include analysis based on having studied this area. I

[6] Multiple means more than three generations, but unknown specificity.

responded that I would not disentangle the personal from the academic, because both are part of his story.

4.5.5 *Eddie*

Eddie is a first generation Pākehā in his late teens. At one point during our interview, I challenged his position. This caught him off guard, but he could subsequently see both sides. He was surprised by me suggesting an entanglement of his identity as Pākehā and his politics. I suggested that we could follow up on this, but that did not eventuate. This interview was harder for me, as there were long silences and I was not sure how much to probe. I tested several ideas. Eddie was comfortable disagreeing with me when necessary.

4.5.6 *Fabienne*

Fabienne is a fourth-fifth[7] generation Pākehā in her mid thirties. I recruited her via a different route than the first five, who came from the same social/activist group. Something I did in all of the interviews, but was only conscious of while transcribing hers, was modelling vulnerability and fallibility, by telling my own stories. Fabienne has read widely on this topic, and raised authors such as DiAngelo. While she was not connected to the other participants, she still used much of the same language and had arrived at similar positions. I was expecting some internal consistency amongst the first five but did not have the same expectation of Fabienne. This was a reassuring check on the insularity of the social/activist group.

4.5.7 *George*

George is a fourth-fifth generation Pākehā in his late thirties. He occupied a similar role to Fabienne— unconnected to the first five— but with the added deviation of living overseas. Of all the participants, I have known George the longest so our conversation had a more personal tone. It was interesting to compare his experience of whiteness in the United States, to that of whiteness in Aotearoa. This allowed me to check on a theory I had developed over the course of the interviews: that it is easier to see the

[7] Hyphenated generations means known specificity, from both sides of the family.

structures of oppression you are complicit in, when you are exposed to a similar system you are detached from. This is reflected in *Participants: Formative experiences*.

4.6 Data management

I recorded all interviews using the 'Voice Memo' app on my iPhone, transferred them to my computer and deleted them from my iPhone. I stored all information on my computer using their pseudonyms. I transcribed manually using 75% playback speed. I replaced all names of people, organisations or locations that may have led to identification of the participants with place holders such as [AAAA] and put the values into my encrypted password file. I made sure my computer was running regular backups.

I sent the transcriptions to each participant, to obtain their consent, giving them two weeks to reply with changes. Some required small changes, and two requested specific care around their identifiability. In these cases, I either changed the transcript outright, or noted to follow up with them if I used that part of the transcript. When they authorised the transcripts, I deleted the audio files. The next step was Analysis.

4.7 Analysis

In analysing the transcripts, I opted to use a thematic approach, as I was "interested in examining the ways that people make meaning out of their experiences, as well as how they construct their social worlds through meaning-making" (Evans, 2018, p. 3). Braun and Clarke (2006) explain that thematic analysis is independent of epistemology, and can be compatible with either an essentialist/realist, or constructivist approach. They provide helpful advice on what counts as a theme, and list six (non-linear) phases of analysis, which I broadly followed: familiarisation; initial codes; searching for and reviewing themes; defining themes; and report writing.

4.7.1 *Familiarisation*

Braun and Clarke (2006) recommend first *familiarising oneself with the data, via transcription, reading, re-reading, and noting ideas.* As I manually transcribed my interviews (although time-consuming and 'boring' as they note (p. 87)), I absorbed them.

After transcription, I wrote up key points.

4.7.2 *Initial codes*

Their second step is *generating initial codes*. They recommend coding inclusively and accepting tensions and contradictions in the data. I printed the transcripts, and went over them with a highlighter, writing codes in the margins. I then put all codes into a spreadsheet, noting their page numbers. This gave me an initial visual overview of where the same concepts appeared in multiple interviews, although it became apparent I would need to aggressively merge overlapping codes. I completed this process with over 250 initial codes across all interviews, which I grouped into 32 concepts (see below). This broadly fits within the recommendations in Elliott (2018, pp. 2852-2853)[8]. I followed an emergent coding practice, which as Elliott (2018, p. 2855) recommends, required going back over interviews to check for consistency.

Braun and Clarke (2006) allow for some disjuncture between the research questions, the questions the participants responded to, and the questions guiding coding. I found some codes were occurring both in the discussion about disruptive moments, and what decolonisation looked like. This suggested my framing had divided time into a pre-interview/past bracket and a post-interview/future/decolonisation bracket. Indeed, in my *Epistemology* chapter, I wrote about looking for a moment where my participants faced disruption to their equilibrium, and instead of continuing to 'patch' (David, 2010) began to question their role in, and performance of, a social order. This would imply a single transformative moment. However, what my participants said was more indicative of a non-linear journey. For example, some mentioned realising they had had a problematic thought, and in 'catching' it, had questioned their assumptions. This was a formative or disruptive moment, but it came up again when I asked what decolonisation meant to them: personal decolonisation was a skill to develop.

I discussed with my supervisor whether to allow initial codes (and by extension, potentially themes) to overlap between research objectives. Our feeling was this reflected more nuance in my participants' experiences than my research objectives allowed for. The more honest way to approach it was to be guided by what my participants said,

[8] Elliott (2018) survey the literature on the ideal number of codes. My 250 that I reduced to 32 fits within most example ranges.

rather than to try and dogmatically code according to my research objectives. Around this time, I coincidentally read Linder (2015), whose white anti-racist identity development model was the non-linear cogs and machine model. This verified my decision to not force coding to adhere to pre-interview and post-interview time.

4.7.3 *Searching for themes*

Braun and Clarke's (2006) third step is *searching for themes*. I grouped the codes into concepts. I added a column in my spreadsheet for which concept the code belonged to. I also wrote post-it notes for each concept. This yielded 32 concepts. Then I grouped them together into themes. This led to four themes. Four of the concepts sat at the boundary of two themes, which I captured in my spreadsheet.

4.7.4 *Reviewing themes*

Their fourth step is *reviewing themes*. While I felt comfortable with the groupings within the themes, I was concerned the themes themselves were self-evident and unsophisticated. I asked my participant Andrew to group the concepts, as a check. His interpretation was quite different. Elliott (2018) discusses the utility of second coding by an unknowing person. They draw on Richards (2015), who warns against this, as "consistency between two raters will not necessarily be desirable, when the two coders have been chosen precisely because of their different understanding of the data" (Elliott, 2018, p. 2859). This matched my experience. While Andrew's recoding was interesting, I ultimately discounted it. I discussed all this with my supervisor, who reminded me simple is often better. Mentally renaming the groupings from 'themes' to 'categories' (Elliott, 2018, p. 2852) helped. I was heartened to find a note I wrote myself saying, "warning: rein yourself in".

4.7.5 *Defining and naming themes*

Braun and Clarke's (2006) fifth step is to *define and name themes*, which involves identifying the 'essence' of the themes, collating and organising data extracts for each theme, and looking for sub-themes. Further, it is necessary to understand the story each theme tells and how this fits into the overall story (p. 92). I went back to my 250-

line spreadsheet and pulled quotes from all interviews relating to every concept within each category. I organised these into what would become chapters, sections, and subsections. This step allowed me to identify the story each chapter would tell.

4.7.6 *Report*

The sixth and final step is writing the report. As I started writing, I immediately found I was using language like 'most participants'. Evans (2018) explains many qualitative researchers find it appropriate to use 'pseudo quantitative terms', but warns it might not tell the reader much about the relevance of a theme (p. 5). Braun and Clarke (2006) discuss how to count and present prevalence, suggesting there is no right or wrong method. They are similarly ambivalent on 'pseudo quantitative terms', arguing while they may be a useful rhetoric device, they might not report truthfully, and conclude the area needs more debate (p. 83). Finally, Elliott (2018) discusses counting codes, making the interesting point that some researchers consider quantitative orientations like counting to be inconsistent with a qualitative project. Furthermore, counting is not always the best indicator of importance. I decided against counting, and, as a consequence, *for* using language like 'most participants' in my reporting. This is because my project is highly qualitative, and the interviews themselves very different. They did not lend themselves well to quantitatively-oriented counting or language.

Braun and Clarke (2006) stress the data must be embedded within an analytic narrative. Starting *Analysis*, I tried to align the sections between the *Literature Review* and *Participants* chapters. This strategy failed. I realised I had to step out of the themes and look at the whole picture anew. I wrote each main point from the *Literature Review* on blue post-it notes; and from my *Participants* chapters on green post-it notes. I then matched blue to blue and to green. This formed the skeleton of the *Analysis* chapter.

4.8 Ethics

This project has two primary ethical considerations. The first is my participants' safety, as I am asking them to share personal stories and discuss potentially challenging topics. The second relates to the choices I make with this project. Forefront in my mind is the risk of perpetuating colonialism through research. My critical anti-racist femi-

nist instinct is to amplify non-dominant voices, and yet I am choosing to explore what Pākehā, the dominant group, think about themselves, what Dyer (1997) calls the "green light problem" (p. 10). These two issues are explored below.

4.8.1 *Considerations for participants*

Tolich (2010) provides ten ethical guidelines I find particularly helpful. While they are speaking to autoethnographers, I find the framing useful for my research. I am also present in the *Participants* chapters, as we are together telling stories, which intermingle as we relate, as discussed above.

Tolich (2010) recommends:

1. Respecting participant autonomy and informed consent.
2. Practising process consent at all stages.
3. Being mindful of conflicts of interest or coercion.
4. Consulting with others like an ethics board.
5. Not publishing anything one wouldn't show the persons represented in the text.
6. Being aware of internal confidentiality amongst participants.
7. Anticipating possible future vulnerability.
8. Avoiding, or at the very least, minimising harm.
9. Considering a non de plume.
10. Assuming all people mentioned in the text could read it (pp. 9-10).

Most of these points were reasonably easy to operationalise, with points six and seven slightly more challenging. There was the possibility of participants recognising the stories and being able to identify each other. The best way to guard against this was by recognising it as a possibility as part of points one and two.

One participant was potentially identifiable by my supervisor. I discussed this with the participant, who did not mind being identified. As I anonymised the transcript, the risk was minimised. After sharing the transcripts, I also shared a draft of the four *Participants* chapters, and gained their consent again.

My ethical considerations extended to stories told by my participants involving other people, as the self is porous (Tolich, 2010, p. 10). This required an extra level of awareness in how the stories were represented in written text, and in this case necessitated

an additional level of consent from a person who was referenced by one of my participants. I sent the relevant extracts to this person to confirm they were comfortable with being indirectly included.

4.8.2 *Considerations for myself*

A second ethical theme relates to my motivations as a researcher. Tuck and Yang (2012) might suggest my drive behind this project represents a settler move to innocence:

> We are asking them/you to consider how the pursuit of critical consciousness, the pursuit of social justice through a critical enlightenment, can also be settler moves to innocence – diversions, distractions, which relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility, and conceal the need to give up land or power or privilege (p. 21).

This reflects warnings from other anti-racist researchers (eg. Cross, 1999; Lykes et al., 2018; Pine & Hilliard, 1990), who all warn about reinscribing injustice:

Lykes et al. (2018) caution that even well-intentioned liberal agents can reinforce institutional racism in their everyday actions (p. 408). They refer to Cross (1999) who shows how even programmes using the language of social justice, multiculturalism and diversity can operate within an uninterrogated whiteness ideology, reinscribing power and privilege (p. 266). Cross (1999), building upon Pine and Hilliard (1990) leaves me with the warning "the unfortunate truth is that we can be strongly antiracist in our own minds but be promulgating racism in profound ways we do not understand" (p. 272).

Probyn (2004) describes this as "a white studying whiteness trying not to reinscribe whiteness" (para. 2). One common strategy is for the white critic to slip into a position of weakness along another axis (gender, class, sexuality, ...), or to qualify it: 'white, but ...' This allows for deflection of responsibility to *own* whiteness. However, the "self-loathing inherent to the white critic of whiteness has to go somewhere" (para. 22). Complicity in whiteness demands we take up responsibility. The best way to address this is an ongoing, genuine interrogation of self, combined with Sholock's (2012) epistemological uncertainty. There is a knife edge balance to be struck, between paralysing self analysis and narcissistic self-centring.

Sium et al. (2012) question whether it is possible to decolonise through Western in-

stitutions like the academy at all. The danger is seeing decolonisation as something in the mind, without leading to material improvements for indigenous peoples. They recommend to take ideas off the bookcase and act on them (Sium et al., 2012, p. VII). I therefore include action research in my epistemological approach. While I am not directly seeking to disrupt my participants, I recognise all encounters can facilitate change. Further, Building upon L. T. Smith (2012), and Cross (1999), perhaps one way to help avoid the danger of perpetuating colonialism through this research is to pervert the subject-object relationship by turning the gaze of the dominant group upon itself. Making Pākehā the object of research doesn't just invert the colonising relationship (although not as much as if I were Māori), it also follows the many recommendations in the literature, for example, Harding (1987) who recommends we examine sources of power by studying ourselves and "studying up" (p. 8).

4.9 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the research process as a whole. It shows how my participants could best be conceived as accomplices co-creating this research with me, which aligns with my epistemological framework. It also covers my approach to analysis, including the challenges I found along the way and how I resolved them. I also introduced my participants, and discussed how to honour their trust in me, alongside the ethical considerations I had for myself as a Pākehā researcher engaging with this topic and how I navigate them and aspire to hold myself accountable at all times.

5. Participants: The problem space

5.1 Introduction

"Part of the problem of colonisation and ... white settler dominance ... of this country, is people not disaggregating their Pākehā identity from wider New Zealand identity" (Andrew).

The following interview questions[1] led to the conversation behind this chapter: *Can you tell me what your thoughts are on what a New Zealand identity means? What characteristics come to mind when you think about what a 'New Zealander' is? Now I'd like to narrow a bit and explore what you think is characteristic of the Pākehā identity. What characteristics do you see there? Is it something different? Do you think there's a general conflation of Pākehā and New Zealand when some Pākehā think about identity?*

Therefore, the purpose of this chapter is to discuss what the participants thought about New Zealander or Pākehā identities *in general*, and therefore serves as an identification of the problem space of the colonial field. It covers topics such as: the problems with a monolithic identity, myths, barriers, privilege, power and racism.

5.2 On a monolithic identity

All participants were mindful of the risk of sliding into monolithic identity, elimination of difference or Pākehā dominance. Charlotte and Fabienne realised slightly late that my questioning was framed to test for this, as I asked first about New Zealand, before narrowing my question to ask about Pākehā, identity. Fabienne noticed when I asked the second question, exclaiming, "Oh, gosh. ...I actually think a lot of the stuff I've just said are things that I associate with Pākehā New Zealand identity". Charlotte said, "that's the way that you framed a New Zealand identity when actually it's not necessarily just that, which is quite an interesting ...perspective ...how the mind tricks us".

[1] See *Appendix: Interview Questions*.

They all recognised a failure in mainstream identity discourses to mark the specificity of Pākehā. David identified that "the idea of sameness, . . . 'we're all New Zealanders', that kind of thing, seems to eliminate difference within identity". George believed this was wilful: "I think there are a bunch of people who believe and want to believe that there is a monolithic New Zealander identity . . . and everyone should be it".

I raised this as being related to the concept of space with Beatrice: "It's like Pākehā is claiming all of that space, and denying it to everybody else, right?". She agreed, calling this, "pretty problematic". Fabienne and Eddie discussed where this tendency to conflate came from. Fabienne said it was a product of growing up in a predominantly Pākehā environment. Eddie mentioned media: "It's something that just happens heaps . . . offhand comments made by people on One News. . . . people talk about 'Kiwi farming culture' and things like that, but . . . they're really not including Māori".

I suggested to Eddie the reason "people kind of disavow it and say, . . . 'I'm just a New Zealander', is because it involves going down a rabbit hole". He agreed: "And doing a lot more learning . . . than you were expecting to do that week." He also identified his "distrust of that concept and that sort of groupthink idea probably comes from . . . having . . . slightly more understanding of colonial processes". Charlotte thought a root cause might be "New Zealanders might struggle to have an identity, or Pākehā might struggle to have an identity". Beatrice also identified this absence, thinking "the way that we . . . approach Māori culture, for some people, is to make up for the absence of anything for ourselves". I will explore this point later. For now, I turn to myths.

5.3 Myths

When discussing what might be seen as the monolithic 'New Zealand' identity, many tropes arose that one would expect, including egalitarianism and ingenuity, sports, militarism, peace, independence, and protest. However, the participants appeared to engage with a more critical analysis than some Pākehā might who adopt these identity markers without questioning them. In the cases of egalitarianism and ingenuity, these were characterised as something we *think* about ourselves. George said, "the ideal of egalitarianism was something that I was brought up to think is a New Zealand charac-

teristic. I don't think it is. . . . It's . . . more of an ideal . . . that we have . . . lost sight of a bit". Similarly, Andrew said, "the sense of egalitarianism that I think people think exists in New Zealand". Even though George was sceptical about egalitarianism, he was struck when he saw a Member of Parliament catching a bus to work, which is quite normal here, compared to the United States.

The "farming, Number 8 Wire, shoot a deer on the weekend, sort of line" (Eddie) was raised by a number of participants, also with a degree of scepticism and disconnection. George called Number 8 Wire the sort of "national myth of ingenuity that every country has, every country firmly believes that they are uniquely . . . we [just] have a unique idiom for it . . . no one else uses fencing wire as their reference point".

Rugby, and sport in general were also mentioned. Andrew played rugby growing up, so "think[s] that's a big part of our culture for better or for worse". Beatrice, discussing the flag referendum[2], noted our apparent inability to express our identity:

> We couldn't even go, there's an obvious thing here for us, this is who we are . . . we rely on the sporting thing, because we do have that . . . there was a silver fern, because that is how we are represented on the world stage, and that's something that unites us, around sport . . .

A theme around militarism, peace, independence and protest was also apparent. Andrew mentioned 'militarism' explicitly, referring to ANZAC as "an underestimated . . . pillar of our identity as New Zealanders, and you know, the Gallipoli myth, which is a total bullshit myth, obviously is . . . a real founding element", going so far as to say it was strategic, deliberate, colonial nation building. Beatrice was also detached from ANZAC day, recognising its significance for others, but characterising it as "feel[ing] . . . other, so it feels like a thing where we were fighting somebody else's war".

The other side to militarism, Andrew said, was "a strong . . . peace element to our identity". He elaborated, "not going to Iraq[3], and nuclear weapons[4], and there's something there about principled independence. A sort of defiance of authority in a way, that I think is in there". Other examples given by him and others included suffrage[5],

[2] See e.g. Annabell and Nairn (2019).
[3] Combat troops were not sent to Iraq in 2003, as there was no United Nations endorsement (Petterson, 2016).
[4] In 1987, nuclear vessels were banned from New Zealand waters and the United States downgraded us from 'ally' to 'friend' (Ayson & Phillips, 2012).
[5] Women were granted the right to vote in 1893 (Atkinson, 2015).

Parihaka[6], Ihumātao[7], protesting the Springbok Tour[8], our independent foreign policy record, which George said, got "up the noses of the military industrial complex"[9], the response to the March 15 shootings[10], and the Christchurch Call[11]. Both Beatrice and George mentioned agility in changing our gun legislation[12] following the March 15 shootings, which felt specifically 'New Zealand'.

However, as the sentiment expressed around egalitarianism also show, there was a sense that some of the things we tell ourselves don't quite hold. This was raised around the idea of an 'independent' foreign policy record as well. George said, "I kind of hope that we keep doing [things like nuclear free] but I think we aren't necessarily doing the modern equivalents". Similarly, Fabienne said,

> I feel like there's ... something about that ... in our identity, but then I'm not actually convinced that we live that, as strongly, it's almost like we say that's us, but actually apart from some big really momentous stuff ... it may not be as strongly. ... What we've said we are, we're not necessarily. Or it's perhaps more, something we want to be, or something we want to think we are, but perhaps ... [we] don't marry it with action ... or we leave that action to certain parts of society, like we might expect it of Government.

Although participants were critical, these identity myths still contained positive elements. However, they also identified a range of negative traits, that, together, contribute as barriers to engaging with colonial complicity.

5.4 Barriers

Some of the negative characteristics that arose I have grouped as 'barriers', to suggest some underlying mainstream stereotypes of the Pākehā psyche may act to prevent a critical analysis of ourselves, history and present. These include variations on stoicism

[6] Parihaka is a Māori settlement that was the scene of peaceful resistance to colonial confiscation of land during the 1880s and 1890s (Hōhaia, 2017). The Crown apologised in 2017(Finlayson, 2017).

[7] Ihumātao is an historic Māori site in danger of being bulldozed for housing development. Save Our Unique Landscape (SOUL) have been living on the whenua/land for years to protect it (E-Tangata, 2019).

[8] 1981 saw intense protests against the (Apartheid era) South African Rugby team visiting (Keane, 2012).

[9] This refers to the nuclear free policy mentioned above.

[10] A white nationalist fired at worshippers in Mosques in Christchurch, killing 51 (Newbold, 2019). The Prime Minister at the time, Jacinda Ardern, was recognised around the world for her response (Luscombe, 2020).

[11] "The Christchurch Call is a commitment by Governments and tech companies to eliminate terrorist and violent extremist content online" (Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, n.d.).

[12] Semi-automatic firearms were banned (New Zealand Parliament, n.d.).

and complacency, and the divided nature of our society.

Most participants mentioned stoicism, not expressing emotions or talking about 'the hard stuff', conservatism, or our blokey, individualistic, culture. Andrew felt Aotearoa was a "deeply conservative, risk averse society" holding us back. Fabienne saw risk aversion in our institutions, leading to a mentality of "this is the way we do things, this is the way we've always done things . . . it takes a lot to . . . rock the boat".

Charlotte also identified complacency, entangled with privilege:

> For a long time we have been quite . . . innovative and interesting in terms of being at the forefront of social issues . . . which has created a . . . sense of comfortableness . . . everyone would say, 'oh compared to the rest of the world we're doing really well, so, we're good'. And I think that does create a sense of complacency in New Zealanders around taking action.

Eddie mentioned suppressing emotions, saying:

> If I decide that I am a Kiwi, and this is what Kiwis do, then it's not that big a step to say, this is what Kiwi men do. And then suddenly, I'm suppressing my emotions, and milking cows all day, and not telling somebody when I'm feeling really, really, bad.

A few participants also mentioned how divided Aotearoa is. Andrew, discussing the "totally divided" city he grew up in, said:

> There are people who are from the university, and hospital, and schools, and the Crown Institutes, and they . . . are mostly, left leaning, sort of liberal intelligentsia, educated. And then there's the people who are related to the agricultural industries, commercial property, quite religious, and they are all basically right wing. And they don't really mix!

Charlotte talked about the impacts of the divide between Pākehā and Māori in the town she grew up in, and Fabienne asked:

> How do we make those connections when so much of what is around is in society is actually, dividing us . . . not directly in terms of how we think and how we relate, but where we're living, what schools we're going to . . . who's predominantly in our workplaces?

When I suggested Pākehā wanted to let sleeping dogs lie and paint over divisions, George said, "The sleeping dogs are not lying anyway . . . and national unity is a phrase that I'm deeply wary of at this point". This wariness, and awareness of divisions indicates the constant effect of the forces of privilege, power and racism.

5.5 Privilege, power, and racism

The participants discussed the implications of living with privilege, and the fear caused when it is threatened. They explicitly named racism, white supremacy and entitlement. Here there were five main themes: laziness, fear, racism, superiority, and how colonialism is inherent in everything.

Beatrice and Fabienne spoke of the ease of whiteness in Aotearoa, how easy it is to navigate systems. Fabienne summed up the problem space:

> By existing and being part of the system, and then part of the dominant in that system, the fact that I basically just run on autopilot is harmful, because I'm perpetuating a system, rather than questioning, challenging, seeking to shift it.

I asked participants to speculate why many Pākehā don't question, challenge, or seek to shift things. Andrew said, "we don't think about it. I think . . . the very idea of examining Pākehā identity would be threatening. I think a lot of people would say, . . . 'look I don't even want to talk about it' ". George reiterated that people don't want to accept implications, because of "the work that would be necessary to do", they would "actually have to change", and might think, "if I just say that I accept this idea, I might have to do something about it, and then you know, that would probably be a hassle."

However,instead of highlighting laziness, Fabienne drew attention to fear:

> [The] good/bad binary thing. To engage with this, I'm on the dominant side of this, that's the bad side. So you're calling me bad, I am in the bad position around all of this conversation, I don't want to be sitting there, so I don't want to engage.

George also thought fear was involved:

> In some ways it's fear of . . . things being complicated, or if they accept that

> there are multiple identities, then they will have to change a bunch of their other behaviours . . . and acknowledge that different groups of New Zealanders are more or less advantaged . . . they would have to admit that privilege . . . exists . . . there are a whole lot of people who will fight pretty hard to not have to accept the implications of the thing that they don't want to accept.

Fabienne said, "a lot of it is fear based . . . or status based. . . . I think there's a fear of loss of what identity is there. . . . A loss of . . . a right, a status, as a New Zealander". She mentioned the loss of meritocratic ideals being associated with this:

> You would warrant your position on merit, but there's that little bit going, 'but would I?' So I think there's a wee bit of that, there's that power thing as well. Loss of power. Or, an implication that the power you hold is . . . not appropriately gained.

George was scathing of the very idea of meritocracy:

> I don't think you have to be a super perceptive person to go into some of these meritocracies and go 'oh the people in charge don't seem to have that much merit' . . . Once you've talked to some very clueless morons who believe they're at the top of a meritocracy, the idea falls apart quite rapidly.

However, David noted "how organisations change, in terms of power sharing. . . which I think is often, connected to the . . . personal awareness, or defensiveness . . . of power holders, and people in positions to change". Andrew was explicit on the motivations of power holders: "the people that wield power, they don't want us to think about power. They just want it to be . . . the way things work, rather than . . . an actual deliberate co-ordinated maintenance of power".

Related to the motivations of power holders, is the superiority inherent in the belief that we know better. Beatrice mentioned the "classic white thing of . . . we know best . . . and if you're the other then you're doing it wrong". This informed her understanding of colonisation, which she described as:

> A bunch of white people came and thought they knew so much more and could do so much better, and whilst we . . . may have been better than was seen in other places, maybe, it still wasn't great, and it was so dominant

> that it eroded all the things that made Māori culture and Māori ownership of this place, so important. ...And the fact that we're still having to deal with the repercussions of that in basically ... every system ... that's been established in New Zealand, has done Māori wrong.

She said, even in 2019, we still have so far to go, asking, "Why has it taken us so long to get there?" I answered, "We still think we know better". She agreed, "And we still think we know better ... across every single issue". Pākehā defensiveness is when "you defend it because it's what's right in your head".

Fabienne illustrated how this entitlement can manifest when describing an experience with a colleague who had been asked to engage early in a process during a project, and struggled to be completely open: "I think if we pushed him, he already had a pretty decent idea of where he thought it should all go. Rather than going, here's a question, I just want to listen." I asked her, "Is that not just entitlement though? ...Thinking that you know all of the answers to all of the things right from the start?" She replied, "yeah".

Belief in the idea that 'we know better' is a key element of racism. The participants didn't shy away from naming 'racism' and 'white supremacy'. Discussing the backlash to the policy to teach te reo Māori[13] in schools, Beatrice said, "that's having to embrace an element of Māori culture and that makes people uncomfortable because they're inherently racist". George said, "New Zealand has problems with racism and white supremacy, like ... everywhere with white people does". Eddie mentioned the different public responses to Welsh language and te reo Māori revival: "it's like ... '[they] don't realise that it's because they're brown, but it's because they're brown that [they] feel uncomfortable about that' ". Charlotte discussed a tendency to deflect "when we're trying to have a conversation about why Māori people are disadvantaged ... they bring up the one box, where it could be different", to which I asked, "why do they need to argue that point, and the answer has got to be, racism. Right?" She replied, "Totally". David also mentioned a tendency for Pākehā to think we were less racist than other countries, a "sort of letting ourselves off the hook". He considers Aotearoa just as racist, but "more passive aggressive about it ... than the more kind of blatant loud versions". George too, said "New Zealand's racism is often ... more subtle".

[13] Māori language.

Our racism may be more subtle, but participants also identified that it was inherent to everything. While exploring current expressions of colonialism, I said to Beatrice, "even the way we talk and media, and ... the awful cartoons, and all of that ... I would classify as colonialism, in action, now". She replied, "Except that's what we are. I mean, that's inherent to everything. ...All of our systems are built up around that". George said something similar: "there was ... a whole lot of things, deliberately or conveniently ... just codified into law and practice, just systemic bits of oppression, that continue".

Beatrice characterised the problem of 'common sense status quo' prevailing:

> I always thought democracy was the best thing, it's like 'of course!' ... it's not until you really start thinking about it and challenging it ... maybe it's actually not! Maybe it's just that all of the big white people say that democracy is the best ... I think it's exactly the same thing, which is that we think we're led to believe that ... everything ... Europeans brought over and developed ... [is] the right thing, and Māori is the other, over here.

In thinking about where responsibility might lie, Eddie mentioned the role of the media in promoting the monolithic identity idea, and George went further, saying:

> It's also ... pushed by ... right leaning media machines ... I don't know which is worse, whether they don't believe it and are prepared to do it for the money, or whether they do it long enough and they begin to believe it.

5.6 Conclusion

It was striking that when discussing generalised Pākehā identity, participants offered few positive traits. Although some tropes arose, they were presented in a critical, and somewhat detached way, questioning whether they were just things we *think* about ourselves, rather than embody. Participants were comfortable and insightful discussing divisions, racism, privilege and power, and barriers to engaging with colonial structures. While some participants were glib, there was also empathy, and a tone of sadness and frustration. It was evident that they were all on their own journey through engagement with this topic, which is highlighted in the next chapter, where their formative experiences are explored.

6. Participants: Formative experiences

6.1 Introduction

"It opened my eyes to the experiences of a number of my colleagues, who I see as the most amazing, strong, leaders, great colleagues, beautiful people . . . I was just completely oblivious . . . even just . . . walking into our workplace, they were almost . . . armouring up" (Fabienne).

The following interview questions led to the conversation behind this chapter: *Can you think of an event in your life or something that you experienced that has influenced or changed the way you think about colonialism? Why do you think some people are so defensive about this topic? Can you tell me what things have led to you being able to talk about this, even though it may be uncomfortable?.*

The purpose of this chapter is therefore to explore participants' formative experiences. Their answers varied broadly, though with substantial overlap. Key themes in this chapter are: living overseas, how to come to see complicity, influential relationships with both Māori and Pākehā, family and childhood influences, exposure to history, activism and workplace experiences, and approaches to personal accountability.

6.2 Living overseas

Almost all participants had either spent time travelling, or living overseas, and mentioned this time, or their return to Aotearoa, as formative. Beatrice explained:

> When I was 16, I did an exchange, over to [South America] . . . over there, I would see a lot of the culture, and I was sort of trying to explain how in New Zealand there just isn't that. So I see Māori culture, and everything that comes with it, because it feels like it's an incredibly . . . deep, precious, wonderful thing, which is just steeped in culture, and then there's the absence of culture. Which is Pākehā. And so, when I was 16 and having that

> kind of realisation, I think part of it was ... the embarrassment of not even knowing who we are.

Similarly, George said, "the first six months I lived in France taught me a lot more about New Zealand than it did about France", and "I don't think I really thought about what it is like for immigrants in New Zealand before I became an immigrant myself". For Charlotte and Andrew, returning home re-engaged them. Charlotte confronted "some racial biases I found travelling". Before travelling she "didn't have much of an interest in New Zealand history", but returning "gave me much more compassion ... and interest in the dynamics and politics in New Zealand, particularly around race and the history". Andrew said, "I think I've failed to properly engage with New Zealand while I was overseas ... coming back to New Zealand ... I think some of my structural analysis might have been a bit flimsy". For some participants, engaging with structures of power overseas that they were less entangled with, was a route to seeing complicity.

6.3 Seeing our complicity

Andrew described his work overseas in the humanitarian field, his interest in injustice and structural oppression. I suggested seeing structures he was *not* complicit in may have helped him see structures he *was* complicit in. He responded, "that specific point about being attuned, or being more open to understand one's own complicity with colonisation and settler identity because you've been able to understand structures of injustice ... that you don't feel complicit in? Don't know. ... Maybe". He went on to say:

> I don't think your entry point can be Pākehā identity, frankly, I think if you wanted to get people on board with this kind of thinking ... you've got to start with understanding structures of power. And it might be that that is easier when it is [in] financial terms. ... The economic analysis, it's way more compelling for people than the race frame... because it's not threatening to them, because ...

I prompted[1], "Because it doesn't challenge their identity?" He agreed: "Because it doesn't challenge their identity". Charlotte raised another indirect route:

[1] This was the interview which led me to consider whether I was 'leading', as discussed in my *Method* chapter.

> I think I delved into ... feminism, deeper, more quickly than I delved into this colonial reality ... but then there are ... very similar power dynamics to racial structures, and that helped me understand it way quicker as well. ... Humans do structural oppression very similarly.

Both Charlotte and David mentioned the expression that if you're used to living with privilege, equity feels like oppression. Charlotte said, "Sometimes you just hear it worded in a way, and you're like, 'oh! I get it!' ". Fabienne mentioned she had been helped by reading DiAngelo's work on white fragility, and breaking down a good/bad binary of "racist bad, not racist good. Conflating racist and racism". Instead, she said, "once you move this conversation out of the good/bad binary, and you go 'you had no choice into where in this system you were born, but that does not ... mean that you just go with it' ".

George talked about feeling like an outsider:

> I found it a lot easier to learn how society was structured when it's ... France and America, and I'm not invested in it ... I'm really interested in it, but from a place of detachment ... I can look at this and I can see problems because they're not my problems.

He elaborated that it helped him to see that "things that I had taken for granted and ... thought were ... just how the world is, and then it turned out that a lot of those things were just choices that New Zealand society had collectively made". Finally, he said, "it's very clear to me now that ... I'm complicit in it and I benefit from it, regardless of my feelings about it". Taking this further, David said,

> It's particularly personal because I do feel both the personal, and a kind of connection to a family history and group history or complicity in the wrongness, and so ... feel a responsibility to want to be part of, solutions, or at least ... undoing ongoing and further harm.

For some participants, a sense of connection, and relationships with both Pākehā and Māori had contributed to this sense of responsibility to undo harm.

6.4 Relationships

It was clear a sense of connection was important. Eddie said, "you open the Stuff comments section, and it's just you feel like you're one against the world". Similarly, Andrew said he was "wanting to be in the fight with people. And wanting to . . . be on the right side! Yeah!". He elaborated:

> Maybe you admire some people who have been . . . victimised by your position in political power, and . . . you admire them for fighting against it, and you want to be seen as helpful to them, and you definitely don't want to be seen as unhelpful to them.

This section covers a variety of relationships, in-group and out-group learning, and positive, as well as negative learning.

6.4.1 *Learning from Pākehā*

Eddie told me something a Pākehā activist mentor said in a Treaty workshop: "I have looked at the situation and . . . I can either be here by right of conquest or right of Treaty and I choose to be here by right of Treaty". He called this "one of the biggest . . . realisation learning moments . . . and what I try and set up my activism . . . around".

David said, "I do feel a sense of . . . identity . . . belonging . . . and connection to, working with other Pākehā who are doing . . . social justice work, Treaty work, doing work . . . to be, decolonising basically". He acknowledged struggling to engage with other Pākehā groups, wishing he had created opportunities, "to be doing that work with other Pākehā, and learning from other Pākehā". He explained this as "quite reflective of . . . as Pākehā . . . our lack of social solidarity, we don't have [have] strong . . . hapū networks, you know, or any equivalent . . . [or] marae".

When I asked Andrew, "I know that you have a Māori woman on [project], and yet the one that you've learned from is the white man", he replied, "maybe because I . . . identify more with [him], because he's like me, he's a Pākehā dude". I clarified, "So it's easier to learn more about yourself from someone who's like you than to be challenged by the 'other' in this sense?" He responded, "I think that is true. Which is . . . why I think there's such a responsibility for people like [him], and people like me and people like you, to

help each other."

Charlotte, David and Eddie all said other Pākehā behaving in a way that made them uncomfortable was formative. Charlotte said, "having a chat with someone where they are super blind to that privilege, then makes me really, way more uncomfortable about mine". David described "a kind of self-righteous jealous feeling ... I feel it quite personally when I feel other people being racist, and that kind of bothers me in a way of there's part of 'you're making me look bad, you're making us look bad, you know, stop it' ". He raised this three times, and the frustration included someone taking up space:

> If I see an older white guy, taking up space in a meeting ... part of my ... reaction to that is ... 'look, I'm consciously trying to make an effort not to take up all the space in the meeting and it's not so you can talk, buddy'. ... I feel resentful that they are not taking their share of the responsibility.

Eddie told me he witnessed someone teasing their daughter's boyfriend for being Māori, in the way he would tease someone for being short, not strong, or not a hard worker. The boyfriend said, "oh, it sucks but I put up with him because he's your old man". Eddie realised "this man who I love doesn't realise it but he's being really super harmful. ...And while I think that he's a good man, he is also a racist". This was formative because it was:

> The first time that two people I knew in real life had disagreed about something and I'd heard two sides of the issue without the other person there. And it was like, 'oh OK, so there are two sides to every issue, and that one happened to be, a racially based issue'. And that whole experience made me really uncomfortable.

Alongside learning from other Pākehā, learning from Māori had been important. This occurred through seeing the impact on friends and colleagues, engaging with iwi-led protest movements and Māori spaces, and feeling anxious and challenged. They also discussed the danger of burdening Māori with having to teach.

6.4.2 *Learning from Māori*

Andrew said it was important to "hav[e] more mixing between Māori and Pākehā. ... Most Pākehā don't have any Māori friends". Yet almost all participants discussed

learning from Māori friends, colleagues, fellow activists, and in David's case, a stranger. Charlotte told me about an early relationship:

> In primary school, ... there was ... this one Māori girl in my class who was my friend. ... I was probably about seven or something, and being like, 'oh wow, she's the only one, imagine if it was the other way around. ... what if I was the only Pākehā girl ... in a class of Māori people'. And I remember thinking about that.

Fabienne said a noho marae[2] was "massively impactful, the way that from the moment we were welcomed on, we were treated as though we were people of the land, and we're such a diverse group, and that was really beautiful". She discussed the impact of "strong relationships and friendships, across the cultures, around my workplace", particularly hearing the lived experiences of her colleagues, "it was personal, it wasn't, out there, it was *that* colleague feels *this* way. And I care about them, so I care about how they're feeling, ... I want to understand". She described these workmates discussing institutional racism: "one ... got up and quoted a person, and just from the description they gave of the person I knew ... exactly who it was ... and they were one of my colleagues". She realised:

> When they're just doing their work, day to day, that's the battle that they're battling, alongside, as part of, intertwined through all of their work, when arguably the work of my team is similar in nature, but I don't have to grapple with any of that.

After the Christchurch shootings, her colleagues' reflections led to a discussion with a Pākehā colleague:

> One of my colleagues led this really fantastic reflection of just naming and acknowledging a whole range of emotions that were sitting around the group. And there was mention of colonialism ... and anger, and rage, ... I was kind of just sitting in there going, 'I'm not feeling that but I know my colleagues are' ... but the conversation I had with the colleague afterwards

[2] An overnight, often multi-day visit to a marae; noho: stay (Noho, n.d.); marae: "Marae are a key feature of Māori society. The marae is a place where the Māori language can be spoken, where customs can be explored and debated, and where important ceremonies, such as welcoming visitors, meeting inter-tribal obligations, or farewelling the dead can be performed. The marae is a wāhi tapu, a 'sacred place' which carries great cultural meaning." (Te Puni Kōkiri, n.d.).

> was, he was dismayed, I think . . . 'why has that been brought into the conversation, this wasn't . . . an attack, on Māori, or it wasn't . . . anything to do with colonialism . . . so why, why?'

She continued,

> [I] said . . . 'I can really appreciate that emotion, because what this has brought up is actually something that is far deeper set in New Zealand and yes, ties back to . . . our settler roots and colonisation', and I kind of just challenged him a little and said that I think that there is actually just really legitimate feelings there and I know that they exist in our group, so we need to be able to actually just hold space for those, and . . . try . . . to actually engage around them, rather than pretend they're not there, or respond with . . . frustration and an anger, that someone has mentioned a feeling of anger and rage.

She said, these experiences "prompted me to think far more deeply about the role of race and culture, around our New Zealand identity and what that is . . . because I hadn't . . . really thought about it, strongly, previously".

Charlotte spent a lot of time at Ihumātao, and described the "very open and honest conversations" that "sort of cleared up some of my viewpoints around . . . what colonialism has done, and you really see it very clearly I think when it's in such an immersed, community . . . I'd never been in a space quite like that before". As she returned multiple times to Ihumātao, the number of Pākehā dwindled and the tone changed. A later time, she said she was:

> more comfortable because I knew more people and I was . . . welcomed there, and I was doing useful work there and it was fine, but also I was less welcome, because . . . there was just less and less Pākehā people there, and it got more and more, just honest, about the way that it was talked about . . . And it was never a personal attack on me, but often people would talk about Pākehā minds or colonialism, and . . . you've just got to sit in it and be like . . . 'yeah'.

David discussed a conversation with an older Māori woman, where he "didn't end up actually agreeing, entirely, with where she was coming from but . . . could understand it

a bit more". He said,

> I can't imagine we ... vote for the same people or would necessarily agree on a lot of political or economic ... stuff, but ... I did start from the assumption that this woman is ... not just Māori but ... a leader in her community ... respected and has status in that community ... I respect her to start with, and then want to understand more about where she's coming from on things that I maybe don't agree with ... You don't need to agree with someone to respect their human rights ... in a similar way, you don't need to ... agree with someone who's Māori to respect that they are tangata whenua with ... tino rangatiratanga as a community ... That's the most base level that you can start from, and ... then there's all sorts of nuances, to unpick and understand.

Beatrice talked about being "hyper aware of [her] Pākehāness" at an event, a "pretty Māori space". She said, "It wasn't a culture shock ... but I also felt ... very white. ... But there was ... none of those kind of little things crept in where I was like, 'that's a racist judgement' ". This contrasts how many participants, including Beatrice, described 'catching thoughts' in other contexts. It seems that being hyper aware in a majority Māori space foreclosed that process.

There was a tension between the grace of people participants were learning from, and the risk of free lessons from marginalised groups. George said:

> If I was in New Zealand and I was making ... efforts to ... learn more about Māori culture, language and experience ... I would need to shut up and do a whole lot of listening ... and to know that I would put my foot in it ... and ask ... dumb questions that I should spend a bunch of time reading before just asking somebody to explain this thing to me that they're probably exhausted of talking about. ... It's a thing that I ... intellectually understand a bit more of now, from living in the States and seeing ... people of colour, just, the way white people treat them and the way white people expect ... free lessons on race relations, and expect people of colour to just provide that whenever they want it.

David, similarly, talked about Pākehā at Waitangi, who "saw their role in a quite practical sense, as being there to, ... talk to Pākehā, welcome Pākehā coming in ... ". I said, "Without burdening all of the mana whenua ... ?", and he replied, "Exactly". He recognised "a lot of [his] experience involved ... quite a lot of Māori being quite generous with their time and work ... in ways that I wouldn't necessarily want to say, 'hey this is the way ... for everyone' ".

Fabienne said, "a [person] that I've heard speak about this ... his biggest moments of learning and development, and humility ... were wrapped up in the moments where he acted or spoke, and he just got it so wrong. But was met with a grace that allowed him to just ... try again". She acknowledged, "and I've had, really great people who have been, really gracious ... and ... amazingly responding to the fact that, simply I've been responding with curiosity". Andrew also discussed two Māori friends helping him see a mistake: "they did it in a very ... kind and generous and sensitive way, and ... sort of got it out of me".

However, many participants talked about feeling anxious with, or intimidated by Māori sometimes, learning to be challenged, and not take it personally. Fabienne said, "Sometimes there's people that I'm quite anxious around. ... I kind of go, 'I feel like I need to get this right around you or I'm going to get really called out' ". Andrew acknowledged the importance of:

> wanting to have those relationships, and having those relationships in a genuine way ... also maybe feeling the tension between ... feeling safe with people, but also feeling slightly ... challenged and ... intimidated. But I think that's a good dynamic. For helping me to overcome the defensiveness.

In order for the tension to be 'productive' in such relationships, it seems there is a line. He described another colleague as 'just relentlessly principled, and so unwilling to ... back down from a principled stance in order to make people feel comfortable ... and if I'm honest, I probably found that a little bit too challenging". He continued,

> I wouldn't say that I didn't learn from [her] as well, but I probably felt slightly intimidated by [her] ... I didn't want to ... get things wrong, and ... disappoint,

> and I think people do feel like 'Fuck, am I going to get this wrong'.

David said, "that's quite an important ongoing thing to be able to do … hear challenging things … reflect on … your part in that … what you contribute to that and then commit to … not doing it". He conceded:

> It is hard to sit and listen to … how and why a group of people are bad and wrong, when you're part of that group … But … part of committing to being part of a change is … just getting better at hearing that and not really taking it personally … I can't change being white … I'm not going to try to deny being white, and a man … I'm also not going to deny … that I benefit from and, in ways that I'm not always aware of, participate in those … aspects of oppressive … positions. … I want to be comfortable enough to listen to and to hear … other people's experience of what white people do, or what white people are like … and then to reflect on, 'oh, do I do that?' … And not feel like I have to … 'not all Pākehā'.

Charlotte said, the words 'colonialism' or 'racism' may seem like a personal attack, but she came to realise, "it's [not] necessarily ever a personal attack … when you talk about colonialism, it's talking about this huge … framework that sits over us and under us". I asked how she felt as an individual. She answered, "comfortable, but I think only in a constructive way". I followed up, "Do you think that there's a productive tension then, in feeling challenged and … continually on the verges of being uncomfortable? … There's … an edge there, that you need to inhabit?" She answered, "Totally … and I think you really need to re-evaluate that line all the time", elaborating:

> … a moment where you notice, either that guilty feeling or those biases that come up, or you taking up too much space, or that moment that you should have stepped in and did something … or when you've done something good and you have stepped in when you needed to and it was hard … it's just recognising in those moments that you did something wrong, or you did something right, or you don't really know what you did and what could you have done differently … it's just really being conscious of how your mind actually is working and how your subconscious works.

Fabienne named this a *daring*:

> if I want to learn and grow and develop, and understand, and engage, in a way that's kind of authentic ... there's sort of a daring that goes with it, and I'm not always going to get it right ... I know there's those little bits of fear, going, 'I'm going to screw it up and it's going to be awful', and what I don't want to do is insult anyone.

I called this a 'push and pull', and she responded:

> Where I'm newly confronted ... you kind of get snapped back a bit into '[gasp], bad. I'm bad'. ... Or you go, 'why does that even matter?' But then, as it kind of sits, the anxiety, the stress, the initial reaction kind of fades, and [you] kind of explore it a little more.

She gave the concrete example of when she was challenged about wanting to translate something into te reo Māori, where she was initially confronted but then eased into trying to understand:

> It was ... one of those moments where you're standing in front of a whole bunch of people and you're like 'I have no answer to this'. No-one's questioned it ... and he questioned it very strongly ... But I had a conversation with him about it afterwards ... and a couple of other ... Māori staff ... to really understand. And, we got to a point, where I ... went, ... 'I don't totally get it but I get enough of it to know, that it's not the right time for this'. ... But that was ... such an awesome learning conversation for me, because ... the guys were so open, so direct, so earnest.

Alongside these personal relationships with both other Pākehā and Māori, family influences and childhood experiences had contributed to participants' ability to engage.

6.5 Family influences or childhood experiences

Charlotte told me about early exposure to Māori, and the values her mother had instilled. Her mother learned te reo and was a social worker at the marae, meaning Charlotte was "engrossed in it, and integrated, by, in it". People often thought their family were Māori. She said her mother had "always been pretty radical in her challenging of

the status quo", and "creat[ed] a space for us to be free thinkers as kids". She said,

> If you are raised to be ... one of the thinkers that thinks inside the boxes that you were given ... there'll be super smart people out there but they can't think in a new way ... to then really analyse your own thoughts ... is a skill that you have to learn ... if you learn it as a kid you're lucky because you learned it unconsciously because you just learned to ... think freely and be creative.

She also told me being "pretty weird as a kid" played a role:

> When you're always someone who has experienced life ... a little bit on the fringes, and you become ... OK with that, it becomes a lot more easy to ... be uncomfortable in those situations or ... analyse your uncomfortableness ... sit with the people that are living on the fringes ... hear about it and really ... soak it up because you just innately have more empathy for what that might be like ... It's almost like you can just hear their struggle, you can go, 'I get it ... I haven't experienced it' but you can understand it.

David said he "started from probably ... my parents' values and my family values and then just kind of maybe, developed it a bit from there, or developed my own understanding a bit more". Andrew also mentioned his parents who "were thinking about power, and structures of power and injustice ... and so there's the starting point I guess, is having an intellectual and political orientation that wants to understand structures of power". Eddie's experience was different. His parents were migrants, and their "attitudes to an awful lot of things is, 'bloody Kiwis' ". He said, "it's probably had an impact on me [that] whenever Kiwi identity is being discussed [it is] ... specifically Pākehā Kiwi identity. Not that my parents ever really made a massive differentiation there". He also said, "my dad I think is a lovely man who tries to do ... the right thing, but he is consistently stereotyping ... pretty much every group that isn't his own". For some participants, another formative experience was exposure to history, either in school, or as an adult.

6.6 School experiences and learning our history

Participants had a mixed experience of learning our history in schools. George, when asked about schooling, was initially unsure, saying, "I think I was taught New Zealand history in schools?", and was surprised when I mentioned the recent announcement about compulsory history teaching (Ardern & Hipkins, 2019). He concluded, "I have a better understanding of it than my parents did, and that was a result of . . . New Zealand's colonial past being taught in school in a way that's quite different from their generation". Beatrice and I discussed the same announcement. She didn't mention anything about learning history in school, just saying that she had, "definitely . . . an awareness . . . it's not built on a really lovely history".

Andrew and David were both influenced by history teachers. Andrew said, "I did have a good history teacher in fifth form . . . he was really exploring those topics, that was pretty formative". David said he had a very good seventh form history teacher, and told me his response to learning Aotearoa's history:

> I remember being . . . excited by it . . . I would read the history . . . James Belich's books of New Zealand wars . . . I was able to react like this because I was so detached from that history . . . I didn't grow up with it . . . I think that I did identify . . . the injustice of the history and I identified quite strongly with the histories of resistance . . . so that's what I think I was excitedly responding to.

This obviously stayed with him. He continued, "I still find it . . . something I really value about the history of resistance in this country where . . . a lot of Māori resistance actually succeeded to a much greater extent than is . . . widely known".

Eddie said, "I have a reasonably good understanding of the historical context, as someone who's not a scholar, but I've taken a couple of courses on New Zealand history . . . I think I have a reasonably good understanding of that link between historical injustice and modern injustice". Fabienne remembered, "I didn't learn any of it in school. In fact the history that I did in university was world history". Further, she said, since there wasn't anything about "colonisation, and the Treaty, and what biculturalism in New Zealand really is [. . .] now it's kind of this discomfort of . . . learning, understand-

ing, not really, even yet, remotely understanding, ... sort of grappling more what with that actually means then".

When I enquired about anxiety or paralysis about history, George was philosophical:

> [I'm] not proud of things that happened in New Zealand's history that were ... my ancestors and people like them ... [but] every country's got a whole lot of problems ... [and] deeply problematic pasts ... All of us just have to work on it ... our colonialism isn't special. ... It's part of ... how I think about the world. ... There's nothing I can do to change the past, that is just, immutable ... and all that matters now, is what we do in the present, and what we choose to do in the future ... that is all we have control over. ... I would consider that there would be a responsibility to redress ... whether or not it's been my ancestors being involved. ... your fellow countrymen are suffering. That alone makes it your duty to redress it.

For some participants, that duty to redress had led them to activism.

6.7 Activism and workplaces

For some participants, there was no obvious clear boundary between activism and their careers. For these participants, activism came first, and therefore was perhaps formative in a different way or at a different stage. This section is therefore split into activism and workplace influences.

6.7.1 *Activism*

For Andrew, activism was a starting point, although he acknowledged, "that doesn't mean ... you're going to be good at identifying and challenging structures of power, because there are plenty of white middle aged, male activists who are probably terrible on this shit". I replied, "And gender too". He agreed, "And fucking worse on that probably. But I think that it's a good starting point".

David talked about his early activism:

> I can remember being concerned even as a teenager ... things that were directly affecting me or people I knew or things that I could sort of see around me, was ... privatisation and ... hospital fees coming in and ... the student

> fees coming in ... I saw those as injustices and I think I did connect it a bit to a kind of social analysis of ... it hurts poor people more.

He said he refused to take a day off high school to celebrate the America's Cup victory:

> I don't want to go to a parade, I don't care about yachting, I don't care about New Zealand winning something! ... But I did take a day off to protest ... French nuclear testing or something like that.

During his time in university, he was, "getting involved, in the students' association and then having ... an engagement with Ngāi Tauira, the Māori students' association". He talked about activism bridging between his detached learning of history, and

> ... to identify more personally with colonisation as a continuing problem and one that required a response from us, and from me. So not just as part of history that I was interested to learn, but as something that affected me now, and affected my identity, and my responsibility.

He worked with a Pākehā peace group who "did a ... noho marae at Te Tii Marae in Waitangi ... [and] a facilitated decolonisation workshop ... [with] elements of ... Treaty training ... so it was the place, the environment, the people ... the generosity of the group hosting us".

Eddie talked about job-sharing a volunteer role of 'Te Tiriti o Waitangi Representative' with a Māori woman, and feeling empowered to do this because of being backed by Māori. I asked, "So you're modelling a Treaty relationship?" He replied, "that's the idea ... but I probably would have been too uncomfortable to step into that role ... but [a Māori friend] asked me if I would. ... I feel like I can justify in my head ... having the backing of Māori to be in that space?"

For some participants, particularly Andrew, activism and work were interlinked.

6.7.2 *Career and workplace influences*

Andrew, Beatrice and Fabienne talked about their careers or workplaces.

Andrew said his professional background was significant. Thinking about injustice meant "constantly thinking about ... structures of power and violence". Also, "people who I was working with in that context maybe [had] been activists for a long time ... so they were thinking about structures of power and oppression".

In Beatrice's work, "there's ... in the back of my head ... a checklist ... 'how does this impact on the environment, how does this impact on [the] most vulnerable ... and what are the Treaty implications?' ". She was also influenced by Eddie's mentor, calling her "the staunchest Pākehā in terms of ... we did bad. ... So I think if I hadn't worked here, I probably wouldn't have a lot of what I have". About her workplace, she said:

> We try very hard ... to be less white! ... And that says something. Right? It says that ... we're not quite comfortable about who we are and about why we're here and about what we've done. And so ... from ... an institutional perspective we need to be changing things because it's not quite right.

Fabienne told me about a programme at her job, to "learn ... the capabilities and capacities to lead effectively through diversity and difference. ... So it is a little bit of how do you get yourself into a space where you can turn off the triggered defensive switch and re-engage". This leads us into the topic of personal accountability.

6.8 Personal accountability

"There are times that I stop and go, 'oh crap, am I doing the right thing, am I in the right space?' (Eddie)."

The participants expressed a high degree of accountability. We explored the different ways they watch themselves grow and learn: recognising and learning from a mistake, catching thoughts and questioning biases, or innate ways of being that contribute to their motivations.

6.8.1 *Recognising mistakes and catching thoughts*

Andrew talked about an event three years earlier. He was competing for a position with a Māori colleague, who asked him to take a different position, to make space, essentially, and he refused. Reflecting, he said,

> Fucking hell. What was I thinking? And yeah there's this Māori guy who has been living here for ten years and speaks fluent te reo Māori, and is [a number of other highly qualifying characteristics], and yeah, he's great, but I'll be better. Shocker. It's a shocker really.

I asked if he was uncomfortable. He answered, "I think I am not uncomfortable about it". I said, "Well you are, you are uncomfortable about it. I mean your body language is extremely uncomfortable". He conceded,

> I'm probably uncomfortable about it. ... It's mainly because I haven't thought about it. But I think it was the wrong decision. ... Well there's probably a lot of wrong decisions, but a core wrong decision, was when [he] asked me 'why don't...' Because he was basically asking me to share power. ... And I said no. And I should have said yes. And I would say yes now. ... I should say sorry to him about that.

Following this discussion, I asked Beatrice about learning from mistakes. She said,

> I don't think there are actions, but probably more thoughts, of ... making assumptions ... that are super judgemental and probably a bit racist ... gradually just disappearing ... it's just more of those ... really subconscious things where after you've done it you think, 'oh hang on just a second, that's really fucking racist ... why were you thinking that in your head?'

Charlotte also mentioned catching thoughts: "I remember then, tackling my own biases. ... it would never come out in my actions towards individuals because that's not how I function but I do remember realising that I did have things towards Māori ... in a subconscious way, you know when you see someone you might get an assumption or something, and I was like, 'that's not cool' ". There was a link between catching thoughts and our actions, and how both can influence the other.

6.8.2 *Actions versus thoughts*

Charlotte said going to Ihumātao had been really good "for the much deeper way of looking at it". She differentiated between thoughts (micro) to institutions (macro) with actions as the middle ground:

> ... [from] all the stuff in the mind [which] is actually the way that you think ... colonially in terms of everything [to] the complete opposite end of the scale, the big thing about how all our systems are framed from that colonial perspective ... governmental systems ... justice systems ... [and then] the actions, the middle ground point [which] for me was pretty easy for me to

> reach in terms of how I hold myself in the world.

She said Ihumātao "was a very cool way to ... confront it ... fully ... in myself", to learn where she could stand:

> [It] really helped ... [to] instead, of being ... an internal thing that I just kind of chipped away at ... it did make me feel like there's ... a platform where I can have a voice that is not squashing any other voices. ... Learning how to fit into that world, and to support ... Māori voices. ... To have a say, and an opinion, but not in a way that ... was diminishing of anyone else's opinions, and not in a way that was ... loud.

The experiences at Ihumātao "helped to ... solidify my confidence in talking about these things ... it was really good".

Beatrice mentioned trying to change herself in response to someone she had worked with who challenged her, saying "probably, maybe subconsciously in my head I was like, 'I'm not that person', and so ... how do I not be that person?" Another contributing factor to personal accountability for a few participants was intrinsic values.

6.8.3 *Innate ways of being*

David explained, "in any situation ... I'm always ... kind of driven to try to understand the perspective of the other group". Similarly, Fabienne said, "I've always really valued different perspectives ... and bringing those and understanding those, so I think there's probably a bit of inclination there". Eddie and George talked about the importance of finding their roles. George said, "as an outsider I was always ... expecting that I would ... be quiet and listen ... seek to understand first, before ... jumping in". Eddie went slightly further:

> I try to immediately say, 'right so what is my place in this?' And almost always, because of the nature of colonialism and patriarchy in New Zealand, that is, I am a person with privilege, whose role here is to speak as little as possible, to listen as much as I can, unless otherwise asked to by someone in the affected community, and take that whakaaro[3] back to people who are maybe not in the space to be able to do that.

[3] Thought, opinion, understanding (Whakaaro, n.d.).

6.9 Conclusion

Although I had assumed a single transformative moment, it is clear the participants are on non-linear journeys. While some formative experiences discussed could be categorised as early factors, it was clear there was 'bleed' into the present and future.

Indirect exposure to structural issues, or detached learning was a key way to see around a corner to structures that we are complicit in. Relationships with other Pākehā, at varying stages of awareness, was influential. Seeing Pākehā blindly operating colonially made participants uncomfortable and aware they occupied the same positionality. Conversely, Pākehā friends could challenge participants to see things differently.

Relationships with Māori, including supporting iwi-led protests, was a good way to learn. Seeing friends and colleagues affected by racism was eye-opening. Feeling slightly challenged was productive, though there was a recognition we need to learn not to shy away when witnessing Māori anger or unwillingness to centre Pākehā comfort. Curiosity, humility and willingness to grow and learn seemed to be key. These contributed to personal accountability, acceptance of imperfection and being on a journey.

7. Participants: Themselves

7.1 Introduction

"That's my Pākehā identity. It's one that is uncomfortable, and requires a sense of remedial action, in a way, to help dismantle the structures of power that are bound up with being Pākehā" (Andrew).

The following interview questions led to the conversation behind this chapter: *Do you think there's a general conflation of Pākehā and New Zealand when some Pākehā think about identity? Do you think you have a different perspective? Why? How much are you aware of the impacts of colonialism to New Zealand? Do you think that has impacted your understanding of your Pākehā identity? What does being Pākehā mean to you? Are you proud of being Pākehā? Is it a comfortable identity for you? Can you tell me what emotions come to mind when you think about these topics around identity, colonisation, decolonisation?*

The purpose of this chapter is to examine how my participants thought about *their* identities, the markers they draw upon or reject, and how they feel about being Pākehā specifically. The key themes this chapter therefore covers are: a sense of absence, hybridity, stories of migration, Te Tiriti as a grounding influence, the role of the nation state, the specificity of 'Pākehā', motivations and the drive to redemption, emotionality, comfort, and the non-linearity of the journey.

7.2 Identity-making for participants

It was apparent that identity was relational. David immediately said, "a New Zealand identity is inextricably ... tied up with how I feel about colonisation and my relationship to it". Both Andrew and Fabienne mentioned biculturalism, with Andrew saying, "I guess there was a big focus on biculturalism and the sort of, re-understanding of the Treaty as a document in the 80s, and the 90s ... so that was my identity growing up, a sense of biculturalism". Fabienne said, "there's something there around bicul-

turalism. I think a lot of New Zealanders probably see ... Pākehā and Māori as being quite key parts of our national identity and probably this belief that ... we do that well". However, for all participants, in their different ways, identity making was rather more complex and multi-faceted than the general Pākehā identity-making described earlier, but a sense of absence was also present.

7.2.1 *An absence of culture*

Beatrice described an *absence* associated with being Pākehā, saying she "always really struggled with what it means ... that kind of lack of culture that we have if it's not Māori culture. So what it is, you know there's the big space, I see where we don't have a culture, we're not Māori". She said, "it boils down to things to me like, 'what's your national dish?' ... I'm like, 'I don't know what my national dish is!' "[1]. I asked if it was an absence of *meaning*. She replied, "it's the cohesive meaning. So, if I think of any other ... country, I have a understanding of what that means, and whilst you're still lumping a bunch of things together, it's still ... a thing. ... Whereas Pākehā ... I just don't know". Fabienne also said, "when I think, well ... what is Pākehā New Zealand culture? ... Sometimes I feel myself, quite envious, because I go, well, I don't have culture". She continued:

> Elsewhere in the world, I would feel pretty grounded going, 'I'm from New Zealand', and almost let the hearer sort of assume what that means and the culture it means, because I can't necessarily put it into words. ... I have been ... more unsettled, or feeling less grounded when I'm actually in New Zealand, because that's when I'm home, but I'm observing so many cultures that I can sometimes get hung up on going ... 'what is mine, I need to put it into words, or I need to be able put it into ... defining actions, or rituals'. ... If I dwell on that, it can cause me to feel a bit ungrounded.

Related to the idea of a lack of cohesion, is the recognition that Pākehā is also a hybrid identity.

[1] This led to a discussion with someone else (not a participant), who said, "I feel like we take other cultures' dishes and put them in a pie! Butter Chicken pie! Pad Thai pie!".

7.2.2 *Hybridity*

Andrew, Charlotte and George mentioned hybridity in different ways, and Andrew and Charlotte identified a related anxiety. George said there was "a lot of complicated like bleed over and cross-over ... [colonial] settlement ... like specific activity has been over for a while, but the effects linger, and we kind of slowly learn to ... blend all of these things together to some extent". Charlotte said New Zealand identity was:

> Super influenced ... more than we know ... by Māori culture, and also then sort of broadened by this whole ... colonialised British culture ... and then more recently, I think Americanised culture has also influenced us a lot ... We see more influence from America and less from Britain with the sort of introduction of mass media as well. So I think it's such an amalgamation of everything ... I think that ... is also why New Zealanders might struggle to have an identity, or Pākehā might struggle to have an identity, because we don't necessarily fit into a box.

Andrew said, "I liked learning waiata when I was growing up. ... I want to learn te reo Māori ... So they are part of my identity". He then said, "I would like to be able to feel comfortable with them as part of my identity. In an appropriate way. I don't necessarily know how the appropriate way is ... I'm just sort of navigating that, I guess we all are". Even with the recognition of hybridity and influence from our colonial roots, there was very little discussion of the significance of 'routes'.

7.2.3 *Routes versus Roots*

David told me his identity was bound up in "various stories of migration and settlement basically", either directly to Aotearoa, or "connecting through another history of colonisation" (America). However, he was alone in raising this as a significant facet of identity. I discussed with Fabienne the point Bell (2009) made about routes versus roots, and she was surprised, saying,

> At no point, have I seen that as part of Pākehā identity ... what did not come to mind at all when you asked that identity question, I did not go 'Pākehā is a settler identity'. My starting point was to go, our identity in this land.

However, she then reflected the importance of routes during the 150th anniversary of settlement in Otago, saying, "R-O-U-T-E-S is such a key part". I responded, "Well that's probably, possibly, because of the words that I used. ... Because Pākehā is a word that belongs on these islands". For some participants, their sense of belonging on these islands is connected to Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

7.2.4 *Te Tiriti as grounding*

All participants talked about the Treaty, but not always as a constituent part of identity. Eddie came close with his point about being here by right of Treaty. Fabienne though, talked about the Treaty being:

> [A] kind of underpinning? ...A grounding historic kind of thing, it's not a replacement for [many] generations of being in a country, but there is this relationship to my country that I can kind of point to a little more strongly. ...Actually I am a New Zealander by virtue of the Treaty. And that ...was actually quite a change in the way that I thought about my identity, because now I'll go 'I'm a New Zealander, and while I'm not Tangata Whenua, I'm Tangata Tiriti'.

While Te Tiriti played a grounding role in connection to country for Fabienne, for some participants the very idea of a nation-based identity was problematic.

7.2.5 *Nation based identities*

Charlotte, David and Eddie all problematised the idea of a nation-based identity. Charlotte said she thought, "for a younger generation ...to not really know your own identity from, like a country point of view, is probably not that unusual, because you're so, like connected with the entire world". However, she did not like the term 'global citizen', and she conceded, "where you're born and where you whakapapa[2] back, does influence your identity, consciously or subconsciously".

Eddie derived more connection to "the places that I've grown up and places that I've enjoyed being in, and the people that I've spent my life around". He said, "I don't think that ...Australia is any more my home [than] the South Island is. 'Cause I've never

[2] Genealogy, genealogical table, lineage, descent (Whakapapa, n.d.).

spent any real time in either of them", and, further, "if there's any discussion of like, where I'm from, as far as whakapapa is concerned, it's almost entirely the West Midlands in England". When I pushed further, asking, "do you feel that that's home?", he said no. I asked, "But you feel like New Zealand is home?" He responded, "…I 'spose". He talked about his response to the offshore oil and gas ban (RNZ, 2018), saying, "I think that's a great thing, but I don't have any more allegiance to that, as if Australia was to do the same thing. Those are equally good in my eyes". Finally, he said,

> I view patriotism in general as being …quite a negative trait. …I think if somebody is patriotic, then, what they are, is loyalist to a set of ideas that they don't have any control over. That being, either the actions of government or the opinions of a wider population.

He acknowledged, "that distrust of that concept and that sort of groupthink idea probably comes from …slightly more understanding of colonial processes". David immediately also linked my questions about identity to a fraught nationalism:

> My personal feelings about identifying as a New Zealander have often been more in the rejection of an identity, than in the acceptance of it, and I think that's …got to do with my feelings about nationalism and colonisation, and …not really connecting to the mainstream or dominant markers of national identity.

He said, "I feel …resistant to identifying with the national team. …it's easy to be contrary about that kind of thing and it's almost an identity in itself to be anti-nationalist". Some participants, including David, mentioned other avenues to identity.

7.2.6 *Other avenues to identity*

Beatrice said, "I don't feel sad …that I don't have something that identifies me as being my culture, because I feel like I have enough other stuff, which fills it", citing her family and her job, although she noted that her European partner has a strong culture he could draw upon and in contrast she didn't "have any of that stuff". David raised belonging to a counter community:

> You can get your sense of identity and stability, acceptance, belonging and so on, by identifying with …a status quo that you need to then protect

> from threats ... or you can get it from ... often more difficult to define, but a sense of being part of a ... counter community ... to that dominant national identity. ... That's what I get often from identifying as Pākehā, and feeling an affinity to ... others ... and it's important that includes other Pākehā, but doesn't for me have to be limited to Pākehā ... [it is] a feeling of affinity to others who want similar or the same kinds of change.

This sense of affinity to other Pākehā leads directly to the topic of how participants felt about the specificity of 'Pākehā'.

7.3 Specificity of 'Pākehā'

It's one that doesn't recognise itself as actually a particular identity (David).

Andrew said, "I think that New Zealand identity, that's kind of one that I grew up with, and it's very obviously white, settler, so I think other people's New Zealand identity might be quite different". He said he was careful to acknowledge he was Pākehā, because "it's a way of contributing to general understanding of these structures of power. So I guess in doing that I'm encouraging other people to think about [that]". Eddie also said, "I acknowledge myself as being Pākehā, but I've never had a huge connection to an identity around it. ... And if anything, I think the ways that those identities tend to express themselves are generally harmful". Beatrice also raised potential harm, describing "a fear of like the more you build up, a uniquely Pākehā identity, the more you are, in some way, devaluing or eroding what a strong Māori identity is?" She continued, "And not wanting to do that ... maybe that's the tension in my head".

David, on the other hand, said, "I can identify more easily as Pākehā actually, than [as] New Zealander". I asked, "Because of the specificity?" He answered, "Yeah". He continued:

> When I said that I'm more comfortable identifying as Pākehā than as a New Zealander ... I'm quite aware that that's ... a rejection of that dominant ... desire to erase difference and ... recognition of difference, and ... impose a kind of sameness that actually reflects a very particular[arity].

don't tend to identify as Pākehā if they're not willing to accept some ... responsibility".

I asked, "So it's a political act?" He responded, "I think it is, yeah".

Eddie considered "the concept of identity, seems to be really, really helpful for an awful lot of people. ... I'm talking specifically about minority groups. But I don't identify as ... any ... groups that have been traditionally oppressed ... so I don't understand what it's like to come from that position".

Charlotte wondered if she would think to identify as Pākehā, saying, "I'm not sure if that's ever been part of how I've ... innately framed myself". We talked about how this was a privilege, and she said, "Absolutely ... I wonder if ... it doesn't even cross people's minds, because it is just your baseline, for the world", and then exclaimed, "Like where we started!" She talked about how Pākehā wasn't a monolithic group either, mentioning her flatmates:

> He's a first generation Pākehā but his parents are Hungarian, so he's totally white ... And then my other flatmate's second generation and they grew up in Australia. ... Whereas ... we've been here for many more generations than that ... But because they look similar to me ... we all look like we could be just many generation Pākehā, New Zealanders. It's all treated the same but it's actually different.

George said he felt equally comfortable with New Zealander, Pākehā, and Kiwi, but thought identifying as Pākehā carried "a responsibility to address problems in New Zealand, and work on them, and work to be better partners with Māori people and other New Zealanders". It was clear that there was a relationship between identity as Pākehā and motivations or politics.

7.4 Motivations and the fluidity of identities and politics

"I think if ... you are Pākehā, then you have a responsibility to help dismantle the structures of power associated with being Pākehā" (Andrew).

In conversation with David, I mused:

> I find myself saying things like, 'is that a political thing or is that an identity thing?' ... maybe the boundary is that the identity stuff is the why and the political stuff is the how? Like I feel compelled to mark my Pākehāness and

> that is both an identity thing and a political thing, and I can't disentangle them, do you know what I mean?

David replied,

> I guess partly what … you're asking … is the question about … the lack of boundary between the personal and political, and … that absolutely applies to this question. … there's something about … what we mean by political that might … extend our personal commitments a bit further … than we might, if we weren't acting politically … or not consciously to that extent. … So in a way I don't see a strict boundary or distinction, because they're connected, and … if someone thinks that they're not a political person and they're just … living their lives [with] their identity that's personal to them, I think they're probably … not being curious about how that's being shaped by, broader political things around them. … I do think that our personal identities are political, we can't get away from that.

He reflected on how that impacted his own identity, saying,

> If I had a national identity that was somehow more neutral … neither colonised nor colonial … I might actually be more comfortable just rejecting it … I might end up being strongly just comfortable with anti-nationalism … and fall back on … those beliefs that I do have which are critical of states and state borders and patriotism, and nationalism. … I do feel connected to and invested in, knowing more about that history and having the history of colonisation and … Crown-Māori relations and Pākehā-Māori relations and Tauiwi-Māori relations … known better, and understood, and explored out in the open.

I explicitly questioned Beatrice, saying, "I want to do those political things because they are about our identity and us being here on these islands". She said, "I don't know …. I just don't see that as being about identity". I asked, "What about then? Or like where is the source of that?", and she replied, "to justify our existence here. … to make it OK, that we're here". I tried with Fabienne as well, asking, "do you think that your determination, to engage, is … entangled with an ethic that sits outside of your identity

. . . or is it related to your identity as Pākehā?" She replied:

> It's hard to disentangle who am I, who do I want to be, how do I want to influence, what New Zealand is, and wants to be. So I think those are kind of all tangled up together. . . . I'm conscious that it's . . . not entirely personal, it's also how that works out through my work. . . . There's a bit of an identity part and there's a bit of a responsibility part. I think.

Beatrice said there was responsibility "towards Māori. So it's that, we did bad, whoever we is. . . . A long time ago. . . . We're only here because bad things happened. And so, we owe it to you, to ensure we are embracing everything about it". David, on rejecting nationalistic identity markers, said:

> The only thing that pulls me back, to identifying as a Pākehā New Zealander, is a feeling of responsibility and . . . connection, and I guess that there's an investedness in wanting this country in particular to be better as well.

Andrew and Eddie both talked about morals. Eddie said, "it's always been a 'do the right thing' sort of situation . . . the idea of using privilege in a way that's positive". Andrew said, "it's your only option if you want to do the *right thing* basically. I think it's a . . . moral standpoint. That you sort of decide . . . I have this power that I just have by virtue of my skin". Finally, he said, "you've got to understand how you're affecting other people just by existing". While these motivations may be ethical, it is however crucial to interrogate further, and ask ourselves whether they stem from a desire for redemption.

7.4.1 *Redemption*

I mentioned Tuck and Yang (2012), regarding redemption, to Andrew, asking, "what is my motivation for this [project]? Because arguably, this is about me trying to redeem myself". He replied, "Could be. Or it could be that you actually want to dismantle those structures of power because you see them as unjust and problematic". I countered, "Well, obviously I do, but . . . there's a critical voice, that says, 'but why?' " He responded:

> It's probably good to think about that but maybe not possible to get an actual answer . . . It's the same as the whole altruism question. Are we altruistic, because we want to enhance our own respect and power and mana or because we genuinely want to help our fellow human?

Talking about guilt, he said,

> You've got to acknowledge the problem ... and that is hard, isn't it. You feel sad when you do that, you feel diminished in your sense, in your self. Because you don't want to ... be a person who is associated with wrong things, bad things.

I questioned, "again we have the move to redemption?". He agreed, "Yeah, so I think you're probably wanting to redeem".

David said to me: "this is a kind of fraught motivation in some ways, but I feel like it's really rewarding and satisfying to me personally, to feel accepted by Māori as a Pākehā that they can talk to, or trust". I then told him about the point Tuck and Yang (2012) make, that decolonisation must mean material improvement: transfer of land, power, privilege, rather than settler redemption. I said:

> It is ... all entangled up in ... what does accountability mean, and to whom, and why, at a personal level, but also at a societal level ... does it come from ... that drive to redemption? What is it that's personally satisfying about being a 'good Pākehā'? ... That can get quite uncomfortable, I think.

He described a challenge from Annette Sykes in a public forum, that decolonisation must involve material improvement for Māori (specifically land return) saying,

> I appreciated it. Not everyone did. ... I appreciated the challenge. ... It's a valid ... challenge, it's not one that I know really what to do with personally ... other than as a reminder that decolonisation ... has to involve a material transfer of resources. It's not just about making things nice.

I raised with redemption with Fabienne too, who said, "there's probably part of that? I think I'd be ... ignorant of myself if I went, 'there's nothing in here that's ... get myself sorted and redemption, and ... I'm one of the good ones' ". This same ability to evaluate motivations and the desire for redemption was key when I asked which emotions came up when discussing the topic.

7.4.2 *Emotionality*

Beatrice said, "we're still feeling the effects of colonisation. All the time, and it's embarrassing and sad". She named "the embarrassment of not even knowing who we are".

She wasn't sure about guilt, but, "definitely not pride. So ... possibly the opposite of that? So slightly ashamed".

Andrew thought it was, "tiring maybe? It's hard to think about? And maybe humility ... wanting to be in a position of listening and learning ... try[ing] to feel open minded. ... Bit of sadness ... maybe a bit of ... intergenerational guilt".

Eddie said he felt, "anger ... sometimes. At Pākehā institutions and the way that they function generally ... and specifically the way that ... is facilitated by the legal system or the ministerial system". He then said, "mostly ... tired and disappointed and a bit frustrated. ... There is ... a call to action". I prompted, "determination?", and he said, "yeah that's the perfect word for it ... that I think is probably the most productive emotion, that can come from that... there is guilt and there is sadness. But I don't think there's very much of them?"

Fabienne talked about "moments of realisation of what people I admire and respect and love go through that I haven't seen", calling her response to this "sort of a despair". She also mentioned determination, saying, "where I am at the moment, I don't want that determination to fade". She linked determination to "things can get better, can do something different, like optimism".

Guilt was present as an emotion, but we also discussed what can be done with it. David talked about the risk of guilt being "paralysing", and the possibility to "disappear ... down a rabbit hole of guilt", while Eddie discussed the need to balance awareness of colonisation "constructively without falling into the white guilt trap that shuts you off". He said, "I don't think [guilt is] productive". Andrew said, "it's not a very good emotion is it?" I said, "well, it can be". He responded,

> What is guilt? ... you're taking responsibility in a way. It's ... admitting that you occupy a position of power, politically. That's based on past wrongs. And that you acknowledge those past wrongs, and that you say ... 'I want to do something about it'.

I followed up, "is it productive in that sense? Like it compels you forward?". He agreed, "Yeah, I guess it's a starting point isn't it?" Charlotte said:

> Guilt and greed are the two more useless human emotions ... white guilt

> is something that can be constructive, but guilt alone is not constructive at all, and I don't like it ... I think it's a good ... confrontation, guilt, as a feeling, ... guilt has to be turned into something else, otherwise it doesn't do anything ... you need to feel the guilt but then you have to transform it otherwise it will eat you alive.

George didn't mention any negative emotions, so I asked "there's nothing negative in there, there's no guilt or shame...?" He just said, "No". He did say there was a "small amount of pride in New Zealand being further along this path than a bunch of other places".

Positive emotions were present too. Fabienne named:

> An excitement, or a hopefulness, that comes, when I see something a bit different and understand a little bit more, and see what others are seeing or hoping, or wanting to build and ... an excitement or hopefulness to ... see how I can ... support, be a part of it.

I asked, "what if there are things that you can't be a part of?". She replied, "I'm a problem solver, fix it kind of person, so sometimes ... that's probably another angle of frustration, or ... not quite uselessness". I prompted, "helplessness?" She continued:

> There's probably some helplessness, but then there's ... when I'm kind of seeing things happen, it's happening without me, it's rightly happening without me, but I feel like I want or should be a part of it ... and it's those moments of going, actually the bit of me that wants to be a part of it, and wants to be involved and is kind of feeling FOMO ... that's actually another example of ... the coloniser perspective going, 'I need to be in there', rather than just going ... 'some things, you need to let be and let go, of their own accord, you don't have to be in it'.

The emotions discussed are tightly interlinked with the level of comfort (or discomfort) experienced by my participants in grappling with their identity as Pākehā.

7.5 Levels of comfort

My participants had varying levels of comfort with their identities as Pākehā. Andrew said:

> My mum would always say, 'it's part of understanding that you're a visitor'. And she always felt like a visitor because she was a migrant herself. ... I do feel like I'm a visitor in many ways. Or maybe a guest? Like, in an indigenous land. ... I don't take it for granted.

I asked him whether this was comfortable, and he said, "I guess I'm proud of understanding it, or trying to understand it". I asked Beatrice, "why do you think you are able to? Be uncomfortable?" Her response was, "Because I am privileged". We talked about other privileged people being less likely to acknowledge it, and she identified safety, saying, "I think it's 'cause I'm in a really safe space, I'm not fighting for anything". I pointed out other people who were not fighting for anything who held tightly to privilege and she conceded, "I'm genuinely stumped. I don't know how to answer that question".

Charlotte said that more recently she had been "getting more and more ... very careful with [her] Pākehāness". Talking about Ihumātao, said, "I feel uncomfortable in the situation because I'm Pākehā, but not as an individual, I don't think". She said,

> I have no problem being a Pākehā, because I didn't choose to be born who I was ... I'm proud to be where I am ... to have come from where I come from. But ... when I sort of analytically think about it as well ... historically what my lineage has done, in this world ... it is very uncomfortable ... when I think about the privilege I have gained from that compared to the privilege that other people have ... lost ... because of that ... I hate that.

As mentioned earlier, David was happier with the specificity of 'Pākehā' than 'New Zealander', "because it's not easier or more positive, but ... it does feel more honest". He said, "I'm not sure how to describe the kind of comfort or discomfort, but ... if it's not too contradictory to say that I'm comfortable with the discomfort". He acknowledged anxiety, saying, "I do often feel anxious going into contexts, or conversations, with Māori ... where ... I will be perceived to be Pākehā and therefore I do feel ... conscious

of what I say and do". He mentioned Pākehā reactions to disagreement amongst Māori, saying, people "were often acting as if, as Pākehā we need to be ... paralysed if there's any disagreement among Māori". He said, "actually, you can take a position which recognises that all mana whenua are mana whenua and you're not".

Eddie said, "I don't feel like I'm made uncomfortable by the idea of being Pākehā, but ... it's about finding that balance of acknowledging that I benefit from a system that has traditionally benefited people that come from where I come from". He then said, "If I hadn't been born here, the ratio of Pākehā to Māori would be smaller, and Māori would be in a better position. ... Should I leave? Probably not. ... it's difficult to line that up in a way that makes sense".

George did not express any anxiety or discomfort, and seemed comfortable in the tension. I offered a hypothetical scenario around finding out childhood happinesses were problematic, testing for discomfort. His response was, "probably if I examined it with somebody who had the knowledge to point stuff out, then I would probably find that a bunch of the things that I'd enjoyed growing up, are deeply problematic. I certainly expect that that is the case". When I asked if that was uncomfortable, he said, "doesn't bother me that much".

Fabienne described how she perceived an 'us versus them':

> Knowing that I was part of the dominant coloniser culture, that sort of feeling of going ... 'where do I stand, what does that mean, am I not welcome?' I think it's not that far, but just this sort of confusion over what that does actually mean, in terms of identity?

I told her a story a Māori acquaintance had related to me, ending with her saying to someone, "sit down, coloniser", and the anxiety I felt that I might do something to prompt such a response. I said, "I don't want to be that". She said, "there's another part that kind of goes, 'I don't want to be labelled that, but if I'm behaving like that I need to be' ". I asked her if she was uncomfortable with uncertainty, and she said:

> At no point in my life, am I going to be able to sit here and say, 'Penny, let me tell you exactly who I am'. ... I as a person, will grow and develop, so I kind of see it a little in that way ... I can sit in the tension of this ... it's the

> fixed versus growth mindset stuff. If I went fixed, 'I need to figure this out, and once I've figured it out I'm drawing a line under it', I'm going, 'that is who I am, that is how I understand being a Pākehā New Zealander, nothing's going to actually shift me', but actually taking the other aspect of going, 'this is actually a journey of engaging and when I come across something, I need to engage and I need to learn, and ... allow it to shape and shift me, and then on to the next experience, which will be the same'.

7.6 The non-linearity of the journey

As discussed earlier, and as the quotation directly above illustrates, there were a number of points that spoke to a problematic distinction between formative experiences, and the present or future. A few more related to a present tension or progression. For example, Charlotte said, "I feel like I still ... occasionally have to ... sort through my thoughts and ... like sit". She stressed the importance of not vilifying yourself:

> I think it's ... looking at ... what you think versus what you do ... you correct your first thought, or your first bias ... there's a good theory called the second thought theory ... people ... vilify themselves about the first thought they have ... you see something and you think about it instantly, and it might be a racist thought or a homophobic thought, or xenophobia, or whatever it is ... and you go, 'woah, that's me' or you feel really bad about it ... and you think you're a racist, or whatever it is ... but actually ... there's a lot to say that [the] first thought [is] influenced by media ... what you hear ... all of those things that affect your subconscious. ... But actually that second thought ... when you analyse that and then go, 'what do I actually think about that' that's the actual thought. ... That is you. ... So ... you have to correct that first thought every time, and eventually the second thought becomes the first thought ... it's a really long process.

Eddie talked about catching thoughts as an ongoing practice:

> It's uncomfortable to have a thought, and think, 'I shouldn't have thought that, that was a racist or a sexist thought, and you need to stop that', but it's

> also, I think, a skill ... to catch the thought. ... And I think that's probably the most important thing, because that influences our actions. And part of that skill is recognising that you're never going to be perfect at it.

There was a story I told most of my participants. With Fabienne, I said:

> I had this conversation recently, with [a friend], ... she said, '... that's how his racism sits on [him]'. As though, of course, it's self evident that we're all racist ... Everyone has it, it's just ... a disease. ... It affects all of us. And I went away and I thought about that and I went 'I wonder where my racism sits on me'.

Fabienne replied, "What a question. 'Where does your racism sit on you?' ", and then thought for a time. Finally she said, "my racism sits on me as an awkwardness around engaging across cultures. ... I think part of our journey as a nation is we don't have the language to engage in these conversations".

7.7 Conclusion

All the participants had complex understandings of their own identity-making, through a variety of markers. Specificity of Pākehā was forefront for all of them, and this was entangled with their politics and motivations. They were engaged with the emotionality of this topic, including the way guilt functions. Importantly, they were able to sit in the contradictory space of being comfortable with discomfort, because it felt more 'honest'. This contrasts the way they thought other Pākehā were unwilling to talk about 'hard' issues.

Key characteristics from the previous chapter: embracing uncertainty, humility and growth, were also present here. The importance of stepping through the moments of feeling confronted or unsure, and then daring to keep going are clear mechanisms that enabled my participants to engage. Being on the (non-linear) journey meant holding yourself accountable, not vilifying yourself but being able to continue correcting your thoughts. Charlotte's point that it is actually the second thought that is real creates space to allow mistakes and keep going.

8. Participants: Possibilities and futures

8.1 Introduction

"I think it comes down to just, actually genuine openness to a different way" (Fabienne).

The following questions led to the conversations behind this chapter: *What does the word 'decolonisation' mean to you in practice? What do you think about the return of land? What about land that may be in private ownership? What about power sharing?.*

The purpose of this chapter is therefore to discuss what participants thought decolonisation meant. In most cases, they talked about psychological, structural and institutional decolonisation. However, they were all, to varying degrees, open to different models of relationship with land. I thus start with the personal elements, move into sharing power and making space, before exploring the topics of land and time.

8.2 Far more honest grappling

Fabienne said we need "far more honest grappling, with where the social political economic issues that we're facing as a nation are really rooted . . . and how race interacts with our socio-economic systems, patterns, with layers of all of the new decisions, challenges, drivers of change". In order to facilitate this, Eddie said, "it has to start from a point of knowing our history". George talked about the value of teaching history in schools, as "once you accept these things happened in the past . . . it's easier to understand the present and the divisions in society in the present, because you can see the line from, this happened, and . . . the follow on effects were this, and now we are here". He then raised the importance of teaching children:

> I do kind of view the public school system as a way for the country to not allow parents sole control over how the children grow up which I think is actually pretty important . . . and I don't really think that parents should be able to shelter their kids from that if they don't like it . . . it's easier, if kids . . . do this in school . . . they're not granted full autonomy as people yet, it's

> clear that they are not the ones who did this … The other thing is … kids are not allowed to be part of the political system, they're also not on the hook for changing anything yet.

Andrew and David talked about trying to understand and challenge structural oppression. Andrew said, "I understand [decolonisation] as understanding colonisation, and the continuing kind of impact and effect of colonisation. …And once you've understood it, and as you're understanding it, trying to dismantle the structures of power and the impacts on Māori". David said something very similar:

> To recognise and to challenge the colonial power structures that exist in our current ways of doing things, and to change them … That includes … white supremacy, or white dominance, and all its … forms. And, in Aotearoa it … means to recentre the status of tangata whenua … in political, social and economic terms.

I said to Fabienne that there are some things Pākehā don't have a right to know. In terms of learning te reo, her perspective was,

> The question to ask is why? Why are we learning? … to honour or … again to master? …I can see that perspective, of, 'you've basically almost killed this out once, why are you so interested now just because it's socially palatable'. …I can totally understand … that scepticism … [and] if we got to the habit of even asking ourselves that close up question, …why are you engaging, is this 'cause someone told you to … is it because this is actually a genuine building of a relationship … how does this function and how does it take us forward?

David and Fabienne raised stamina. David said, "you're looking at Pākehā fragility, and so, the question would be … how do you build … resilience in being Pākehā?" Fabienne said, "it's building muscle a wee bit, and building that courage to—I hope—that increasingly on this journey I will get more courageous around engaging, even if there is that kind of fear". She continued:

> I was really, really impacted by a simple comment that was offered to me in response to kind of a question of, 'how do we continue to grapple with

> all this ... when you've got people of ... differing degrees of awareness and engagement?' ... which was essentially, "you do not honour the 'other' by demeaning yourself".

This honest grappling and reaching toward engaging requires a level of cross-cultural understanding and pluralism.

8.3 Cultural pluralism

Andrew talked about the importance of understanding language and culture, saying:

> the greater the understanding of te reo Māori, and Māori world views, the greater the potential for dismantling problematic structures of power. ... So ... for those of us that want to rebalance structures of power, there's a strategic interest in promoting understanding of culture and language.

I raised a potential problem, asking if there was a risk of, "forcing the kind of unknowable difference of the 'other', in this sense, into ... into Western ontologies ... [which] is itself a form of colonial violence, and how do you reconcile ... wanting to know and understand?" He responded, "this is why I said that language is important. Because if you're going to understand the language and you can see it in its own terms, then you don't need to squeeze it into your linguistic framing".

When I asked Beatrice what decolonisation might look like for Pākehā, she said:

> The only thing I can think of is about Pākehā sitting comfortably alongside Māori. But that is both Māori being empowered enough to be able to sit alongside, but also everything about what we do as Pākehā isn't great.

She continued, "wouldn't it be nice in a very naïve way, if we could just ... learn ... from ... how Māori take care of things. And bring that over to us". We talked about the risk of being assimilative. I said, "I do think that the instinct ... is to dominate ... my concern would be that ... we would not be able to do that without being appropriative". We went on to agree that the best way to guard against this is genuine power sharing.

George said:

> I would like to believe in the ideas of ... egalitarianism, and New Zealanders ... systematically caring for each other, ... using government to ensure that

> everyone is cared for and gets what they need ... rather than this naïve idea of equality of just everyone gets the same stuff.

I interjected, "because then they'd all get Pākehā stuff". He continued:

> People have different needs, because we are not ... monolithic and it's ... our duty ... to give each other what we need, rather than just ... we've written down an ISO-9001-compliant, care package for being a New Zealander. You get a flag, and you get an All Blacks jersey, and you get ... the Buzzy Bee ... Lamingtons, marshmallows, Marmite, Gingernuts[1]. ... Different communities ... need different stuff, and we should work so that people get what they need, so that we can all live happier, more fulfilled lives.

As Eddie pointed out, "well, actually colonial issues are intersected with every other issue we have". This recognition brings us into the topic of power sharing.

8.4 Power sharing

"There's a lot more that we could do even short of revolutionary power sharing which also needs to happen" (David).

Beatrice told me about employee selection: "there's a particular candidate who is Māori and is a woman, and instinctively I was like, 'fuck yeah, because, that's how things change'. But then also that's an incredible amount of pressure on one person". She mentioned a Māori colleague: "[They are] just one person, but I watched them quite a lot, and they have tried to change ... some of the processes that we use here ... You change by having people who can bring that to different positions".

This is a numerical problem. I described my job-share role, saying, "that balance between having both of us there is good. But when there would be ... one [the person I job-share with] and a hundred Pennys, that would be terrible! Which is what you were describing right?" "Yeah", she replied. I suggested, "So maybe decolonisation is more of a balance, of those two world views, right?" "Yeah", she agreed. David observed:

> This is a really common experience ... to be part of processes or organisations ... which are impacted by these power dynamics and [are] Pākehā-

[1] George is listing things that might be seen as 'kiwiana': widely seen as iconic.

> dominated, and either excluding Māori or imperfectly including Māori, and then it's uncomfortable to be part of that, and ... know how to navigate it.

He concluded, "what I see as really progressive, and what I want to see more of, is organisations structurally sharing power ... in a way that models a Treaty relationship". George was open to power sharing, but raised a concern from observations of the United States:

> [With] two viable political parties, one of them is just intransigent, and ... it's just led to paralysis. ... If we had co-equal partnerships, and you get a really intransigent ... Pākehā representative, who was just like, 'my way or the highway, otherwise we do nothing, and I benefit from nothing' ... That's the thing where ... probably it would end up needing to be a more complicated arrangement.

Fabienne responded positively when we explored alternative governance models, saying, "that's something to explore, that would be fascinating ... that's steps down our maturity journey as a nation, but that is a fascinating conversation. Why assume our current governance is [the only possibility]?" In order to share power, there is a clear need for Pākehā to make space.

8.5 Making space

"Knowing that there is a space, because there is a space for everyone's opinion, but not ... claiming a space that isn't yours" (Charlotte).

Making space came up a lot during the interviews. David told me he thought that:

> Pākehā who are willing to ... accept their responsibility more fully ... we need to get better at understanding that our role is really to get out of the way... And to get other Pākehā out of the way with us.

David and Eddie raised Pākehā dominance of Tauiwi as an issue. David said:

> Some Pākehā person will ask, 'well what about...?' they'll use other minorities which is kind of offensive in itself, in terms of assuming that Māori are just a minority ... as if that is a challenge to ... the kind of two-ness of

> the Māori and non-Māori relationship. And I think . . . it is a challenge, but it's a challenge to the Pākehā-centric nature of how we see the Treaty partner . . . The only way in which that's relevant, or justified I think, [is] in terms of who bears the most responsibility to change. . . . The space that we need to be making . . . on the one hand, is power sharing . . . an equal partnership basis with Māori, but on the other hand, challenging our own dominance within the other part of that partnership to be more . . . fully inclusive of diversity. . . . With . . . all of the other groups of Tauiwi.

Eddie said, "Asians Supporting Tino Rangatiratanga[2] have . . . modelled . . . the Treaty relationship, beautifully. And better than . . . most Pākehā groups that I know of".

David and I discussed spaces that were appropriate, and inappropriate. He mentioned our role holding the Crown accountable, and not wading into debates we have no place being a part of:

> I felt I had some responsibility or voice . . . on the role of the Crown, or on the role of colonisation . . . It's valid . . . as Pākehā also to have an analysis and a critique . . . in terms of the role of the Crown in effectively dictating to Māori, how . . . to structure themselves . . . when the Crown was in the wrong, but . . . actually criticising the individuals, the leaders, the role of . . . iwi and rūnanga and things like that . . . I think that's an issue for Māori.

He told me about an experience at Waitangi:

> The time we did . . . take quite a 'pushing ourselves forward' role, was when [the] Government arrived. So we . . . took on—and again this was discussed and agreed with Māori protest leaders . . . what different groups would be doing—one of the things that we were kind of given to do, was challenge, I think it was probably Helen Clark[3] at the time, the Government representatives when they arrived. . . . Keeping your own leaders accountable is always sort of appropriate.

I wanted to find where my participants felt uncomfortable about decolonisation

[2] "ASTR is a group committed to supporting Māori sovereignty through treaty education with Asian communities and solidarity with Māori-led movements" (Asians Supporting Tino Rangatiratanga, 2019) . Their website is https://www.facebook.com/Asians4Tino/.

[3] Helen Clark was the Prime Minister of Aotearoa from 1999 to 2008.

as it relates to land. I expected they would be comfortable with power sharing, co-governance, probably returning Crown land, but that returning privately owned land might feel uncomfortable. I was surprised by the responses.

8.6 Land

"If I lost my house to a ... socialist decolonisation revolution, I'd be pretty happy with that" (David).

"If there's a popular guillotine-the-rich uprising ... I'll just ... hand people my money and pick up a pitch fork" (George).

In commenting on land ownership, Andrew said he had:

> a wider class-based critique of land and property ownership, and I would actually prefer more generally, land to be held in trust by community entities, or collective entities. ... That may not be what Māori want to do, if we go down the road of giving land back, but ... I think—conveniently, supportive of decolonisation— ... land ownership is fucked up ... because it's ... been designed ... for land owners to extract profit from land.

I pointed out, "again we have this ... being able to talk about the issue ... because of an alignment with something else. So maybe it's easier for you to understand returning land, or giving up land, even land that's in private ownership". He said, "I think that's true". He tested himself, asking, "what about my mum's house? ... how would I feel about giving that back?". I asked, "Is that uncomfortable?" He answered, "a little bit. ... But ... I would like to do it". He continued:

> What do I want from land? ... If I had land, I'd want ... to know that I was going to be able to stay here, have a right to occupy it. ... actually ... I don't really feel like anyone should own land.

He concluded, "that's got to be part of decolonisation. ... Give land back". He then suggested, "if DOC[4] was co-governed by the Crown and Māori ... all DOC land—which is a fucking shitload—would be co-owned by the Crown and Māori".

I asked Beatrice about private land, and she said:

[4]The Department of Conservation, Te Papa Atawhai.

> I love where I live ... I bought that piece of land ... and we built our house. But ... if ... actually ... something had to happen ... and it's not right, and it's unjust ... then I could imagine, as long as my family had somewhere to live, and it wasn't ... the depths of ... hell somewhere, but if ... I was OK, then actually that's more important.

However, demonstrating she was still in the process of 'catching thoughts', she said:

> I assume immediately, if ... challenged again, I'd then start making all sorts of judgement calls about ... what is the better use of land, and what would it be used for and actually can you justify and ... go down that path, which I think actually indicates the opposite.

Charlotte started, "in general ... things like Ihumātao ... land that is not actually owned or inhabited by Pākehā or by anyone ... there's actually no argument about it". On private land she was less certain, saying:

> Māori were here first, and that does give a claim to the land, but also other people did come ... it would have to be a case-by-case-basis ... how that particular bit of land was taken ... what the history of that was ... If it is a result of stealing and murder, like most of it is, to be honest ... that has to be re-evaluated ... but also that person might not have had anything to do with that ... might have now created a very strong bond to that land, and been born on that land, and I do have a lot of empathy for that.

David does not own his house, but said, "we rent a nice house, and I benefit from colonisation just as much without having to own the land it's on". He added:

> We could go a long way in terms of ... restoration and ... material decolonisation ... without getting to the point of ... ordinary people losing the homes that they live in ... There's a lot that could be done just by taking that need to return land more seriously ... I think it should be a major part of budgets moving forward.

Eddie said, "mostly, ... I feel good about [returning land] because I have a trust in Māori institutions, Māori systems, and those Māori people with whom I've had conversations, that that wouldn't happen in an unreasonable way". Fabienne made a similar

point:

> A mark of decolonised New Zealand [would] be, we wouldn't have that suspicion ... of going, oh we can't give Māori the beaches, the foreshore, no, because ... they'll block us ... It's ... us versus them mentality, it is individualistic, property-right driven thinking.

She continued, "Individual property rights and private property are so ingrained in our economic, financial, social systems, Pākehā systems, that it's almost like we can't expand our thinking". I asked about her own house. She said:

> I think ... initially ... really uncomfortable, thinking about this piece of land, where we're sitting. But then, if I didn't own the land, but was given the right ... to occupy it, by the owners of the land, so actually moving away from freehold titles to leasehold titles and all those variants. ... actually that even changes my relationship to the land. That could actually be really useful for me mentally, because it puts me into a mindset of going, 'I'm here for a time, what I do, not just to my house, but actually to the land that it's sitting on, that doesn't belong to me. ... I have to look after this, I'm being entrusted with this land', that's a completely different mindset.

George and I talked about corporate, farmed, and private land. About returning corporate land, he said, "I don't think companies are really real ... It's less obviously straightforward to me how it would work, but ... I'm open to the idea". About returning farm land, he said, "farms are businesses, don't care", but then retracted, saying:

> I was probably too flippant. ... To me, farms are businesses ... I understand that there are people who ... have multiple generations of their family ... on a piece of land, and they are really highly invested in it, but ... [that] amount of investment in the land, probably crosses over into an idea of stewardship, ... maybe if they could ... understand that what is being proposed is very similar to what they have been doing for the same reasons.

On private land, he said:

> I've never owned property, so ... I don't think that I can relate to the ... 'this is mine and I own it' ... My theoretical position—which has never been

> tested—. . . is that, once I know that my actions are pretty reasonably making another group of people unhappy, and it's straightforward for me to . . . change that situation . . . then it's incumbent on me to . . . make an accommodation . . . I mean, if you know that this particular set of private land is particularly meaningful to a group of people, and that there are reasonable alternatives. . .

My participants appeared much further along than the mainstream in discussing returning land, even private land. This brings me to the topic of time.

8.7 Time

"In 200 years, what [will have] evolved? How have things changed? . . . Why has it taken us so long to get there?" (Beatrice).

Eddie was concerned about time, saying:

> Everything takes so frickin' long . . . if you were to now institute te reo Māori in high schools, proper teaching of New Zealand history and you had enough Māori teachers to cover that . . . you're still talking about waiting for everybody that finished school last year, to die, before the entire population knows enough to have an effect.

George said, "I'm not quite sure if this is . . . Pākehā thinking . . . but there's a bit of me which is like, 'geez I wish we would like, fucking get on with [decolonisation]' ". Fabienne was optimistic, seeing hope in "how powerful young voices are, at shifting the voices of the older people in their lives", citing climate change, where she was seeing "senior leaders in private business, who are going, 'we need to think more carefully about this, because my 13 year old will not get off my back' ". She concluded, "our generation are likely to be the ones who really get a kick from those younger ones going, 'we're learning this, you currently hold power, what are you doing?' " David described a process, saying:

> When I'm saying decolonisation I'm thinking of that as . . . work to be done now. And, I think you can do decolonisation work in a very colonised context, and it might. . . have a variety of forms, and . . . I don't know if there is a

final point.

Eddie also said, "I don't know what the world looks like when decolonisation is complete, but I try to have an understanding that up until we've reached that point . . . I am living, with more advantage than is my due". Finally, Fabienne commented:

> Because I'm only at this point on my journey of really understanding [how] truly colonised New Zealand is . . . I feel like it would be quite rich of me to go, 'actually a decolonised New Zealand looks like, blah blah'. Is that not just me perpetuating . . . exactly what we've been talking about?

8.8 Conclusion

While participants recognised the need for Pākehā to not centre ourselves and dictate what decolonisation looks like, they were genuinely willing to engage, curious and open to imagining other ways of being.

They stressed the importance of honest grappling with messy topics; needing to be open to learning; decentering ourselves and sitting down when necessary; and exploring other models of governance and institutional structures.

The topic of land was specifically designed to test for comfort, and I was surprised how open participants were to the idea of returning *private* land to Māori. Some conditionality remained— having somewhere to live or right to occupy— but the process of talking it through with me, particularly for Fabienne, led to openness to other ways of relating to land. This suggests a circularity where not talking about it contributes to our ongoing unwillingness to not talk about it. This process must be interrupted by brave conversations and willingness to experience discomfort.

9. Analysis

9.1 Introduction

There is an inherent tension between the literature and the participant data. Much of the theory speaks to the *problem space*: whiteness, white fragility, and settler colonialism. While the participants occupy that position, they do so critically, differentiating them from the majority of Pākehā who embody uncritical, active settler colonialism.

Therefore, I initially thought theory and participants could operate as two data sources giving a fuller picture of the entire field. As I worked through the analysis however, I found the participant data spoke back to the theory in a more aligned way than I had expected. This is because as we talked through the problem space in the interviews, the participants speculated about Pākehā broadly, but also, due to the non-linearity of the journey, they recognised colonising instincts in their own ways of being.

My initial strategy of trying to align the sections in my *Literature Review* chapter to the sections in my *Participants* chapters totally failed. Instead, to see the alignment between theory and experience, I had to step back and start from 'scratch', looking across the all the data rather than limiting myself to structures I already had. This led to (slightly) different themes within this chapter: Pākehā identity, seeing complicity, emotionality and guilt, time and the journey, relationships, ethics and making space, and ignorance. After discussing these in turn, I also briefly muse on where the blindspots and boundaries of comfort lay for participants.

9.2 Pākehā identity

The identity markers the participants highlighted about a generalised New Zealand identity broadly follow the literature. The Pākehā standard story McCreanor (2005) describes utilises the same tropes participants mentioned (e.g. Number 8 Wire). Similarly, both Turner (1999) and Bell (2014) mention sport, while the participants identified rugby and the Silver Fern. Their analysis of Pākehā as stoic, unable to talk about

the 'hard stuff' was reminiscent of Turner (1999), who wrote that part of settler forgetting was grief without an object, an inability to weep. The way Pākehā appropriate Māori culture to make up for an absence also followed the literature (Bell, 1996, 2014). Although it was acknowledged that this absence could cause a somewhat ungrounded feeling, the participants did accept this, looking to other avenues for identity-making. The discussion with Andrew and Beatrice about militarism, ANZAC and Gallipoli also echoed Maddison (2012), who pointed to the importance of Gallipoli in the construction of national identity. That the participants recognised that these tropes, myths, and narratives may actually represent more what we *think* about ourselves than who we actually are, indicates they see through this standard story (McCreanor, 2005) to the alternative accounts.

There was very little acknowledgement of Pākehā identities as stories of migrations, what Bell (2009) calls 'routes'. This was perhaps my phrasing of the question around 'Pākehā'. Although Bell (2014) discusses hybridity within indigenous identities, the participants talked about Pākehā hybridity, mentioning our colonial settler roots, American media, globalisation, and, not least Māori. One talked about the variety of Pākehā identities differentiating between her first generation Hungarian flatmate, and her own multigenerational Pākehātanga. While Māori influence was mentioned, it was tempered by an anxiety of appropriation. This speaks to the 'paradox of appropriation': recognition of the risk of appropriation registers complicity, while also acting as an obstacle to belonging (Probyn, 2002). While the participants mentioned biculturalism, feeling grounded by the Treaty, they did so reflexively, with the concern we only *think* we are good at biculturalism. They did not seem to fall prey to discourses of authenticity and acceptance on the settlers' terms (Bell, 2014).

Uncritical, imagined (colourblind, but still Pākehā) national belonging and membership (O'Malley & Kidman, 2018; Rifkin, 2011) was problematised. The participants disavowed the politics of homogeneity and assimilation via a disaggregated 'one-New Zealand-ness' (Johnson, 2005), largely preferring the specificity of Pākehā as more 'honest', and were careful to position themselves as Pākehā. Two rejected nation based identities generally. Bell (1996) and Johnson (2005) write that understanding Pākehā-

tanga, and adopting the marker Pākehā, are political acts that displace Pākehā's discursive dominance, but does not undo its hegemony. So too, Dyer (1997), Fowler Snyder (2015), and Probyn (2004), advocate making whiteness 'marked', or 'strange' in order to recognise itself. Almost all of the participants talked about how identifying as Pākehā carried a responsibility, to encourage others to think about underlying structures of power, as a mechanism to reject how 'New Zealander' erases difference. This ran counter to the mainstream tendency to insist upon a monolithic New Zealand identity.

The link between settler identities and sociopolitical formations (Bell, 2014; Rifkin, 2011; Turner, 2011) had highlighted the need to recognise the way settler realities are constructed through practice, and how colonisation operates as a structure, not a complete event (Mackey, 2014; Tuck & Yang, 2012). This was recognised by the participants, one of whom talked about colonialism being "inherent to everything". The discussion about entitlement, and thinking we know better demonstrates what Mackey (2014) calls 'fantasies of entitlement'. The participants' discussion of 'catching thoughts' and the relationship between thoughts, actions, and institutions showed they recognised these ongoing practices in themselves, and how they relate to settler creation of reality. This awareness is related to the process of coming to see our complicity.

9.3 Seeing complicity

Recalling the "unbearable searchlight of complicity" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 9), recognising complicity requires an unsettling humility (Sium et al., 2012). Further, complicity is the *only* starting point (Probyn, 2002). The participants were all willing to discuss seeing their complicity. We discussed the possibility of recognising complicity indirectly, first understanding structural oppression that they weren't complicit in (via feminism, or while living overseas). In George's case, living in a country he didn't feel invested in was a factor. This level of detachment was also present in David's discussion of learning history. Exposure to complicity in a detached, indirect, or safe way seems to have helped the participants come to terms with it.

I did not detect any sign of competing marginalities (Fellows & Razack, 1998). Al-

though all participants would be quick to acknowledge their privilege, those who had experienced other 'isms', or being 'weird' as a child, talked about this being a way to sit with the lived experiences of Māori. 'Sitting' in this way requires an ability to recognise emotional responses.

9.4 Emotionality and guilt

As noted, Boler (1999) argued emotional responses need to be unpacked. All participants were open to acknowledging emotional responses and looking beyond them in this way, recognising colonising instincts in their emotional responses. Boler (1999) described how sometimes defensive anger protects our frail identities, and reflects the fear that privilege is not merit based. Some participants identified fear about loss of identity and crumbling of meritocratic ideas. George was particularly scathing about meritocracies. If privilege is based on an arbitrary social status (Boler, 1999), remembering it is conferred by birth, unearned but also unasked for, can inoculate against guilt (Addy, 2008). Charlotte and David talked about not being able to change being white. George saying the past was immutable seemed to function in the same way to alleviate guilt.

I was influenced by the idea that guilt should not be 'bared', but instead 'borne', and therefore, bearable (Bell, 2004). Guilt came up organically with the participants, but they recognised it could be paralysing and must be transformed to make productive. Huygens (2007) warned guilt is related to Pākehā individualism, indicating individual rather than collective responsibility, when we need collective change. This was highlighted by David, who noted the lack of Pākehā social structures which would help support collective change.

Fragility is revealed by the emotional labour Boler and Zembylas (2003) describe. This speaks to the very beginning of the theory: white fragility. DiAngelo (2011) recommends reframing fragility in terms of building stamina. David and Fabienne both discussed resilience, and the necessity of 'building muscle' in order to work to overcome fear and build courage to engage. The ongoing process of 'catching thoughts', holding oneself accountable, making mistakes and learning and continuing all build muscle.

Muscle and courage are required to come to terms with the 'considerable anguish' of having an oppressive identity, and constantly re-examining oneself (Freire, 1996). This was expressed as the productive tension of being always slightly challenged, or feeling slightly anxious. However, one participants mentioned there was a line where it got too uncomfortable for him. Others talked about walking an edge, re-evaluating the line constantly, and the daring involved in this 'push and pull'. This process takes time.

9.5 Time and the journey

Huygens (2007) writes about the time required for real change, suggesting it might take seven generations. Eddie expressed dismay it might take one full generation, Fabienne was more positive, suggesting younger voices might shake us up and drive change earlier. Huygens (2007) and Linder (2015) acknowledge the non-linearity of the journey, with Linder (2015) describing interconnected cogs (guilt and shame, fear of appearing racist, and distance from whiteness) leading to getting stuck and cycling between activism and inaction. I did not explicitly test this, but non-linearity was clearly present in the way the participants discussed their experiences, from how they learned from mistakes, to generally catching themselves and holding themselves accountable. This accountability often was linked back to relationships.

9.6 Relationships

Although I discussed ontological reduction with Andrew, my interviews were not generally couched in academic jargon. However, I was struck by the metaphor of pou as co-existing ontologies (Bell, 2017). They argue this demonstrates Pākehā identity can be affirmed alongside Māori (without settling the relationship), and how enhancing the mana of one enhances the mana of the other. We need to accept "having harmed others just by being one's self" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 10), expressed by Andrew as, "you've got to understand how you're affecting other people just by existing". However, Fabienne's words, "you do not honour the 'other' by demeaning yourself" reflect Bell's (2017) co-existing pou, upholding each other's mana.

It was interesting but unsurprising that many participants talked about relationships

with Māori being formative. I had A. Smith (2013) in mind, warning against the self-reflexive settler/white subject who comes to see "her complicity in settler colonialism and/or white supremacy because of her exposure to Native peoples" (para. 10). A. Smith (2013) is writing about the confessing privileged subject, but the issue is the same: the story is told by the white subject.

There are other problems with realising complicity via access to Māori. Boler (1999) writes that empathy with the 'other' centres the self. Jones (1999) warns of *assuming* access to the 'other'. Berenstain (2016) argues epistemic exploitation maintains oppressive structures (See also Johnson (2005)). This was recognised by the participants who did not want to burden Māori by asking for/expecting 'free lessons'. I am reminded of Saslow (2016, 2018), who describes Derek Black's rise out of white nationalism. He relied heavily on personal relationships for this transformation. Recognising the risk of epistemic exploitation, it seems personal relationships with affected groups remains a key transformative mechanism. This underscores the importance of learning from other Pākehā where possible, and the responsibility we have to undertake to try and bring people along with us.

Therefore, Johnson's (2005) recommendation that whites should work on whites is salient, and indeed speaks to the participants' formative experiences learning from other Pākehā (although not exclusively positively), and their responsibility to teach other Pākehā. The model of *Radicals, Translators, Early adopters* and *The Mass* (Huygens, 2007) would position the participants as *Translators*, especially Eddie in his role of listening and taking whakaaro to other Pākehā, and Fabienne, mediating with a colleague about the Christchurch shootings.

Johnson (2005) describes anti-racist Pākehā constructing their differentiation from the mainstream, with overseas travel as a formative experience. This was a huge topic for the participants. Other formative experiences Johnson (2005) noted included workplace influences, which the participants discussed, and "unusual childhoods" (p. 145), interesting in light of Charlotte's point about being a 'weird' child, and also parents' inherited values.

The participants' musings on the importance of being connected, and *on the right*

side with others matches Huygens's (2007) findings that facilitating factors for Pākehā change included being part of a liberation community and a sense of connected destiny. Being on the right side is clearly related to an ethical responsibility.

9.7 Ethics and making space

On the relationship's ethical dimension, Bell (2014) recommends interrupting our will to mastery and certainty, and unsettling and decentering ourselves. Politics must be deduced from ethics, and so too, interruptible. 'Far more honest grappling' demonstrates the participants' need and willingness to interrupt certainty and settled horizons (Bell, 2014). They described the responsibility to genuinely share power, with numerical equivalence and without intransigence, to make space and dismantle Pākehā dominance. Bell (2008) argues that making space involves accepting pluralisation of centres. This arose for participants not just decentering themselves in relation to Māori, and recognising which spaces were appropriate, but also in relation to other Tauiwi. This acknowledges the fallacy Huygens (2007) identifies about the dominant group's homogeneity.

Interruption of space, certainty and dominance involves vulnerability and emotional labour, but is empowering (Boler & Zembylas, 2003). Boler's (1999) pedagogy of discomfort (see also Boler and Zembylas (2003)) invites us to embrace ambiguity and uncertainty. This matches what participants said about finding ways to engage that felt more honest, and being comfortable in discomfort. They were able to sit in that discomfort or tension and examine what was underneath. They talked about navigating their Pākehātanga being a balancing act, one needing honesty and care. Fabienne's fixed versus growth mindset was one way to manage discomfort around uncertainty.

Engaging with difference means denying liberal individual exit strategies (celebration/tolerance, denial/sameness and natural response/biological) (Boler & Zembylas, 2003). I did not detect these. The participants actively engaged with power structures, and were not tempted by individual celebration; embraced difference and actively eschewed sameness; and showed no sign of the natural response strategy. George was scathing about universalism with his description of an ISO-9001-compliant identity

package. I kept watch for signs of 'tolerance' as a good white nationalist practice (Hage, 2000). I did not perceive anyone uncritically positioning themselves as white managers of the national space. They were quick to label racism and white supremacy in Aotearoa in general, and the tendency to disavow national constructions of identity also guards against Hagean tactics. Their disavowal of white normativity indicated a shrugging off of white ignorance.

9.8 Ignorance

Ignorance was very present in the literature and contributed to *my* understanding of colonising processes, particularly my inclinations as a researcher and will to mastery of knowledge. Ignorance only arose explicitly during interviews in a few places, but was implicitly woven throughout.

The strategic and structural underpinnings of ignorance and power (Alcoff, 2007; Jones, 2001; Logue, 2008; Mills, 2007) demand recognition and self-extraction. This means eschewing the white normativity the participants saw Pākehā exhibit. The complicated relationship with history reflected in the participants' mixed experiences, and their recognition that we must learn our history, speaks to the literature on ignorance generally, but specifically the attitude toward history as 'forgetting' and 'dreaming' (Turner, 1999, 2011). As noted, Berenstain (2016) argues Fricker's (2007) hermeneutical gap can be exacerbated by the dominant group's refusal to adopt new language. Fabienne picked this up, noting, "as a nation . . . we don't have the language to engage in these conversations".

The positive side of ignorance is the 'passion for ignorance' (Jones, 2001). Respecting unknowable difference and the boundaries of the unknowable is a strategy to relate in a non-colonising way (Bell, 2014). This came up in a few places. In Andrew's strategic promotion of understanding culture and language, in order to dismantle problematic structures of power, I specifically raised the risk of ontological violence. In wanting to learn from the better approaches Māori have to managing many domains, Beatrice and I discussed the risk of being assimilative. Neither Andrew or Beatrice explicitly discussed deliberate ignorance, but the discussion around risk shows that participants

want to relate in non-colonising ways (Bell, 2014).

The closest to recognising strategic ignorance was Fabienne's discussion about motivations behind the desire to know, sitting with feeling left out, and recognising the coloniser instinct to want access to all spaces. My sense is that the participants understood (although only Fabienne articulated) the tension that Logue (2008) calls the "contradictory space between the desire to know and the desire to ignore" (p 61), and were approaching coming to terms with settlers not having the right to know everything (Mackey, 2014). The related ethics of incommensurability means accepting that decolonisation is not accountable to settler futures (Tuck & Yang, 2012) . This was reflected as an uncertainty about a settled end point, and Fabienne's insight that being prescriptive about what decolonisation looks like would be perpetuating a colonising process.

Bailey (2007) writes that moving beyond the entanglement of identity and ignorance demanded by white supremacy involves transcending a logic of purity and embracing a 'curdled' identity. All participants were willing to engage with the messiness of this topic. Fabienne summed this up: "I think probably this conversation has captured the beautiful mess that is my thinking". Messiness indicates that there blindspots and boundaries that still need to be worked on.

9.9 Boundaries and blindspots

During my Literature Review, I was very impacted by the argument Tuck and Yang (2012) make: "settler moves to innocence are those strategies or positionings that attempt to relieve the settler of feelings of guilt or responsibility without giving up land or power or privilege" (p. 10). I wove questions into my interviews to test boundaries of comfort and willingness to make material change. It is worth noting that I consider the participants I selected to be more radical and open than the vast majority of Pākehā. Even so, there were a few moments where we butted up against a comfort boundary or a blindspot.

The answers the participants gave about power, privilege, and land indicated they were comfortable with material decolonisation, and did not just view it as a 'metaphor'.

However, private land was a line where conditionality or discomfort crept in for some participants. Still, as noted, the process of talking through it yielded a shift in Fabienne's case. There seemed to be another comfort boundary that existed when Māori acquaintances refuse to centre Pākehā comfort. While authentic engagement is often met with grace, or being *slightly* challenged or anxious, which was productive, there was a line beyond which engagement became hard.

There were also two small blindspots. First, there was limited recognition of the value of strategic ignorance and respecting the right to be not-known as non-colonising ways of relating. The discussion on navigating a risk of appropriation came close, but did not go as far as explicitly acknowledging positive ignorance as a foil against appropriation. As above, Fabienne was the only one who explicitly discussed on two occasions that there were spaces she had to accept she did not have a right to. The second blindspot was the role of routes (Bell, 2009) in Pākehā identity-making. It came up in only two interviews and one of those was prompted. This does suggest there is some slippage into a Pākehā identity "'born' post colonisation out of the New Zealand soil" (Bell, 1996, p. 156). However, as noted, this may have been my question framing.

Motivations are an important point. Tuck and Yang (2012) warn of desire for redemption (and, Bell (2009) writes, acceptance and belonging). I discussed this explicitly with a few participants, and they were honest enough to admit that their motivations were not entirely altruistic, acknowledging that they didn't want be associated with 'bad things' (Andrew), that it was rewarding to be accepted as a trusted Pākehā (David), or that redemption was inevitably present (Fabienne).

Finally, I wonder how much of what the participants and I think is hypothetical performativity, thus far largely untested in practice. The best way to guard against this is to constantly examine our motivations, blindspots, and boundaries of comfort, and actively avoid centring ourselves.

9.10 Conclusion

There is a high degree of alignment between the participants' thoughts and experiences, and the theory, across the themes of whiteness, white fragility, settler colonial-

ism, Pākehā identity, uncertainty, discomfort, anti-racism and ethics. This holds both for what they thought about the problem space and Pākehā in general, and how they saw themselves as they move through complicity in colonial structures and practices. Ignorance was an exception, not often explicitly present in the participants' reflections. Upon analysis however, it appeared implicitly throughout.

The participants demonstrated a critical understanding of the topic and how they conduct themselves within it. However, as noted, there were a few blindspots or places where a comfort boundary become apparent, as conditionality crept in. Finally, there is a risk some topics in these conversations are, and are likely to remain, untested in practice, and may therefore be hypothetical performativity.

10. Conclusion

10.1 Introduction

This final chapter draws together the threads from throughout this thesis. It outlines my original intentions, and revisits the thesis process. Then the main topics within the literature, the themes from the stories the participants told me are reviewed, along with how these were joined these together in my analysis to give effect to my research objectives. The chapter then closes with a reflection on the project as a whole.

10.2 The beautiful mess

I had originally wanted to seek out and disrupt Pākehā processes of defensiveness and deflection. As is probably the case with every enthusiastic student, I was encouraged to condense the scope of my project. Next, I continued wanting to 'see', via 'periscoping' Hiemstra (2017), the cloistered space where disruptive moments might lie for defensive/deflective Pākehā, through the participants' stories. An original research objective in the Participant Information Sheet [1] was therefore: *Theorise where possible disruptive moments might exist for other Pākehā and in what contexts.* However, this thesis turned into a study seeking to explore the commonalities amongst Pākehā who are aware of their colonial positionality[2].

In situating the research, literature on whiteness, white privilege and white fragility were canvassed, moving through settler colonialism to Pākehā identity and fragility. The oblivious responses or epistemological strategies of uncertainty, ignorance, and discomfort were all important themes in the literature. Finally, the ethical dimensions of engaging, allyship and anti-racism completed my literature review.

Conversations with the participants were wide-ranging. The problem space included uninterrogated Pākehātanga, the damage it causes, and what the barriers are for engaging. We discussed formative experiences, why they were able to engage, sit with

[1] See *Appendix: Information Sheet*.
[2] I therefore removed that research objective, and removed periscoping from my *Epistemology* chapter.

discomfort and hold themselves accountable. They told me what they thought about their identities, emotionality, comfort and the non-linearity of their journey. Finally, we discussed what decolonisation might look like, and their responses to that.

During the analysis phase, I was surprised to find a strong alignment between the theoretical literature, and what the participants said. To see this required stepping back from the structures I created for both theory and participant data, and attempting to hold both simultaneously anew, to see the connections within.

These phases of engagement with the literature, conversations with participants, and analysis were designed to help deliver on the thesis' research objectives, which were:

1. Explore the relationship between participants' construction of their Pākehā identity and of their national identity, and to what extent they draw a separation between the two.
2. Explore in what ways Aotearoa's colonial history and present inform participants' constructions of Pākehā identity.
3. Explore how participants' Pākehā identity is comfortable or unsettled, and whether they embrace uncertainty and discomfort or struggle against it.
4. Explore what participants think decolonisation might mean in practice and how comfortable this is for them.
5. Discuss any possible disruptive moments or confluence that troubled participants' previously uninterrogated identity constructions.

Although the *Participants* chapters did not naturally match the objectives, I had anticipated this while coding, and am comfortable my process was honest.

The title of this section refers to something Fabienne said: "I think probably this conversation has captured the beautiful mess that is my thinking". It is also an apt metaphor for the entire project, capturing the messiness of shifting away from my original plan, the entanglement of myself with the participants, and my positionality within this subject. As such, it is worth reflecting on the entire project, as something both messy and beautiful.

10.3 Reflections

In this section, I reflect upon the process I followed, and— with a nod to action research— how I have shifted during this project, and how the project has contributed to a shift with my participants as well.

10.3.1 *On my process*

There are three points I have been particularly reflecting on regarding process. The first is the composition of the participants. Originally all but one were recruited from the same political/activist network. I took the opportunity to interview George, who was living in the United States, because I thought it would be interesting to investigate his slightly differing positionality. I was relieved, but unsurprised, to find internal consistency between all participants' language and positions, including George.

The second relates to how I interacted with the participants during the interviews. I discussed the situatedness and entanglement of the researcher with the object of study in my *Epistemology* chapter. My Interview Questions Preamble stated that the interviews were "semi-structured conversations, in which we meander through the various parts of the subject together". This framing, combined with my relationship with the participants, led to natural conversations which included interjections or prompting. I considered after the first interview whether it was leading, but concluded, as per Powell and Kelly (2017) that "the stories my participants shared were shaped by the interaction of their identities and mine" (p. 50).

Finally, there was one slightly jarring tension while writing my *Analysis* chapter. As much of the literature is highly critical of whiteness and settler colonialism, I found myself considering whether participants were exhibiting negative traits the theory describes, and feeling defensive of them, not wanting to criticise. I feel accountable to them. They shared with me their time, stories and emotional responses. Although their high degree of personal accountability and reflexivity means I don't think this is a serious bias, I felt compelled to add a late section on where boundaries or blindspots existed. Even so, where I could be critical of them, it genuinely appeared that they were aware of themselves.

10.3.2 *On the project*

Bell (2014) warns against obsessive reflexivity and white narcissism by focusing on the white subject. I was also struck by the point A. Smith (2013) makes about the confessing privileged white subject telling stories, when the subaltern is denied their voice (Spivak, 2010). *However*, this risk needs to be balanced against the dangers of uncritical complicity in ongoing colonialism. The best way to counter that, is coming to terms with our Pākehātanga. This requires reflexivity without sliding into narcissism or paralysis.

I think back to the role of action research, particularly Noffke (2012), arguing action research is a way to directly make change and cut out the middle step. I re-read what I myself wrote about the participants as accomplices: "We are ... fundamentally, collaborating on a project of understanding our complicity in colonialism". Much of the literature recommends that "whites should work on whites" (Johnson, 2005, p. 145). The participants and I were, and are, working on ourselves and each other. It was evident that through our interviews, there was shift and movement, as participants told and reflected on their stories and thought about how to move into the future. This acknowledges the Baradian flavour to my project, which allows for the inevitability of intra-actions leaving 'marks' (Barad, 2007), both on me, and my participants; and the potential for ripples (Kara, 2017), or 'lines of flight' (Marn & Wolgemuth, 2017) that extend beyond encounters.

There was one visible line of flight. Regarding the conversation Andrew and I had about his failing to make space when asked, where he said, "I should say sorry to him about that": A while after our interview, he told me the opportunity had arisen. Our conversation had been a contributing factor in his facing this mistake and trying to put it right[3]. Apologising doesn't undo the original harm, or *necessarily* change the future, but it indicates that some sort of change has been wrought.

I also shifted during the course of this project. David, during a consent check, asked what I had learned as a researcher/writer, and a Pākehā/activist and how those things intersect. There were many small experiences which changed the trajectory of my

[3]This was the person I sent information about the thesis, and an excerpt to, to gain their consent at being indirectly referenced See *Considerations for participants*).

thinking, three of which were:

First, early on, I had a frank conversation with a Māori colleague. I asked her what she made of Pākehā paralysis. She said something matter of fact, along the lines of, "I have no time for it, because it doesn't do anything". This made me realise how much this is about action and change, not navel-gazing.

Second, Sholock's (2012) argument to embrace epistemic uncertainty and "disrupt cognitive manifestations of white privilege wherein white knowers expect epistemic comfort, confidence, and mastery" (pp. 703-704) made me realise I needed to confront my own will to mastery of knowledge.

Finally, Fabienne's comment, "you do not honour the 'other' by demeaning yourself" stayed in my head, alongside Pratt (1984): "to acknowledge the complexity of another's existence is not to deny my own" (p. 35).

Together, these moments alongside the rest of the extensive reading and conversations with the participants have contributed to the most important outcome for me: an understanding that we must learn to balance on a knife edge between paralysis and narcissism, and find a firm enough footing, from which to act with meaning and intention, without demanding certainty. The negative emotions expressed by the participants, which I recognised in myself (shame, guilt, embarrassment) must be moved past, in order to stand firm, grounded, poised for action, rather than risking cringe and slippage. This means coming to terms with being Pākehā, an identity that, yes, is predicated on colonialism, and *is* often uncomfortable.

My whole thesis thus reflects my own (non-linear, ongoing) journey. I recognise the privilege in having access to an academic institution, and the time and energy required. But I hope more fellow Pākehā embark on this journey where possible. It is also my hope that perhaps, for some participants, being part of this project has contributed to their journey as well, as "to borrow a metaphor from Freire and Houghton: *together enough of us wear a track by walking*" (Kirton, 1997, p. 16, emphasis in original).

10.4 Conclusion

It is worth reflecting briefly on possible future research. The most obvious future project is what I originally set out to do: try to disrupt uncritical Pākehātanga. This would almost certainly involve working with Treaty practitioners, in a stricter action research framework, rather than borrowing ideas from action research and weaving them into a composite epistemology as I did. It would also require a comprehensive, full ethics process, and much time. Secondly, Linder (2015) noted the probable gendered nature of white guilt. This would be a fascinating direction for future Pākehātanga research.

However, I have achieved what I set out to do: explore the ways that Pākehā identity can act as a barrier to, or alternatively, as motivation for engaging with colonialism and decolonisation, and how we Pākehā can hold ourselves accountable on that journey.

This project has been as much about my own journey, as it has been about exploring what the participants thought. Our encounters have inevitably changed all of us. This underscores how the participants and I are in a continual process of *becoming*, which will never be settled. The sense of responsibility to recognise and interrupt the colonial processes we are all complicit in demonstrates a commitment to decolonisation, in which we Pākehā must decentre ourselves and embrace alterity. This does not mean that we will always succeed: this journey implies making mistakes and the humility to learn from them and do better. Pratt (1984) calls this "be[ing] at the edge between my fear and the outside, on the edge at my skin, listening" (p. 35). To conclude this thesis, I circle back to the start:

> *There is an irreconcilable tension between the search for a secure place from which to speak, within which to act, and the awareness of the price at which secure places are bought, the awareness of the exclusions, the denials, the blindnesses on which they are predicated (Mohanty, 2003, p. 101).*

Bibliography

Addy, N. (2008). White privilege and cultural racism: Effects on the counselling process. *New Zealand Journal of Counselling, 28*(1), 10–23.

Alcoff, L. M. (2007). Epistemologies of ignorance: Three types. In S. Sullivan & N. Tuana (Eds.), *Race and epistemologies of ignorance* (pp. 39–57). Albany, NY: SUNY.

Annabell, T., & Nairn, A. (2019). Flagging a 'new' New Zealand: The discursive construction of national identity in the flag consideration project. *Critical Discourse Studies, 16*(1), 96–111.

Ardern, J., & Hipkins, C. (2019). *NZ history to be taught in all schools [Press Release]*. Retrieved March 3, 2020, from https://www.beehive.govt.nz/release/nz-history-be-taught-all-schools

Asher, N. (2009). Chapter 5: Decolonization and education: Locating pedagogy and self at the interstices in global times. *Counterpoints, 369*, 67–77.

Asians Supporting Tino Rangatiratanga. (2019). Call for Asians to stand in solidarity with Ihumātao. Retrieved May 19, 2020, from https://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/AK1908/S00024/call-for-asians-to-stand-in-solidarity-with-ihumatao.htm

Atkinson, N. (2015). Voting rights - Votes for women. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/voting-rights/page-4

Ayson, R., & Phillips, J. (2012). United States and New Zealand - Nuclear-free 1980s. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/united-states-and-new-zealand/page-3

Bailey, A. (2007). Strategic ignorance. In S. Sullivan & N. Tuana (Eds.), *Race and epistemologies of ignorance* (pp. 77–94). Albany, NY: SUNY.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe halfway: Quantum physics and the entanglement of matter and meaning*. Duke University Press.

Beausoleil, E. (2018). Gathering at the gate: Listening intergenerationally as precursor to settler-indigenous encounter. *Women Talking Politics*, 36–38.

Bell, A. (1996). 'We're just New Zealanders': Pakeha identity politics. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Nga patai: Racism and ethnic relations in Aotearoa/New Zealand* (pp. 144–158). Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Bell, A. (2004). 'Cultural vandalism' and Pakeha politics of guilt and responsibility. In P. Spoonley, C. Macpherson, & D. Pearson (Eds.), *Tangata tangata: The changing ethnic contours of New Zealand*. Southbank Victoria, Australia: Thomson.

Bell, A. (2008). Recognition or ethics? De/centering and the legacy of settler colonialism. *Cultural Studies*, *22*(6), 850–869.

Bell, A. (2009). Dilemmas of settler belonging: Roots, routes and redemption in New Zealand national identity claims. *The Sociological Review*, *57*(1), 145–162.

Bell, A. (2014). *Relating indigenous and settler identities: Beyond domination*. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Bell, A. (2017). Co-existing indigenous and settler worlds: Ontological styles and possibilities. *Journal of New Zealand Studies*, *NS24*, 15–24.

Berenstain, N. (2016). Epistemic exploitation. *Ergo*, *3*(22), 569–590.

Boler, M. (1999). *Feeling power: Emotions and education*. New York: Routledge.

Boler, M., & Zembylas, M. (2003). Discomforting truths: The emotional terrain of understanding difference. In P. P. Trifonas (Ed.), *Pedagogies of difference: Rethinking education for social change* (pp. 74–89). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *The field of cultural production*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Bradbury Huang, H. (2010). What is good action research? *Action Research*, *8*(1), 93–109.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101.

Cheyne, C., O'Brien, M., & Belgrave, M. (2008). *Social policy in Aotearoa New Zealand* (4th). Australia: Oxford University Press.

Cross, B. E. (1999). New racism, reformed teacher education, and the same ole' oppression. *Educational Studies*, *38*, 263–274.

David, M. (2010). Editor's introduction: Methods of interpretive sociology. In M. David (Ed.), *Methods of interpretive sociology* (pp. xxiii–xlii). London, UK: SAGE.

Dazzamo. (2018). *Re: Treaty of Waitangi: What was lost. [comment]*. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/104100739/treaty-of-waitangi-what-was-lost

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

DiAngelo, R. (2006). ‘‘I’m leaving!” White fragility in racial dialogues. In D. E. Armstrong & B. J. McMahon (Eds.), *Inclusion in urban educational environments: Addressing issues of diversity, equity, and social justice* (pp. 213–240). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

DiAngelo, R. (2010). Why can’t we all just be individuals?: Countering the discourse of individualism in anti-racist education. *InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies*, *6*(1), 1–24.

DiAngelo, R. (2011). White fragility (R. DiAngelo, Ed.). *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, *3*(3), 54–70.

DiAngelo, R. (2015). *White fragility: Why it’s so hard to talk to white people about racism*. Retrieved March 3, 2020, from https://goodmenproject.com/featured-content/white-fragility-why-its-so-hard-to-talk-to-white-people-about-racism-twlm/

Donald, P., Gosling, S., Hamilton, J., Hawkes, N., McKenzie, D., & Stronach, I. (1995). ‘No Problem Here’: Action research against racism in a mainly white area. *British Educational Research Journal*, *21*(3), 263–275.

Doubt, K. (1989). Garfinkel before ethnomethodology. *The American Sociologist*, *20*(3), 252–262.

Drucker, P. F. (2003). *The essential Drucker: The best of sixty years of Peter Drucker’s essential writings on management*. New York: HarperBusiness.

Durie, M. (2005). *Ngā tai matatū: Tides of māori endurance*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Dyer, R. (1997). *White*. London: Routledge.

Elkington, B., Jackson, M., Kiddle, R., Mercier, O. R., Ross, M., Smeaton, J., & Thomas, A. (2020). *Imagining decolonisation*. Bridget Williams Books.

Elliott, V. (2018). Thinking about the coding process in qualitative data analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, *23*(11), 2850–2861.

E-Tangata. (2019). *Conversations: Pania Newton*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from https://e-tangata.co.nz/video/conversations-pania-newton/

Evans, C. (2018). Analysing semi-structured interviews using thematic analysis: Exploring voluntary civic participation among adults. In J. Lewis (Ed.), *Sage research methods datasets*. United Kingdom: SAGE Publications.

Fellows, M. L., & Razack, S. (1998). The race to innocence: Confronting hierarchical relations among women. *The Journal of Gender, Race and Justice*, *1*, 335–352.

Finlayson, C. (2017). *Parihaka has waited a long time for this day*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from https://e-tangata.co.nz/history/parihaka-has-waited-a-long-time-for-this-day/

Fowler Snyder, G. (2015). 'Marking whiteness' for cross-racial solidarity. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research On Race, 12*(2), 297–319.

Frankenberg, R. (1993). *The social construction of whiteness: White women, race matters*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Freire, P. (1996). Pedagogy of the oppressed (revised). *New York: Continuum*.

Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1940). Color trouble. *Opportunity, 5*, 144–152.

Gordon, L. P. (2018). Transformation and agency in activist scholarship. In *Making future matters*. Computers; Composition Digital Press. https://ccdigitalpress.org/book/makingfuturematters/gordon-response-essay.html

Hage, G. (2000). *White nation*. Routledge.

Hall, S. (1987). Minimal selves. In L. Appignanesi (Ed.), *Identity* (pp. 44–46). London: Institute of Contemporary Arts.

Haraway, D. (1988). Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of the partial perspective. *Feminist Studies, 14*(3), 575–99.

Harding, S. (1987). Introduction: Is there a feminist method? In S. Harding (Ed.), *Feminism and methodology* (pp. 1–13). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Hekman, S. (2010). *The material of knowledge: Feminist disclosures*. Indiana UP.

Hiemstra, N. (2017). Periscoping as a feminist methodological approach for researching the seemingly hidden. *The Professional Geographer, 69*(2), 329–336.

Hōhaia, T. M. (2017). Taranaki tribe. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/taranaki-tribe

hooks, b. (2014). *Black looks race and representation*. New York: Routledge.

Huygens, I. (2007). *Processes of Pakeha change in response to the Treaty of Waitangi* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Waikato.

Indigenous Action Media. (2014). *Accomplices not allies: Abolishing the ally industrial complex*. Retrieved August 28, 2019, from http://www.indigenousaction.org/accomplices-not-allies-abolishing-the-ally-industrial-complex/

Johnson, M. (2005). 'The land of the wrong white crowd' anti-racist organizations and Pakeha identity politics in the 1970s. *New Zealand Journal of History, 29*(2), 137–157.

Jones, A. (1999). The limits of cross-cultural dialogue: Pedagogy, desire, and absolution in the classroom. *Educational Theory, 49*(3), 299–316.

Jones, A. (2001). Cross-cultural pedagogy and the passion for ignorance. *Feminism & Psychology, 11*(3), 279–292.

Kara, H. (2017). Identity and power in co-produced activist research. *Qualitative Research, 17*(3), 289–301.

Keane, B. (2012). Ngā rōpū tautohetohe – Māori protest movements - Rugby and South Africa. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from http://www.TeAra.govt.nz/en/nga-ropu-tautohetohe-maori-protest-movements/page-4

King, M. (Ed.). (1991). *Pakeha. the quest for identity in New Zealand*. Auckland: Penguin Books.

Kirton, J. D. (1997). *Paakeha/tauiwi: Seeing the unseen*. Waikato: WARC.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lawn, J. (1994). Pakeha bonding. *Meanjin, 53*, 295–304.

Linder, C. (2015). Navigating guilt, shame, and fear of appearing racist: A conceptual model of antiracist white feminist identity development. *Journal of College Student Development, 56*(6), 535–550.

Logue, J. (2008). The unbelievable truth and the dilemmas of ignorance. *Philosophy of Education, 2008*, 54–62.

Lorde, A. (2003). The master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. In R. Lewis & S. Mills (Eds.), *Feminist postcolonial theory: A reader* (pp. 25–28). New York: Routledge.

Louisson, A. (2018). Tūwū: Growing and listening out of enclosure. *PAN: Philosophy Activism Nature*, (14), 45.

Lugones, M. (2003). *Pilgrimages/peregrinajes: Theorizing coalition against multiple oppressions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman; Littlefield.

Luscombe, B. (2020). *A year after Christchurch, Jacinda Ardern has the world's attention. How will she use it?* Retrieved May 18, 2020, from https://time.com/5787443/jacinda-ardern-christchurch-new-zealand-anniversary/

Lykes, M. B., Lloyd, C. R., & Nicholson, K. M. (2018). Participatory and action research within and beyond the academy: Contesting racism through decolonial praxis and teaching "against the grain". *American Journal of Community Psychology, 62*, 406–418.

Mackey, E. (2014). Unsettling expectations: (Un)certainty, settler states of feeling, law, and decolonization. *Canadian Journal of Law and Society / Revue Canadienne Droit et Societe*, *29*(2), 235–252.

Maddison, S. (2012). Postcolonial guilt and national identity: Historical injustice and the Australian settler state. *Social Identities*, *18*(6), 695–709.

Marcetic, B. (2018). *A history of outrage over the word 'Pākehā'*. Retrieved May 3, 2020, from https://thespinoff.co.nz/atea/03-03-2018/a-history-of-outrage-over-the-word-pakeha/

Marn, T. M., & Wolgemuth, J. R. (2017). Purposeful entanglements: A new materialist analysis of transformative interviews. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *23*(5), 365–374.

Matias, C. E., Viesca, K. M., Garrison-Wade, D. F., Tandon, M., & Galindo, R. (2014). "What is critical whiteness doing in our nice field like critical race theory?" applying CRT and CWS to understand the white imaginations of white teacher candidates. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, *47*(3), 289–304.

McCreanor, T. (2005). 'Sticks and stones may break my bones ...' talking Pākehā identities. In J. H. Liu, T. McCreanor, T. McIntosh, & T. Teaiwa (Eds.), *New Zealand identities: Departures and destinations*. Wellington, NZ: Victoria University Press.

McIntosh, P. (1988). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In V. Cyru (Ed.), *Experiencing race, class, and gender in the united states* (pp. 209–213). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Mills, C. (2007). White ignorance. In S. Sullivan & N. Tuana (Eds.), *Race and epistemologies of ignorance*. Albany, NY: SUNY.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (n.d.). *Christchurch Call*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from https://www.christchurchcall.com/

Ministry of Health. (2013). *Socioeconomic indicators*. Retrieved May 3, 2020, from https://www.health.govt.nz/our-work/populations/maori-health/tatau-kahukura-maori-health-statistics/nga-awe-o-te-hauora-socioeconomic-determinants-health/socioeconomic-indicators

Mohanty, C. (2003). *Feminism without borders: Decolonizing theory, practicing solidarity*. Durham; London: Duke University Press.

Moore, D. L. (1997). Rough knowledge and radical understanding: Sacred silence in American Indian literatures. *American Indian Quarterly*, *21*(4), 633–662.

New Zealand Parliament. (n.d.). *Bill proposes further tightening of gun controls*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from https://www.parliament.nz/en/get-involved/topics/all-current-topics/bill-proposes-further-tightening-of-gun-controls/

Newbold, G. (2019). Violent crime - Mass homicides, 1990 –. *Te Ara - the Encyclopedia of New Zealand*. https://teara.govt.nz/en/violent-crime/page-6

Noffke, S. (2012). Revisiting the professional, personal, and political dimensions of action research. In S. Noffke & B. Somekh (Eds.), *The sage handbook of educational action research* (pp. 6–23). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Noho. (n.d.). *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (Online Version)*. Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=noho

Okun, T. (2001). *White supremacy culture*. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from http://www.cwsworkshop.org/PARC_site_B/dr-culture.html

O'Malley, V., & Kidman, J. (2018). Settler colonial history, commemoration and white backlash: Remembering the New Zealand wars. *Settler Colonial Studies*, *8*(3), 298–313.

Parsons, J. B., & Harding, K. J. (2011). Post-colonial theory and action research. *Turkish Online Journal of Qualitative Inquiry*, *2*(2), 1–6.

Petterson, J. (2016). *NZ made 'right judgement' over Iraq*. Retrieved May 18, 2020, from https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/political/308164/nz-made-%27right-judgement%27-over-iraq

Pickering, A. (1995). *The mangle of practice: Time, agency, and science*. U of Chicago P.

Pine, G. J., & Hilliard, A. G. (1990). Rx for racism: Imperatives for America's schools, *71*(8), 593–600.

Poata Smith, E. (2013). Inequality and Māori. In M. Rashbrooke (Ed.), *Inequality: A new zealand crisis* (pp. 148–158). Wellington: Bridget Williams Books.

Powell, J., & Kelly, A. (2017). Accomplices in the academy in the age of Black Lives Matter. *Journal of Critical Thought and Praxis*, *6*(2), 42–65.

Pratt, M. B. (1984). Identity: Skin blood heart. In E. Bulkin, M. Pratt, & B. Smith (Eds.), *Yours in struggle: Three feminist perspectives on anti-semitism and racism*. Ithaca: Firebrand Books.

Probyn, F. (2002). How does the settler belong? *Westerly*, *47*, 75–95.

Probyn, F. (2004). Playing chicken at the intersection: The white critic of whiteness. *Borderlands*, *3*(2).

Read, P. (2000). *Belonging: Australians, place and aboriginal ownership*. Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press.

Richards, L. (2015). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide* (3rd). London, UK: SAGE.

Rifkin, M. (2011). Settler states of feeling: National belonging and the erasure of Native American presence. In C. F. Levander & R. S. Levine (Eds.), *A companion to American literary studies* (pp. 342–355). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

RNZ. (2018). *Parliament passes bill banning new offshore oil and gas exploration*. Retrieved March 18, 2020, from https://www.rnz.co.nz/news/political/375417/parliament-passes-bill-banning-new-offshore-oil-and-gas-exploration

Rose, D. (1996). Land rights and deep colonising: The erasure of women. *Aboriginal Law Bulletin*, *3*, 6–13.

Ryan, G. (2018). Introduction to positivism, interpretivism and critical theory. *Nurse Researcher*, *25*(14-20).

Saslow, E. (2016). *The white flight of Derek Black*. Retrieved December 18, 2019, from https://www.washingtonpost.com/national/the-white-flight-of-derek-black/2016/10/15/ed5f906a-8f3b-11e6-a6a3-d50061aa9fae_story.html?noredirect=on

Saslow, E. (2018). *Rising out of hatred: The awakening of a former white nationalist*. New York: Doubleday.

Sholock, A. (2012). Methodology of the privileged: White anti-racist feminism, systematic ignorance, and epistemic uncertainty. *Hypatia*, *27*(4), 701–714.

Sium, A., Desai, C., & Ritskes, E. (2012). Towards the 'tangible unknown': Decolonization and the indigenous future. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, *1*(1), I–XIII.

Smith, A. (2010). Queer theory and native studies: The heteronormativity of settler colonialism. *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, *16*(1-2), 42–68.

Smith, A. (2012). Indigeneity, settler colonialism, white supremacy. In D. M. HoSang, O. LaBennett, & L. Pulido (Eds.), *Racial formation in the twenty-first century* (pp. 66–90). Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Smith, A. (2013). *The problem with 'privilege'*. Retrieved August 28, 2019, from https://andrea366.wordpress.com/2013/08/14/the-problem-with-privilege-by-andrea-smith/

Smith, L. T. (2012). *Decolonizing methodologies: Research and indigenous peoples*. London: Zed Books Ltd.

Sneddon, P. (2004). *Pakeha and the Treaty: Why it's our Treaty too*. Auckland, New Zealand: Random House.

Somerville, M. (1999). *Body/landscape journals*. Nth Melbourne: Spinifex Press.

Spivak, G. (2010). Can the subaltern speak? In R. Morris (Ed.), *Can the subaltern speak?: Reflections on the history of an idea* (pp. 21–78). New York: Columbia University Press.

-tanga. (n.d.). *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (Online Version)*. Retrieved May 17, 2020, from https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=-tanga

Tangata Whenua. (n.d.). *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (Online Version)*. Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=tangata+whenua

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition* (pp. 25–73). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Te Puni Kōkiri. (n.d.). *Marae*. Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://www.tpk.govt.nz/en/whakamahia/oranga-marae/marae

Tino Rangatiratanga. (n.d.). *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (Online Version)*. Retrieved May 17, 2020, from https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=tino+rangatiratanga

Tolich, M. (2010). A critique of current practice: Ten foundational guidelines for autoethnographers. *Qualitative Health Research, 20*(10), 1–12.

Triple A. (2018). *Re: Treaty of Waitangi: What was lost. [comment]*. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/104100739/treaty-of-waitangi-what-was-lost

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1*(1), 1–40.

Tully, J. (1995). *Strange multiplicity: Constitutionalism in an age of diversity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, S. (1999). Settlement as forgetting. In K. Neuman, N. Thomas, & H. Ericksen (Eds.), *Quicksands: Foundational histories in Australia and Aotearoa New Zealand*. Sydney: UNSW Press.

Turner, S. (2011). Settler dreaming. *Memory Connection, 1*(1), 115–126.

United Nations. (2007). *United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples*. Retrieved May 17, 2020, from https://www.un.org/development/desa/indigenouspeoples/declaration-on-the-rights-of-indigenous-peoples.html

Villanueva, S. T. (2013). Teaching as a healing craft: Decolonizing the classroom and creating spaces of hopeful resistance through chicano-indigenous pedagogical praxis. *The Urban Review, 45*, 23–40.

Walker, R. (2004). *Ka whawhai tonu matou: Struggle without end.* Auckland, New Zealand: Penguin Books.

Whakaaro. (n.d.). *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (Online Version)*. https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=whakaaro

Whakapapa. (n.d.). *Te Aka Māori-English, English-Māori Dictionary and Index (Online Version)*. Retrieved May 12, 2020, from https://maoridictionary.co.nz/search?keywords=whakapapa

Wolfe, P. (2006). Settler colonialism and the elimination of the native. *Journal of genocide research, 8*(4), 387–409.

Zachpagella. (2018). *Re: Treaty of Waitangi: What was lost. [comment]*. Retrieved March 21, 2019, from https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/104100739/treaty-of-waitangi-what-was-lost

Unsettling Pākehā Fragility

INFORMATION SHEET

1 Researcher Introduction

This Information Sheet describes Penny Leach's Master of Arts in Politics. It provides general information about the project and specifics as to the participatory component.

2 Project Description and Invitation

The purpose of this project is to further understand the entanglement of Pākehā identity with colonialism. Many Pākehā react defensively when asked to consider this issue, while others are open to having uncomfortable conversations about identity and colonialism.

I therefore aim to understand where disruptive moments may have occurred with the participants that enabled a foreclosure of defensiveness and a more critical analysis, with the broader aim of theorising where this openness might occur for other Pākehā.

Would you consider participating in this research project with me?

3 Participant Identification and Recruitment

I am using a snowball sampling strategy to identify between 5 and 8 participants, utilising connections I already have in my various political networks.

The participant profile is a Pākehā New Zealander, at least first generation, who does not consider any other country (e.g. where their parents or grandparents migrated from) as *home*. The participants will already be on their own journey of grappling with their Pākehā identity and be aware of the privilege that entails.

As a thank you for participating, I am offering a koha of a $50 Unity Books voucher.

There is a small chance we might discuss events that have been emotional. You have the right to discontinue the interview at any time.

4 Data Management

I intend to record the audio of our interviews and transcribe them. Once you have confirmed your transcription, I will destroy the audio recordings.

I will not identify you by name in my thesis. Any demographic information (beyond age and gender) will be only included if salient, and with your consent.

5 Project Procedures

Participation in this project involves:

- an interview with me at a suitable (private) location;
- being sent the transcript of the interview for confirmation that it is accurate;
- the possibility of a follow-up interview or questions of clarification;
- being sent the section of the thesis that discusses your perspective, to ensure continued consent;
- being sent a final draft of the entire thesis, to ensure continued consent.

6 Participant's Rights

You are under no obligation to accept this invitation. If you decide to participate, you have the right to:

- decline to answer any particular question;
- ask for the recorder to be turned off at any time during the interview;
- ask for selective removal of text from the transcription of your interview;
- ask for any identifying characteristics or demographic information to be excluded;
- ask for changes in the final write up specific to your interview;
- withdraw from the study;
- ask any questions about the study at any time during participation;
- provide information on the understanding that your name will not be used;
- be given access to the full thesis when it is finished.

7 Project Contacts

Feel free to contact Penny Leach, or her supervisor, Bethan Greener, with any questions.

Penny: penny@mjollnir.org or phone: 021 736 695
Bethan: b.greener@massey.ac.nz

8 Compulsory Statements

This project has been evaluated by peer review and judged to be low risk. Consequently, it has not been reviewed by one of the University's Human Ethics Committees. The researcher(s) named above are responsible for the ethical conduct of this research.

If you have any concerns about the conduct of this research that you wish to raise with someone other than the researcher(s), please contact Prof Craig Johnson, Director, Research Ethics, telephone 06 356 9099 x 85271, email humanethics@massey.ac.nz.

Unsettling Pākehā Fragility

PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM - INDIVIDUAL

I have read, or have had read to me in my first language, and I understand the Information Sheet attached.

I have had the details of the study explained to me, any questions I had have been answered to my satisfaction, and I understand that I may ask further questions at any time.

I have been given sufficient time to consider whether to participate in this study and I understand participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time.

1. I agree/do not agree to the interview being sound recorded.
2. I wish/do not wish to have my recordings returned to me.
3. I agree to participate in this study under the conditions set out in the Information Sheet attached.

Declaration by Participant:

I, _____ hereby consent to take part in this study.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Unsettling Pākehā Fragility

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1 Preamble

The interviews are intended to be semi-structured conversations, in which we meander through the various parts of the subject together. This sheet is intended as a guide to ensure all topics are covered, but not a formulaic or rigid structure.

I wish to remind you that at any time, you can decline to answer a particular question, end a particular direction the discussion is going, or discontinue the conversation altogether.

2 Questions

- First an easy question. Can you tell me what your thoughts are on what a New Zealand identity means? What characteristics come to mind when you think about what a 'New Zealander' is?
- Now I'd like to narrow a bit and explore what you think is characteristic of the Pākehā identity. What characteristics do you see there? Is it something different?
- Do you think there's a general conflation of Pākehā and New Zealand when some Pākehā think about identity? Do you think you have a different perspective? Why? Can you think of an event that might have changed your view on this?
- How much are you aware of the impacts of colonialism to New Zealand? Do you think that has impacted your understanding of your Pākehā identity? What does being Pākehā mean to you? Are you proud of being Pākehā? Is it a comfortable identity for you?
- What does the word 'decolonisation' mean to you in practice? What do you think about the return of land? What about land that may be in private ownership? What about power sharing?
- Can you tell me what emotions come to mind when you think about these topics around identity, colonisation, decolonisation?
- Can you think of an event in your life or something that you experienced that has influenced or changed the way you think about colonialism?
- Why do you think some people are so defensive about this topic? Can you tell me what things have led to you being able to talk about this, even though it may be uncomfortable?
- Is there anything else you want to talk about?